SHSBC TAPES 201-300

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 4. February 2015
a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1. 62-08-09 GOALS LISTING ................................................................. 1
2. 62-08-14 ROCK SLAMS AND .......................................................... 19
3. 62-08-14 WORLD CLEARING PROGRAM ...................................... 37
4. 62-08-15 TV DEMO: 3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ..................... 55
5. 62-08-16 3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ...................................... 87
6. 62-08-21 FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT .......... 101
7. 62-08-21 BASICS OF AUDITING .................................................. 119
8. 62-08-22 TV DEMO: DYNAMIC AND ITEM ASSESSMENT ........ 137
9. 62-09-18 DIRECTING PC'S ATTENTION ....................................... 165
10. 62-09-18 3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM .......... 177
11. 62-09-19 TV DEMO: TIGER DRILL .............................................. 191
12. 62-09-20 LISTING LINES .............................................................. 219
13. 62-09-20 GERIATRICS ................................................................. 237
14. 62-09-25 CURRENT TRENDS ....................................................... 254
15. 62-09-25 3GA ASSESSMENT ........................................................ 270
16. 62-09-27 3GA LISTING, PART I .................................................. 286
17. 62-09-27 3GA LISTING, PART II .................................................. 299
18. 62-10-02 3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS ............................. 315
19. 62-10-02 3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS, PART II ............. 333
20. 62-10-04 MODERN SECURITY CHECKING .................................. 353
21. 62-10-04 MAKING A GOAL FIRE .............................................. 369
22. 62-10-09 FUTURE ORG TRENDS .............................................. 387
23. 62-10-09 INSTRUCTORS' BUGBEAR ......................................... 401
24. 62-10-11 3GA GOALS FINDING, PART I ................................. 419
25. 62-10-11 3GA GOALS FINDING, PART II .................................. 435
26. 62-10-23 3GA CRISS CROSS ...................................................... 451
27. 62-10-23 3GA CRISS CROSS: FOLLOWING THE ROCK SLAM ... 466
28. 62-10-25 3GA CRISS CROSS DATA ........................................... 482
29. 62-10-25 3GA CRISS CROSS SECONDARY PREHAV SCALE .... 498
30. 62-10-30 PREHAV SCALES AND LISTS ................................... 516
31. 62-10-30 LISTING GOALS .......................................................... 532
32. 62-11-01 THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD ............................ 550
33. 62-11-01 THE ROAD TO TRUTH .............................................. 564
34. 62-11-13 THE DIFFICULT CASE .............................................. 580
35. 62-11-13 ENTRANCE OF CASES ............................................. 596
36. 62-11-15 TERMINALS ................................................................. 612
37. 62-11-15 CLEARING TECHNOLOGY ........................................ 628
38. 62-11-20 LAYOUT OF THE GPM ............................................. 643
39. 62-11-20 FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING ............................... 659
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>62-11-22</td>
<td>Q&amp;A PERIOD: TIGER DRILLING, CLEARS</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>62-11-22</td>
<td>Q AND A PERIOD: DISTRICT OFFICES, CO-AUDITS</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>62-11-27</td>
<td>ROUTINE 2-12, PART I</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>62-11-27</td>
<td>ROUTINE 2-12, PART II</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>62-11-29</td>
<td>R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART I</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>62-11-29</td>
<td>R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART II</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>62-12-11</td>
<td>R2-12 DATA</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>62-12-11</td>
<td>PHANTOM ROCK SLAM</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>62-12-13</td>
<td>R2-12 DATA: NEEDLE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>62-12-13</td>
<td>REPAIR OF R2-12</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>63-01-08</td>
<td>R2-10 AND R2-12</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>63-01-08</td>
<td>CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>63-01-10</td>
<td>R2-12</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>63-01-10</td>
<td>HOW TO AUDIT</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>63-01-15</td>
<td>R2-12 DEAD HORSES</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>63-01-15</td>
<td>R2-12 NEVERS</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TV DEMO: TR 0 DEMONSTRATION</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TR 0 LECTURE</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>63-02-06</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS’ CONFERENCE</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>63-02-07</td>
<td>R3MX, PART I</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>63-02-07</td>
<td>R3MX PART II</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>63-02-12</td>
<td>ROUTINE 3M</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>63-02-13</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDS AND HAVINGNESS</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>63-02-13</td>
<td>DISCUSSION OF DEMO SESSIONS</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>63-02-14</td>
<td>ROUTINE 3M DATA</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>63-02-19</td>
<td>RUNDOWN ON PROCESSES</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>63-02-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: FINDING RRS</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>63-02-20</td>
<td>TALK ON TV: DEMO FINDING RR’S</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>63-02-21</td>
<td>R2 AND R3: CURRENT AUDITING RUNDOWN</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>63-02-26</td>
<td>R3M: CURRENT RUNDOWN BY STEPS</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>63-02-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>63-02-28</td>
<td>GOALS PROBLEMS MASS</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>63-03-05</td>
<td>R2 AND R3: URGENT DATA</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>63-03-07</td>
<td>WHEN FACED WITH THE UNUSUAL DO THE USUAL</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>63-03-19</td>
<td>R3M: HOW TO FIND GOALS</td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63-03-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDIMENTS AND HAVINGNESS SESSION AND SHORT LECTURE</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>63-03-21</td>
<td>R2G SERIES</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>63-03-26</td>
<td>CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>63-03-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH</td>
<td>1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>63-03-28</td>
<td>THE GPM</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>63-04-02</td>
<td>GPM ITEMS</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-04</td>
<td>ANATOMY OF THE GPM</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-16</td>
<td>TOP OF THE GPM</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-18</td>
<td>DIRECTIVE LISTING</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-23</td>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-25</td>
<td>FINDING GOALS</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-30</td>
<td>PATTERN OF THE GPM [DIRECTIVE LISTING]</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-02</td>
<td>RUNNING THE GPM</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-14</td>
<td>IMPLANT GPMS</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-15</td>
<td>TV DEMO: BLOCKING OUT AND DATING INCIDENTS</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-16</td>
<td>THE TIME TRACK</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-21</td>
<td>THE HELATROBUS IMPLANTS</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-22</td>
<td>TV DEMO: ENGRAM RUNNING – HELATROBUS IMPLANT GOAL</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-23</td>
<td>STATE OF OT</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-28</td>
<td>HANDLING ARC BREAKS</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-29</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-05-30</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING CASES PART II</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-06-11</td>
<td>ENGRAM CHAIN RUNNING</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>62-08-09</td>
<td>GOALS LISTING</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>62-08-14</td>
<td>ROCK SLAMS AND</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>62-08-14</td>
<td>WORLD CLEARING PROGRAM</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>62-08-15</td>
<td>TV DEMO: 3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>62-08-16</td>
<td>3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>62-08-21</td>
<td>BASICS OF AUDITING</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>62-08-21</td>
<td>FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>62-08-22</td>
<td>TV DEMO: DYNAMIC AND ITEM ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>62-09-18</td>
<td>3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>62-09-18</td>
<td>DIRECTING PC’S ATTENTION</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>62-09-19</td>
<td>TV DEMO: TIGER DRILL</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>62-09-20</td>
<td>GERIATRICS</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>62-09-20</td>
<td>LISTING LINES</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>62-09-25</td>
<td>3GA ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>62-09-25</td>
<td>CURRENT TRENDS</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>62-09-27</td>
<td>3GA LISTING, PART I</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>62-09-27</td>
<td>3GA LISTING, PART II</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>62-10-02</td>
<td>3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>62-10-02</td>
<td>3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS, PART II</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>62-10-04</td>
<td>MAKING A GOAL FIRE</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>62-10-04</td>
<td>MODERN SECURITY CHECKING</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>62-10-09</td>
<td>FUTURE ORG TRENDS</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>62-10-09</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS’ BUGBEAR</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>62-10-11</td>
<td>3GA GOALS FINDING, PART I</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>62-10-11</td>
<td>3GA GOALS FINDING, PART II</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>62-10-23</td>
<td>3GA CRISS CROSS</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>62-10-23</td>
<td>3GA CRISS CROSS: FOLLOWING THE ROCK SLAM</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>62-10-25</td>
<td>3GA CRISS CROSS DATA</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>62-10-25</td>
<td>3GA CRISS CROSS SECONDARY PREHAV SCALE</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>62-10-30</td>
<td>LISTING GOALS</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>62-10-30</td>
<td>PREHAV SCALES AND LISTS</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>62-11-01</td>
<td>THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>62-11-01</td>
<td>THE ROAD TO TRUTH</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>62-11-13</td>
<td>ENTRANCE OF CASES</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>62-11-13</td>
<td>THE DIFFICULT CASE</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>62-11-15</td>
<td>CLEARING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>62-11-15</td>
<td>TERMINALS</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>62-11-20</td>
<td>FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>62-11-20</td>
<td>LAYOUT OF THE GPM</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-22</td>
<td>Q-A PERIOD: DISTRICT OFFICES, CO-AUDITS</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-22</td>
<td>Q&amp;A PERIOD: TIGER DRILLING, CLEARS</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-27</td>
<td>ROUTINE 2-12, PART II</td>
<td>723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-27</td>
<td>ROUTINE 2-12, PART I</td>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-29</td>
<td>R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART I</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-11-29</td>
<td>R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART II</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-12-11</td>
<td>PHANTOM ROCK SLAM</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-12-11</td>
<td>R2-12 DATA</td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-12-13</td>
<td>R2-12 DATA: NEEDLE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-12-13</td>
<td>REPAIR OF R2-12</td>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-08</td>
<td>CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-08</td>
<td>R2-10 AND R2-12</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-10</td>
<td>HOW TO AUDIT</td>
<td>885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-10</td>
<td>R2-12</td>
<td>867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-15</td>
<td>R2-12 DEAD HORSES</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-15</td>
<td>R2-12 NEVERS</td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TR 0 LECTURE</td>
<td>967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TV DEMO: TR 0 DEMONSTRATION</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-06</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS' CONFERENCE</td>
<td>979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-07</td>
<td>R3MX PART II</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-07</td>
<td>R3MX, PART I</td>
<td>989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-12</td>
<td>ROUTINE 3M</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-13</td>
<td>DISCUSSION OF DEMO SESSIONS</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-13</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDS AND HAVINGNESS</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-14</td>
<td>ROUTINE 3M DATA</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-19</td>
<td>RUNDOWN ON PROCESSES</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-20</td>
<td>TALK ON TV: DEMO FINDING RR'S</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: FINDING RR'S</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-21</td>
<td>R2 AND R3: CURRENT AUDITING RUNDOWN</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-26</td>
<td>R3M: CURRENT RUNDOWN BY STEPS</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-02-28</td>
<td>GOALS PROBLEMS MASS</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-05</td>
<td>R2 AND R3: URGENT DATA</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-07</td>
<td>WHEN FACED WITH THE UNUSUAL DO THE USUAL</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-19</td>
<td>R3M: HOW TO FIND GOALS</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDIMENTS AND HAVINGNESS SESSION AND SHORT LECTURE</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-21</td>
<td>R2G SERIES</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-26</td>
<td>CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-03-28</td>
<td>THE GPM</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-04-02</td>
<td>GPM ITEMS</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>63-04-04 ANATOMY OF THE GPM</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>63-04-16 TOP OF THE GPM</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>63-04-18 DIRECTIVE LISTING</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>63-04-23 GOALS</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>63-04-25 FINDING GOALS</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>63-04-30 PATTERN OF THE GPM [DIRECTIVE LISTING]</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>63-05-02 RUNNING THE GPM</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>63-05-14 IMPLANT GPMS</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>63-05-15 TV DEMO: BLOCKING OUT AND DATING INCIDENTS</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>63-05-16 THE TIME TRACK</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>63-05-21 THE HELATROBUS IMPLANTS</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>63-05-22 TV DEMO: ENGRAM RUNNING – HELATROBUS IMPLANT GOAL</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>63-05-23 STATE OF OT</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>63-05-28 HANDLING ARC BREAKS</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>63-05-29 PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>63-05-30 PROGRAMMING CASES PART II</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>63-06-11 ENGRAM CHAIN RUNNING</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1. 62-09-25  3GA ASSESSMENT .................................................................................................................270
2. 62-10-25  3GA CRISS CROSS DATA......................................................................................................482
3. 62-10-25  3GA CRISS CROSS SECONDARY PREHAV SCALE .................................................................498
4. 62-10-23  3GA CRISS CROSS .................................................................................................................451
5. 62-10-23  3GA CRISS CROSS: FOLLOWING THE ROCK SLAM .............................................................466
6. 62-09-18  3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM .................................................................177
7. 62-08-16  3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ................................................................................................87
8. 62-10-11  3GA GOALS FINDING, PART I .............................................................................................419
9. 62-10-11  3GA GOALS FINDING, PART II ............................................................................................435
10. 62-10-02  3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS .......................................................................................315
11. 62-10-02  3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS, PART II .........................................................................333
12. 62-09-27  3GA LISTING, PART I ...........................................................................................................286
13. 62-09-27  3GA LISTING, PART II .........................................................................................................299
14. 63-04-04  ANATOMY OF THE GPM ...................................................................................................1375
15. 62-08-21  BASICS OF AUDITING .......................................................................................................119
16. 63-03-26  CASE REPAIR ...................................................................................................................1307
17. 63-01-08  CASE REPAIR .....................................................................................................................851
18. 62-11-15  CLEARING TECHNOLOGY .................................................................................................628
19. 62-09-25  CURRENT TRENDS .............................................................................................................254
20. 62-09-18  DIRECTING PC’S ATTENTION ............................................................................................165
21. 63-04-18  DIRECTIVE LISTING ..........................................................................................................1407
22. 63-02-13  DISCUSSION OF DEMO SESSIONS ...................................................................................1063
23. 63-06-11  ENGRAM CHAIN RUNNING ...............................................................................................1658
24. 62-11-13  ENTRANCE OF CASES .......................................................................................................596
25. 62-08-21  FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT .................................................................101
26. 63-04-25  FINDING GOALS ................................................................................................................1439
27. 62-11-20  FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING ......................................................................................659
28. 62-10-09  FUTURE ORG TRENDS .......................................................................................................387
29. 62-09-20  GERIATRICS .......................................................................................................................237
30. 62-08-09  GOALS LISTING ................................................................................................................1
31. 63-02-28  GOALS PROBLEMS MASS .................................................................................................1204
32. 63-04-23  GOALS ................................................................................................................................1421
33. 63-04-02  GPM ITEMS ........................................................................................................................1359
34. 63-05-28  HANDLING ARC BREAKS ..................................................................................................1610
35. 63-01-10  HOW TO AUDIT ..................................................................................................................885
36. 63-05-14  IMPLANT GPMS ...................................................................................................................1493
37. 62-10-09  INSTRUCTORS’ BUGBEAR .................................................................................................401
38. 63-02-06  INSTRUCTORS’ CONFERENCE .........................................................................................979
39. 62-11-20  LAYOUT OF THE GPM .......................................................................................................643
<p>| 40. | 62-10-30 | LISTING GOALS .................................................................................................................. 532 |
| 41. | 62-09-20 | LISTING LINES .................................................................................................................... 219 |
| 42. | 62-10-04 | MAKING A GOAL FIRE ......................................................................................................... 369 |
| 43. | 62-10-04 | MODERN SECURITY CHECKING .............................................................................................. 353 |
| 44. | 63-04-30 | PATTERN OF THE GPM [DIRECTIVE LISTING] ................................................................... 1455 |
| 45. | 62-12-11 | PHANTOM ROCK SLAM ........................................................................................................ 787 |
| 46. | 62-10-30 | PREHAV SCALES AND LISTS ............................................................................................... 516 |
| 47. | 63-05-29 | PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1 .......................................................................................... 1626 |
| 48. | 63-05-30 | PROGRAMMING CASES PART II ........................................................................................ 1642 |
| 49. | 62-11-22 | Q AND A PERIOD: DISTRICT OFFICES, CO-AUDITS ...................................................... 691 |
| 50. | 62-11-22 | Q&amp;A PERIOD: TIGER DRILLING, CLEARS ........................................................................ 675 |
| 51. | 63-02-21 | R2 AND R3: CURRENT AUDITING RUNDOWN .................................................................. 1137 |
| 52. | 63-03-05 | R2 AND R3: URGENT DATA .............................................................................................. 1222 |
| 53. | 63-01-08 | R2-10 AND R2-12 ................................................................................................................ 833 |
| 54. | 62-12-11 | R2-12 DATA ....................................................................................................................... 769 |
| 55. | 62-12-13 | R2-12 DATA: NEEDLE BEHAVIOR ................................................................................... 803 |
| 56. | 63-01-15 | R2-12 DEAD HORSES ........................................................................................................ 901 |
| 57. | 63-01-15 | R2-12 NEVERS .................................................................................................................... 917 |
| 58. | 62-11-29 | R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART I ........................................................................... 739 |
| 59. | 62-11-29 | R2-12 THEORY AND PRACTICE PART II .......................................................................... 753 |
| 60. | 63-01-10 | R2-12 .................................................................................................................................. 867 |
| 61. | 63-03-21 | R2G SERIES ........................................................................................................................ 1291 |
| 62. | 63-02-26 | R3M: CURRENT RUNDOWN BY STEPS ............................................................................. 1157 |
| 63. | 63-03-19 | R3M: HOW TO FIND GOALS ............................................................................................. 1256 |
| 64. | 63-02-07 | R3MX PART II ..................................................................................................................... 1005 |
| 65. | 63-02-07 | R3MX, PART I ...................................................................................................................... 989 |
| 66. | 62-12-13 | REPAIR OF R2-12 ............................................................................................................... 817 |
| 67. | 62-08-14 | ROCK SLAMS AND ............................................................................................................. 19 |
| 68. | 62-11-27 | ROUTINE 2-12, PART II .................................................................................................... 723 |
| 69. | 62-11-27 | ROUTINE 2-12, PART I ...................................................................................................... 707 |
| 70. | 63-02-14 | ROUTINE 3M DATA ............................................................................................................ 1069 |
| 71. | 63-02-12 | ROUTINE 3M ..................................................................................................................... 1021 |
| 72. | 63-02-19 | RUNDOWN ON PROCESSES ............................................................................................. 1085 |
| 73. | 63-05-02 | RUNNING THE GPM ........................................................................................................... 1475 |
| 74. | 63-05-23 | STATE OF OT ....................................................................................................................... 1594 |
| 75. | 63-02-20 | TALK ON TV: DEMO FINDING RR'S ...................................................................................... 1129 |
| 76. | 62-11-15 | TERMINALS ......................................................................................................................... 612 |
| 77. | 62-11-13 | THE DIFFICULT CASE ...................................................................................................... 580 |
| 78. | 63-03-28 | THE GPM ............................................................................................................................ 1343 |
| 79. | 63-05-21 | THE HELATROBUS IMPLANTS ............................................................................................. 1553 |
| 80. | 62-11-01 | THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD .................................................................................... 550 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>62-11-01</td>
<td>THE ROAD TO TRUTH</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>63-05-16</td>
<td>THE TIME TRACK</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>63-04-16</td>
<td>TOP OF THE GPM</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TR 0 LECTURE</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>63-03-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH</td>
<td>1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>62-08-15</td>
<td>TV DEMO: 3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>63-01-16</td>
<td>TV DEMO: TR 0 DEMONSTRATION</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>63-05-15</td>
<td>TV DEMO: BLOCKING OUT AND DATING INCIDENTS</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>63-02-27</td>
<td>TV DEMO: CASE REPAIR</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>62-08-22</td>
<td>TV DEMO: DYNAMIC AND ITEM ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>63-05-22</td>
<td>TV DEMO: ENGRAM RUNNING – HELATROBUS IMPLANT GOAL</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>63-02-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: FINDING RRS</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>63-03-20</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDIMENTS AND HAVINGNESS SESSION AND SHORT LECTURE</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>63-02-13</td>
<td>TV DEMO: RUDS AND HAVINGNESS</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>62-09-19</td>
<td>TV DEMO: TIGER DRILL</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>63-03-07</td>
<td>WHEN FACED WITH THE UNUSUAL DO THE USUAL</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>62-08-14</td>
<td>WORLD CLEARING PROGRAM</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHSBC TAPES 201-300  XIII  04.02.15
GOALS LISTING

A lecture given on
9 August 1962

Thank you.
Well, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 9 August.
What's the year?
*Audience: 1962. AD 12.*
AD 12. All right, thank you.
And what I'm going to talk to you about is just – technically just listing.
Listing: How to list.
In the beginning, there was the Model Session. [laughter]

Now, what do you do in listing that is different than any other auditing? Well, you prepcheck the object of and the lines of the auditing command – every session beginning with a fast check. Got it? And I think if you do that, your number of items that you need to list out a goal will materially diminish. I think you'll find it saves its time over and over and over and over.

So let's put in the rudiments – the beginning rudiments – *bangety-bangety-bang,* and say the pc's goal, and to-be-a-tiger it. In other words, get the middle ruds in on it, fast. Get it to firing if we can. Of course, we go just so far, this thing is going to start firing latent, and it's going to expire one way or the other. But after all, it is our target. And to run somebody endlessly with his goal suppressed and invalidated and all that sort of thing is liable to require a large number of additional items and all kinds of other things in the session, don't you see? Other things might go wrong. You might even waste a whole session and not even recognize that you have wasted one.

All right. Now, the auditing command, of course, is the Who-What lines, of which there are four.

Now, I'm not going to try to give you a wording of the Who-What lines and say that will forever and always be true.

First you have finding the goal, in 3GA, and proving it out, and then you get to listing. And in actual fact, the first step of listing is to find lines that fit the goal.

Now, you've got a picture that you must comply with. And the picture is an outflow arrow and an inflow arrow – arrows pointing at one another. Draw a circle for the pc and then
draw a line going out from him and then the arrow ends, and then draw another line extending
that one, but its arrow ends are in toward the first arrow.

And then you have the retarding arrow of the first line, and then you have the retarding
arrow of the second line, and they're just arrows alongside the other two arrows – going
the opposite direction. In other words, you got four arrows here: One is going out from the pc
and one is going in toward the pc. And then you've got the other pair of arrows further out;
the first one is in toward the pc and the other one is out away from the pc.

Now, the auditing command that you want simply matches up the four basic flows.
Now, you see, there could be 16 flows listed, there could be 32 flows listed, there could be
128 flows listed. Don't you see? You could list and list – oh, wow! But staying with four is
the most economical, as far as we know at this particular time. But those four must be mean-
ingful to the pc; they've got to make sense to the pc.

Now, we want to know – we want to know – the first line is, "Who or what would
have it?" "Want it," "Have it" – I don't care which one you use. That's as far as the goal is
concerned. Then "Who or what would oppose it?" See, that's your outer arrow pointing in
toward the first arrow. "Who or what would oppose it?"

Now we've got to have specifically, "Who or what would keep you from performing
it?" or "doing it?" You see? And then we've got to find out, "Who or what would oppose its
being opposed?"

Now, how you get these words to go together is remarkable, and so forth, but they
must fire.

Now, the goal has a rocket read, and then so must the lines. You've got to have a read
on those lines. And the read on these lines must exist not because you've made a mistake on
the line. You recognize that you could write the wrong line, and so forth.

Do you know to date we have had three people, one of whose clearing was held up,
and two, that was loused up, right here at Saint Hill, because nobody paid enough attention to
the wording and value of the wording of lines? So this is not a light subject. This is a very
important subject. And it is the auditor's responsibility, not the Training Director or somebody
else's responsibility. This is the auditor's responsibility. Those lines are there and they've got
to fire.

In other words, if you read this line, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" that
thing has got to fire on that, not because the goal is on the end, but the line as a major thought
has got to fire. That's got to fire.

Now, remember that the whole rash of free needles that we got out earlier this summer
were all listed on this simplicity. (I'll show you how simple it can be.) Line one: "Who or
what would want to catch catfish?" (Let's say this is the goal.) Line two: "Who or what would
oppose catching catfish?" Line three: "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" Line
four: "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?"

Now, those are the exact lines – the verb form changing on two of the lines to an
"-ing." And look, even though they were reaching madly and having an awful time on line
four, and scrambling around on it most horribly, they still made it, see? Now, it was only when, on one, (and I'm not saying this just to be mean, although the person who thinks – who is going to hear it in a moment will swear that I said it just to be mean) – the introduction of "your" into the line (unreported by the auditor) – into one of the lines prevented that line from ever going to free needle. Till one day I caught the thing up and found out that this extra word existed in the line, knocked the extra word out, had it prepchecked a little bit, and wham, all four lines went to free needle.

See, there was one line in there – I've forgotten which line it was, but it was something on the order of "Who or what would oppose your catching catfish?" Not "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" See? Just the introduction of that "your" on one of the four lines. See, it wasn't on the other three. And yet this was listed this way by three auditors, see? And the first auditor was completely exonerated on the matter because nobody had formulated the lines at that time to amount to anything and we were just at the beginning of this level, and this auditor put them together as kind of what the pc thought they might be, you see? And there was a "your" in it. And that prevented those things from going to free needle. So, in other words, the wording of the line can prevent or achieve a free needle for that line. It is the wording of the line.

Now, our modern – more modern version seems to hit people much closer. And we have had at least one goal not go Clear on the old four lines, but be much easier to run, and is running much more easily, and actually on the original four lines just went up to 5.0 as the TA, and stuck. Right goal, but it just went up and stuck because these lines were not adequate to describe the situation, you see, and started moving again the moment the wording was changed to these lines which we are now using.

Line one: "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" Line two: "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" Line three: "Who or what would retard" (or "pull back") "opposition to catching catfish?" And line four: "Who or what would pull back" (what is it?) "…from catching catfish?"

Audience: "Someone or something."

Oh, "someone or something from catching catfish?" Now, "someone or something" could of course be on all four – on at least two of the lines, or on more of the lines, you understand. But there is the pattern which we are using now. It's "pull back" and "pull back," or "retard" and "pull back," on lines three and four.

But the point is, the line has got to fire. You read the goal, "To catch catfish," bang! "To catch catfish," bang! "To catch catfish," bang!

All right. That read transfers over on to all four lines. And it is not true that it transfers on to just three of the lines and the other one isn't hot just now. See, it's because that line that is not firing is not quite right. See? You should be able to put these four lines together and get them all to fire. You say, "To catch catfish," bang! "To catch catfish," bang! "To catch catfish," bang! "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" Bang! You see? They've all got to fire that way.
Now, there are various oddball wordings which haven't worked. We run into the problem of the negative goal. Let's take the goal "Not to talk." "Who or what would want not to talk?" That's perfectly fine, isn't it? "Who or what would oppose not to talk?" That's good, isn't it? That's fine. We're just going along fine there. Now let's get to line three on the old wording. "Who or what would not oppose not to talk?" Double negative. Enterprising auditor, shift the double negative, of course, change it around so you don't have a double negative, that'd make it "much better" – she never goes Clear. And line four, "Who or what would not want to talk?" Now that's really becoming garbage as far as the auditor can see. Pretty gruesome.

But what do you know! Interestingly enough, it's perfectly comprehensible to the pc. Double negative – so what? Doesn't mean anything to the pc. The line means something to the pc, but that it isn't grammatically something or other was not a thing. So that first wording was perfectly okay and was all right to remain just as it was if you had a negative goal.

But this wording didn't work, see – double negative, that's all right, doesn't matter. But this wording didn't work: "Who or what would want the goal 'not to talk'?" "Who or what would oppose the goal 'not to talk'?" "Who or what would not oppose the goal 'not to talk'?" For some cockeyed reason it ceases to make sense very soon, see? "The goal..." "the goal..." "the goal..." Makes it grammatical, but – apparently makes it unworkable.

Now we'll get another one: Let's take the "-i-n-g" out of it. "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" See? "Who or what would oppose the goal 'to catch catfish'?" Now, this one is important for you to know about, because pcs will try to steer you into it. It hasn't the least bearing on the situation. It doesn't go clear. Apparently this one lays an egg. But a pc tells you "that's real hot." The pc will tell you, "That's real good." And apparently it is for the birds. See the difference? It's a different meaning. "Who or what would oppose the goal 'to catch catfish?'" of course is just dandy. That sounds good, doesn't it? Well, it isn't the same meaning that you want on your list line.

We don't care about opposing the goal. To hell with the goal – why keep it in that realm? We want to know who would oppose catching catfish, not oppose the goal "to catch catfish." It's "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" that clears the pc. See, that's the opposition. It's the opposition to action. Because remember, these are flow lines. When everybody – anybody tries to steer you away from a wording which you think is proper and so forth, in arguing it out with a pc, or figuring it out yourself or something, just remember this: These are actions. These are actions.

Now, of course, we get "want the goal": that's a kind of an inflow, isn't it? And that has always kind of loused me up. I don't know quite why an inflow word like want works as an outflow action of the goal. But it apparently keeps the goal in the item's head that has got it. See? But have, as far as I know – although I don't have too much data on this – have apparently works equally well. Apparently.

But it's what fires that counts. But what fires has got to be actions of the goal. It's got to be action. Because you're listing flow lines.
So this would be dead wrong: "Who or what would oppose people who had the goal to catch catfish?" This is dead wrong. That's – you want to know who or what would oppose people. Well, that's not the goal.

All right. Let's go a little bit further afield here. It's after all "catfish," isn't it? All right, so "Who or what would oppose catfish?" You're practically listing two lines at once. That's what messes up there. Because anybody who's trying to catch catfish is opposing catfish, too. And anybody who's opposing catfish is also opposing catfish, and you've got no opposition anywhere. So you might as well just do the one line for the two, don't you see?

And there we come into the liability of listing lines. Now, believe me, this is quite a problem, because you're liable to make this horrible mistake, unless forewarned: The pc is given four commands but actually only lists three lines. Now, look at the mess this gets him into. He lists twice as many items on one line and he lists no items on another line, and an equal number on the remaining two lines.

In other words, he overlists one line and doesn't list another line at all. And the pc is going to go round the bend. See, he's really going to get cooked with this one. Next thing you know, your tone arm is stuck, and you'll be saying it's the wrong goal, and everything is all upset. Well, the pc, through his own interpretation, can do this just fine. So the best way to handle this is have pcs draw you pictures.

Now, you want to draw the pc a picture of the one I just gave you and present this as a problem to the pc of how you're going to word this thing. Of course, you're going to word this thing with correct wording. If absolutely impossible, you're going to change it. But you're going to try to word it with correct wording. But you want to show the pc this thing. And it's this arrow that comes in toward him, and this arrow that goes out that faces the other arrow, and then this arrow that pulls back and then this arrow that goes out parallel to the other one. You want to show him those four arrows, and you're going to say, "That's oppose. That's opposed to doing your goal, and this is doing your goal, see, and this is keeping you from doing your goal, don't you see, and that's retarding the other from being opposed. But at the same time, we don't want this fourth line here to be the second line up here. Do you see how that could be? See, who would oppose you doing your goal? Who would – and who would not want you to do your goal?" Ooooh, those things are getting awful ghostly close together, aren't they?

But you got to have wording here that means these four flows, with regard to the action of this goal.

Now, goals are action situations. Even "Being a hound dog," as a goal "To be a hound dog," see – requires an action. The action is at least "to be." That's not much action, but it's still enough action to be action and it causes a flow. You say, "Who would want to be a hound dog?" and of course now you've got it pretty well made. Of course, there's some action a little bit added in there. And "not want to be a hound dog," see? You could get these things, you see, but they're still actions. "Oppose being a hound dog," that's guaranteeing action, you see? And "retard opposition to being a hound dog."

And these are very hard for pcs to wrap their wits around very often. Particularly when they're lying at the bottom of the GPM. There they lie, nobody has disturbed them on this
subject for millennia, you see, or trillennia. Nobody's even breathed it at them or mentioned it to them, and you all of a sudden come along and propound the philosophic principle of whether or not they're going to oppose or not oppose being a hound dog, you know? They've just never considered it. They'll be in this kind of a state: They know that everybody opposes being a hound dog. And that is the "truth." That isn't a fact, you see; that's the "truth." The truth of life: Life opposes being a hound dog.

Now, you introduce a brand-new idea. You say, "Who would want to be a hound dog?"

"Want to be a hound dog?" Good heavens, nobody's thought of that, you see?

Well, that's factually – they haven't thought of it for ages. See? And these other actions, the other three actions – . So they very readily steer themselves over onto one groove, if they possibly can, it'll be the flow they happen to be stuck on at the moment you get them to figure it out.

So their advice is worse than useless. But you want to find out whether or not they can answer it. That's what you want to know. That's why you consult them. You don't take their wording, but you want to find out if they can answer it. And then you juggle the wording around or do anything you have to do to the wording so that you can clear, you know, invalidation, mistake, wrong word, anything like that you want to clear on this thing. And after this line is cleaned up with a fast check on the mid ruds, like to-be-a-tiger drill – after this line is cleaned up, brrrrp, see? That – you say that line and you get pow! You get a read, see? You say the line, you get a read. You say the line, you get a read. Dandy. Here we go. That's fine, see?

Now you want to get the next one, so that when you say that line you get a read. Say that line, get a read. Prepcheck it out. In other words, you midrud the thing. You see, you get those mid ruds in on the line, and then test it. You'd be surprised how busy they are sometimes in invalidating lines, and all that straighten out.

So frankly, I've opened up a subject to you, you possibly haven't looked at very intimately, and that is the wording of a line to be listed. But that, second to the goal, is the most important source from which all clearing flows – is that line. And now, keeping an even balance amongst those lines as they list.

All right. Now, so much for this – this wording of the line. Your next step is to make sure that as you list, you list in Model Session, your rudiments are in without antagonizing the pc unduly because; you see, you can put the rudiments in so often that it amounts to no auditing, and then the rudiments go out, see?

So your basic action is don't list too long on one line. How long is too long? It's the exact – I'll tell you exactly how long you should list a line, exactly how long: as long as the flow in that direction persists.

Yeah, how are you going to know that? Well, short of an oscilloscope, you're not. An oscilloscope will show you the flow line. So you just pays your money and you takes your chance.
But I'll give you an indicator. This would be slightly overlisting a line, but would be safe. This is slightly overlisting the line by an item or two, but it's very safe: As soon as the pc says, "Uh – and uhhhh – ," change your lines. Go to the next line. Why? You've hit the null point.

You see, don't be under the delusion that the pc is thinking up these items. Don't make that mistake. He thinks he's thinking; he thinks he's talking; he thinks it's all going off, but actually he's just a wound-up doll. See, he's just firing off – . He couldn't help it. He practically couldn't help but give you the items, because they're being dealt. See? Because they're in – they're stacked in the GPM in that way. He doesn't think of any of them.

Now, if a pc is groping for the right wording, you've overlisted. "I mean a-uh-I mean a-uh-uh-ummm-uh, no, that isn't the right word. Uhuh-a uh-a big-a big-uh-uh, no, a big, big – a huge – uh-uh – a gargantuan – uh-a tr-tr-uh, let's see, a tremendously – no, that isn't – uh, tremendously large – ." Oh, man, you overlisted a long way back. You should just quit, see?

Now, that item will spew onto the paper, bang! Just without any trouble from the pc. And long times in listing sessions without many items coming onto the page is all caused by the auditor not judging the flows right. Comm lag of the pc eats up session. And if you keep the pc out of that comm lag – you just list in rotation: one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; and don't let the pc comm lag or shut off an automaticity.


Well, the funny part of it is, is you mustn't have shut him off at "water buffalo," because it'd suppress the next two items. He can't help but say them, don't you see? They're just being dealt off the top of the deck, one, two, three, four, see? They're just coming right on up, "one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, tr-tra-le-nun-nun," and then "a-ah – ." Shift lines.

Now, I'll tell you when you've listed too long, slightly, but not to the other degree: "I can't get the right word for it. I don't know what – ." Oh, you're way overdue, man! You missed the 5:15, you missed the 6:20, see, you missed the midnight express. No, here's the one: The pc says, "No, that's not it." You've gone over. You've gone over, right now.

He's invalidating the item he is giving you. Why is he invalidating the item he has given you? Because the other flow line is now meeting the direction of his attention and is overwhelming his attention so that any item he thinks up is of course being overwhelmed by the other flow line coming to him. Just like that, heh! It's very neat.

And you just listen to him, as he goes along on listing, and he says, "A water buffalo, a tiger, a Mindoro native, a pygmy, a uh-uh-uh-uh-a p-python, a uh-um-uh-uh-a deer. No. No. No, that's not it. Um-a uh-buck. A buck-uh-uh-no, no, um-a buck, uh-no. No, not a-not-not-not a-not a buck deer. Uh-um – let's see, now. Um – . Well, I c-ca-can't can't really think of the name of the thing. Uh-uh – a big – uh-a buck, uh-uh-uh-a v-a very lar-uh-a uh – . It's a certain kind of a deer they have down in Mindoro, a uh-a dak, – or u-u-."
Oh man, you missed the 6:15, the 8:30, the 10:20 – they've all gone by. See? That's the whole gamut. You have run the lot now, see?

Your first indicator was "and a uh – ." Well, out of courtesy, you could let him give it to you. He'll say, "a uh-buck."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Now, all right, we're going to start on the next line. And here we go." We've shifted gears, and we're now listing on something else.

That's really the way to get away from the pin fast, and your pc doesn't get suppressions, and you don't have to put in the mid ruds all the time and all that sort of thing. Just catch it on that first "ahh – ." And it's just handed to you on a silver platter.

He tells you, "This line has run as far as it's going to go, and is now in an eddy area, and is about to turn around and go the opposite direction." That's what he tells you with that "ahh – ." With the invalidation, he tells you, "It has already turned around and is going in the opposite direction, and anything I think of is being overwhelmed and invalidated by the line which is now coming the other way." See? And when he can't think of it at all, he's just totally overwhumped. Now the line is really racing at him.

But similarly – let me make this point again – it is a high crime to shut off an automaticity because he won't be able to get it again. This thing is firing off and you put a suppression right on the middle of the thing. He's going to tell you all of a sudden thirty items – brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr
Now, you're going to get in trouble sooner or later because your lines are going to get ragged if you list to the comm lag. And that's liable to upset you. So you take one of those times when he's feeling very, very easy, and catch up a few items. And it's a nice balance which you do. But if it's straining him to think of any more items just to make you catch up, you abandon catching up. You got it? Because it's not a quantitative process, after all. It's the amount of flow, see? It's the amount of flow that we're interested in, not the number of items. And number of items is merely an approximation of keeping them level. That is a sloppy index of how much flow has been gotten off any one of these lines.

As far as checking the mid ruds is concerned, every time you turn around, you won't have to do it if you list this way, which makes for very fast listing. But if you make yourself a bunch of mistakes – this is really when to use the mid ruds, a fast check of the mid ruds, not a repetitive check. If you make a big mistake, and this pc is going brrrrrrr, and you say, "Thank you. Thank you very much! Yeah, thank you! Yeah, well I got that! Now, are there any other item that – a person or being there that would want to catch catfish?" And the pc is sitting there looking blanched, you know? He's been struck dead. He's halfway through an automaticity, and he can't get it out.

Actually, recognize what's happened to him. You've suppressed thirty or forty items, just like that. Bang! You didn't quite see what you were doing, you know? You didn't realize he was running off an automaticity and it was just tearing right on down the line, and you all of a sudden gave him a nice Tone 40 acknowledgment, see? Brought him into present time, put him into the session, crash, you see, all that sort of thing, and you just smell the rubber burning.

You make a goof like that, don't let him yap or get upset about it, just get in your mid ruds. Suppress – man, that is really going to be hot. You made him suppress the lot. Get the idea?

Or, if you were kind of sleepy and it was a summer afternoon, and you suddenly wake up to realize that the pc for five minutes has been sitting there saying various things like this: "Is it a large – a – a large tiger, a-a-a very – no, no, a tiger, a stri – a striped – . I can't quite get the word for this. A tiger with horns. No, that would not be right," and so forth.

And you wake up suddenly, the pc's been going on like this for about five minutes – be an awfully good thing to get in the mid ruds. In other words, the mid ruds are something with which you pick up goofs. And if you're really a smooth auditor you don't goof.

Now, how many items does it take per line to list a goal out? How many items? What an interesting question. It's almost philosophic in its impulse. It has a lot to do with how smoothly it was done, oddly enough. And the less smoothness it was done, the less in-sessionalness it was done with, the more items you are going to have. So therefore you can't say how many items should appear on a list as just a fait accompli. How many items, bang! You see? You can't say that. But you sure can say that it isn't going to be ten or fifteen. Ten or fifteen hundred? Now we're getting more into the zone and order of magnitude.

But speaking, then, we're only speaking for the first goal. How many is it for a second goal? How many is it for a third goal? How many is it for a fourth goal? Well, these things become shorter and shorter – these lines do.
So, how many clears the goal? Well, as many as you write down well and expertly to a point where the needle goes free. That's how many it is. And it certainly is not going to be less than a thousand, I don't think. We've got the third goal, I think you're still within that order of magnitude. But I'm just guessing there.

The first goal, seven thousand items on each line – I wouldn't worry too much about it unless the TA has gone up and stuck and has been stuck for a long time, or something like this, you see? I wouldn't worry about the number of items. I'll tell you what to worry about in a minute. But the number of items isn't something to worry about, you understand? Too few – God help us. Ah, no.

Now, of course you don't ever null these items, and the pc is going to ask you, "Why are we writing them down?" It would be an interesting question: Why are we writing the items down?

Well, my answer to that is writing them down is a better acknowledgment and it's a much better way to keep tabs on your lists, and there's various reasons for writing them down. But amongst them isn't nulling. We don't ever do anything with these items. I don't know anything to do with them.

Your pc at first will be rather puzzled as to which one it is. Well, of course, that's the joke. It isn't a "which one?"

He's been going a long piece of track on that Goals Problem Mass, man. He's had an opportunity to collect an awful lot of identities. And the identities which he personally has picked up has had the opportunity to collect an awful lot of enemies. And he himself has collected an awful lot of things which oppose enemies. And he himself has had a very interesting taste for things which prevented him from doing his goal. He'll begin to wonder after a while what possessed him. And all of these things combined make quantity. And the quantity is large.

All right. Now, let's talk about how long a line is listed. It is listed exactly to free needle. It is not listed one item beyond free needle. Hear me now: not one item beyond the free needle. Needle was free. Now, the proper conduct of an auditor, when observing a free needle on a line, should be professional. He should not suddenly get hold of one of his favorite valences of a rodeo performer, start bucking about in the chair and trying to put a quirt to the E-Meter.

"A free needle! Ha-ha! Hey-hey! Ha-ha! Ha – that's enough, it's a free needle. Hey, do you want to come around and see this?" [laughter] That is not optimum auditor conduct. It's all right, because we can run the suppressions off. But you'll feel like that when you first see one.

You go to the next line and list it to free needle or, if it doesn't go to free needle, until the flow runs out as usual.

Sometimes one of them goes free, and three of them will stick for a while. Some of them – then you've got two free, and the other two are sticking. And then sometimes you've got three free, and one is all hung up. And then eventually it goes free.
Well, the way to do that is you keep going one, two, three, four, see? This thing is stuck. This line is sticky; it's not free. Come back here to your next line in sequence, see, and put one, two, three, free needle, see?

Now your needle is free when you go to your next line; your next line doesn't upset it at all. Now, I can't lay down a rule absolutely here, because it may not make the least bit of difference. But if it – you said the line to the pc and you get no needle reaction of any kind whatsoever and nothing happens to the needle, it might be very foolish to list it. So we go to the next line and we read the thing off and there's no needle reaction of any kind to it, you see, and the needle is still free. And we come to the line we had that was sticky in the first place and it's still sticky; now we list that thing on down until we get to a comm lag, and it's still stuck. Well now, which line do we come back to next? Because nothing is cooling this thing down. Well, you'd better check them, hadn't you?

Now, it won't upset anybody if you put one item on each one of these lines. Now, we're into a completely questionable area of what is the right thing to do? Experience will tell what is the right thing to do. I can't give you a packaged answer, but I can tell you this: is don't list beyond a free needle! Because it's quite upsetting. It's like asking for a rudiment answer when there isn't one, see?

And if I were to lay down an operating rule for myself on this, as something I would now be guided by, I would wade myself through this. I would read these other lines and see if I could get a stick, or a fall, see? Something. And I'd get an item. And then I'd walk back to the line that was stuck, and I would list it till I got a comm lag. You get the idea? And I'd walk myself through this. And if I had three lines, all of which were giving a free needle, I wouldn't test all three in rotation every time. I'd test one after the other. In other words, I'd take the sticky line, I'd list on it to a comm lag, and then I'd choose another one of these lines – not the one in rotation; I'd skip a rotation, see? And then I'd list some more sticky needle and then I'd choose the third one that was free and test it now. You know, I'd just walk my way through this, sort of like on eggs. You get the idea?

And I wouldn't list those lines. My instinct would be agin it. If I couldn't get a fall or a stick or any needle misbehavior on it, I don't think I would – I would touch them. I'd ask them the pc – I'd ask the pc if he had any items on these lines, but my auditing command would not be "Who – or – what – would – want – to – catch – catfish?" "Can you think of anything right now that – anything, anybody, want to catch catfish? No, you can't. All right. Thank you. Huh-huh, that is – that's fine. Thank you very much." Get off of there, see?

Pe said, "Yeah, I just thought – uh – game wardens catch catfish every now and then." And then you've set it down, see? All right. He just gave you that gratuitously; that's to keep from missing withholds.

You're at a touchy end of the case. And obviously to you it isn't a touchy end of the case at all, because the pc is now practically Clear and a Clear can stand anything. That might be your reason. If the needle is this free, why, doesn't matter how we treat the pc, is it?

Well, that's the wrong kind of thinking. Because right at that stage of the game it is rather edgy, because you could take one of these free needle lines and you could list it right
on into a hole. In other words, you could stick it all up again. It's already happened here. Don't think I'm just dealing on theory only. Overlisting has occurred.

All right. That's enough for that. You can certainly list through to free needle on four lines.

Now, if one line consistently and continually hangs up, and you can't make it go free, then you investigate the living daylights out of what is wrong with that particular line and see if you can find anything wrong with it at all. And see if you can get any variation of wording of that line to fire nicely and neatly, and continue listing on that new wording, and that line will go clean. Okay? That's in case of emergency. Because there might have been, throughout, something wrong with that one line. See, you might have missed it. Already been done here, so it can happen. Three lines went free, one didn't.

Well, when that happened before, "your" was in the fourth line. That "your" was enough to keep that line from going free. And an examination of it – only took a couple, three sessions of listing after that, and all four lines were free, just like that, see? So, suspect that if you get too much an inequality of this, and it's hanging on too long, don't let it go for months; look into it. Okay?

Audience: Mm-mm.

All right. Now, what are the dangers of listing? Number one, listing is auditing. It is auditing and must be treated as such. It is the only therapeutic action undertaken to free a goal – is merely listing. The pc does not give out these answers analytically, no matter how bright and alert the pc might act. They're all being dealt off the bottom of the deck, all out of the reactive mind, and you must not worry as to whether the pc is inventing answers or dreaming them up or thinking of them analytically or anything else. Just be calm about this. Look, there are enough things to worry about in auditing without inventing things.

No, just take what the pc gives you, man. Keep the session going and relax. See? All right.

Now, as you are starting in with the goal, you have a period of danger. And this period of danger begins at the moment of finding the goal and is over when you have proved beyond doubt that this goal, while being listed on all four lines, turns on pain on line one, sensation on line two, a little more sensation than pain on line three, and a little more pain than sensation on line four. And when you've proven that to your own complete satisfaction – .

Well, look, I – you're looking at me as though I should detail this more, but figure it out for yourself, man. Figure it out for yourself. Lines one and three belong to the pc. And lines two and four belong to the enemy. And the enemy is sensation and the pc is pain. That's easy. And unless you get that optimum condition of affairs, that goal is wrong. And you better get off of that, hotter than hot and faster than fast.

Line one – here's what makes a goal wrong: Line one turns on sensation. "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"


"Who or what would oppose catching catfish?"
"Ouch! Oh, what a terrible pain went through my head. Oh, what an awful pain in my back. Oh, dear, dear, dear. Ohrarr. Ohh, my – ouch!" See?

It's the wrong line! That should be turning on sensation; it's turning on pain.

And we get to line three, which is the pc's own line again, since it's an allied line, and the person says, "Nyoom! Oh dear, still very dizzy and so on, so on and so on and so on and so on. Very dizzy, and there's this little tiny pain in my ear, but that doesn't amount to much. Sure makes you dizzy, doesn't it?"

And he gets to line four, "Who or what would pull back your goal?" – you see, that's the enemy, man – and, "Ouch! Urp! Pain went through the back there. What was that?"

Now look, that condition as a purity seldom exists. It won't exist for very long. If you continue to list this it all becomes sen. Everything gets to be sen. But if you go too far on this, everything goes sen. The bank starts to become hard, beefy, lumpy. The person wakes up in the morning and the ridges he usually had are now really ridges. We're getting an exaggeration of the situation. That bank is becoming heavy. It's like running Creative Processing without having the goal "To create."

And the pc will wake up in the morning, actually, and he'll feel like there's a board going through his head, see? Something like this. And he's – . And it all turns into sensation. It's all dizzy, groggy, pressures, nausea, misemotion. Starts to feel like that after a while – he didn't do anything to high blood pressure, probably, but he starts to feel like high blood pressure would be much more comfortable. You see, all four lines go to sen. That's an interesting item, isn't it?

Now, if all four lines went to pn, I wouldn't worry. But if they all went to sen, to hell with it. Get out of there. You're wrong. I don't care what you think, you're wrong! You got it? I don't care what the pc says. That's the wrong goal! Yeah, it read! Yeah, it's fine. Yeah, it checked out. Yo. Yo, we had three Instructors and the governor of Australia check it out! [laughter] I don't care about all those arguments! The line is wrong! Because that is the final proof of a goal. You got it?

You haven't got a goal until you have listed it two or three hundred items on each line, as the auditor. And that will save your bacon. Of course, if it checks out beautifully, pc got pain on it, bang, and so forth, you're pretty sure, aren't you? But the final test of any pudding is the listing. You go two, three hundred items deep on this thing; if it's turning on pain in the right places and sen on the right places, and that sort of thing, oh boy, you're in. Go for broke.

Now, the only thing could happen wrong is you start listing with the rudiments out. Something crazy goes on in the pc's life, he's got PTPs like mad or rudiments are wildly out, or something of the sort, you see? And on a minor way – you see, checking the goal out every time is just a way of speeding this up. It won't prevent clearing, and checking the lines out won't prevent clearing by listing. They just slow it down.

But a wrong line will. A wrong line will prevent clearing. "Who or what would try awfully hard to oppose catching catfish?" And the next line to it is "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?" you see? And the next line down the line – all out of position, see, all misworded.
It would be too cruel an experiment – I have seen this in actual action – but you can take four lines, check them out, and then throw one. Now it will fire on a suggestion and an invalidation, see, and a mistake. You can get it to fire, of course, just like you can get a goal to fire. And now insist on listing that line. "Who or what would know he had to have to catch catfish?" And then put all the other ones down correctly.

The action of doing something like that is to bring the TA up to a stick. It's almost exactly 4.5 to 5.0. Almost always. I haven't ever seen a tone arm on a misworded line, or mis-listing, or ARC broke sessions, or over-listing in sessions – the errors you can make, in other words – that on goals listing didn't go up to 4.5 and 5.0. I'm quite prepared to see one go up to 6.0, or to 7.0, or 3.75. I'm quite prepared to, you understand. But it just happens that every one I've seen have gone from 4.5 to 5.0 and then stick. They'll stick at 4.5 or they'll stick at 5.0. And more have stuck at 5.0 than at 4.5.

So when your tone arm starts lingering around 5.0 for a session, and next session lingers around 5.0, don't be surprised if the third session your pc all of a sudden says, "Well, I was awfully dizzy. I was walking down the street, and I saw the buildings sort of reel." You're doing something weird. Something wild is going on here. Something's happened. You got to straighten it out.

Now, what straightens out? How do you straighten one of these things out? Well, you locate what's wrong. You better check out the goal and get it to fire again if you possibly can. Check out the lines, one after the other; see if there's any disagreement from the pc on these lines or these wordings. That's quite important. You're not going to change them around just because he disagrees with them, but you're going to sure make it answerable, if you can. Check out your sessioning in general (which isn't really enough to keep it all hung up) and just straighten this thing out and get it to rolling again. That's what you're going to do.

Now, look: If you can't straighten the goal out after you've listed a couple hundred, if it ceases to fire after two or three hundred items on each one of four lists, it's sort of "Which way did they go? What happened?" You got to get it back to firing again. Of course, if you can't get it back to firing again, it was probably the wrong goal in the first place.

The method we're using to find goals right now rather makes it very difficult to get a wrong goal. That makes it pretty difficult for you to get a wrong goal or run a wrong goal. That's the beauty of it, and why I love that method. Ease of auditing and positiveness of finding the goal were enough to have this. And that's not why I'm happy about it. It used to be that only an Instructor or somebody who was specially trained in that little tiny technique of checkout – we could absolutely rely on the fact that it was the right goal.

Now, any of you guys, if you're good enough to do nulling by mid ruds down to a point where you find a goal, you're so used to checking them out that checking out a goal doesn't faze you anymore. You'll be able to actually look at a goal and say, "Well, boom, let's check it out." Brrr, brrr. "To be a tiger" tzal-tup, bang, thud, bang. "Yup, it doesn't fire." See, that'd be all there was to it, you know? "Let's see, is there a suppression on there? That goal been suppressed? That isn't a goal." See? Positiveness enters into the picture. And that's going to save an awful lot of bacons.
So, preventing the wrong goal from being found has been quite a campaign I've had to engage on for here for quite a while, and actually it was – what was marvelous is that this new nulling by mid ruds, not just for its value for the auditor, but to prevent wrong goals from being found, is worth its weight in planets, man, and that's pretty heavy.

Now, this idea of finding a goal, finding it firing, and saying that is the person's goal or agreeing that it is the person's goal – that's perfectly all right, because it can be run out. It's an assertion, see? That's all right. But when the pc keeps saying, "No, it isn't my goal" and the auditor keeps saying, "Yes, it is your goal," a ridge is built up which is pretty hard to take apart. And it will keep a goal firing. So don't argue over somebody's goal or you'll make it fire and fire and fire, and it's not his goal. You get the suppressions, invalidations off it – he'll agree with it if it's his goal, and if it isn't his goal, he won't.

You could find an opposition goal. This is the other thing that could be wrong. You could find an opposition goal. Now, I don't know that by nulling by mid ruds you will find an opposition goal. I don't know too much about finding opposition goals, as distinct from finding goals. I can't give you much data on this, actually, because I've never seen an opposition goal that would fire after it has been prepchecked and nulled by mid ruds. You understand? So there's always the possibility that opposition goals actually only fired because they were invalidations of the goal or something. You get the idea? And they might not have had rocket reads on them at all, you see?

And somebody the other day came up with a reverse rocket read on a goal, and immediately proposed it was probably an opposition goal, which I thought was very interesting. So if you see that sort of thing, let me know. But I don't know that you can get a rocket read on an opposition goal. I don't know that it isn't just the invalidation of the goal that makes the opposition goal fire.

Well, there's – you're fairly secure if you have found the goal and checked it out. But don't be too cocky until you've got two hundred on a line. And if you found a goal and then turned it over to somebody to list, remember to reach out, by the time they got three hundred on each line or something like that, and say to the pc, "How are you doing? How do you feel? All right. When they ask you so-and-so and so-and-so, where does the somatic come?"

And the person says, "Well, it's so and so on."

"Now, what kind of a somatic is it? Is it a sensation, or is it painful or what is it? And what line is it on?" And check it all out yourself, you got the idea? You know, don't read the Auditor's Report. That's a good prevention.

Otherwise than that, you realize that somebody who is trained to HCA level could be quite competent in listing. And listing is the longest part of clearing. So if you had somebody helping you in auditing and you kept your eye on the situation, a person with less training than is necessary to find goals could list goals, and because he was doing this sort of thing and doing some Prepchecking and so forth as he went along, he would actually get up to a point where he could locate goals. So it's a good training school, listing is. See?

Now, that lengthens the number of people you could clear by three or four times. Savvy?
Now, you got to know all about listing and you should list somebody to Clear just to see how it looks and get the experience and that sort of thing, but I don't expect you to list every goal to Clear that you find. It'd be a much more economic situation for you to find the goal and then keep your eagle eye beagled on the somebody who is listing it out.

Now, how about auto-listing? Well, there is no telling. I won't say that auto-listing is impossible. I don't – I don't believe that it is possible or impossible, at this particular stage of the game.

I believe that it would be better than nothing. Let me put it that way.

But to tell somebody to go home and list on four lists and you will look into it in a couple of weeks, it seems to me like it's sort of taking his life in your hands! You know? I wouldn't be sure at this – about this at all. But I would say this – I would say this: that if you were on a desert island and you knew your goal, and you knew exactly what the goal is and it'd been expertly checked out – and there was absolutely no way under the sun for you to get Clear any other way, I would say that you should pick up a pencil and a piece of palm bark. But we would know more about that in due course.

Now, these are the various ramifications to listing. Clearing itself consists of the cycle of finding a goal and then listing it until you have a free needle on each of four lines, finding another goal and listing it on each of four lines, finding another goal and listing it on each of four lines. And the state of case is regulated by the number of goals the person has which have not been found and listed. Those are damping factors.

Now, here at Saint Hill it's fairly simple to make a first-goal Clear – not simple, but with heroic activities (let us put it that way), we can make a first-goal Clear.

Now, to find a second goal on a pc, and list that one out – this is getting much more difficult. We have just now found and checked out a second goal on Jean, and that was very, very good news that I was very happy about. And at least it was stated to me in so many words that it was checked out today. Was it?

Female voice: Hm-hm.

Yeah. All right, that's a second goal. Okay, now she's got a little time to list on this second goal. And I think they possibly even may list it out because the listing, very possibly, is much shorter than a first goal. But we know more about that in due course.

She's already starting to depart from the standard state of Clear, or such a person is already starting to depart from what we have considered Clear. They're starting to move up into Theta Clear or something like that, and it's an adventure from there on out, because these various states, now, of course are not regulated in any way by different processes to different conditions. It's a gradient scale of the same condition all the way, of course.

Now, I can't even tell you how many goals it is to OT. See? Or how long it'd take you to find and list each one of these goals. I was very happy to find today that the second goal would fire so nicely. Nice. I was told they had good rocket reads on the thing. See? I was very happy about that.
Somewhere up the line, why, the goals are not going to stay in. They're going to start blowing. But how far do you have to keep the goals not blowing to get OT? See? But that's – that is the road that we are on, basically. And it's a repetition of the same action.

The only improvement which I see in auditing which is coming immediately up, and so on, is a mechanical improvement. That is to say, a persistency of read – devices to make a read more persistent and therefore more observable by an auditor.

I don't see any changes to amount to anything on clearing as such. I do see some dodges one could do to probably shorten up finding a goal. And I see some frills one could add on to listing that would possibly shorten the thing up one way or the other. But I don't look for any fabulous advance from that line. I don't. Because there are certain limitations that you hit, and the limitations is that the person has got just that much case, and they have to sit there just that long, and they can talk just that fast. Get the idea?

All right. And maybe when we're all OT, why, maybe we'll look back over the whole thing again, and we'll say it would have been much easier had we done it this way. And I hope that we're in that condition and don't have to do it some other way.

Those are the improvements I look for in clearing. I really don't look for many other improvements. But I do look for improvements that will take little shortcuts – little faster, something that is more valuable to do this than to do that, you know, little things along the line.

And we may carve it down, we may carve it down considerably. We may use various systems of auditing. Just given you one tonight: You find the goal, let an HPA list it, see, under your eye. Therefore you've lost two hundred hours of auditing, just like that. Various other mechanisms of this character can be fine, and we can step it up into quantitative clearing. Our problem now is quantitative clearing.

My immediate problem is to get some of you to read an E-Meter better. Well, I'm solving that with drills and attention and various things, and I'm also double-solving it by making sure that a persistent-read E-Meter comes into existence in the very near future that can be hooked up to a Mark IV and red lights go on and pinball's dials go around when you hit a read, see, and it stays on until you do something about it or something like that. [laughter]

But I have actually no quarrel – no real quarrel with your drills, no real quarrel with your auditing presence, no real quarrel with these things. I see just this metering that's being a problem. And we'll get that licked.

I have a problem of how many – how many of you can I push on through to first-goal Clears in a space of time, when the fellow alongside of you can't read an E-Meter and neither can you. You know? Some of you are in that condition, and that's worrying me. I got these various problems, but I haven't got any technical problems now. I haven't got any. I'm not even worrying about what's in the guts of this meter. I just told them, well, what we need is an idiot meter. You have an on-and-off switch and a red light. When you say something to the pc the red light goes on. Or it doesn't go on. And if it goes on you clean it up, see, and if it doesn't go on, you don't clean it up. Idiot meter! These things we'll have. These things we'll have.
I can undoubtedly find where we can best expect the goal to appear on a list, and therefore cut down the number of goals we have to null in order to find the goal, you know? Do various other tricks of this character. But as far as technology is concerned, we got it made, and you're doing it. And the only thing some of you are doing wrong is you're missing a few reads, see? Well, that's all I got to cure, so that's easy. That's that.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Well, here we are, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

*Audience: Fourteen. Fourteenth.*

Fourteen? It isn't.

*Audience: Yes, it is.*

How did you get into the 14th when I'm in the 16th?

*Voice from audience: Bit of a comm lag.*

Fourteen August, AD 12. Lecture one.

This is on 3GA-goals: writing and finding goals.

First and foremost, there is the detailed theory which could go back of this. Once upon a time there was a thetan. And he couldn't go forward, and he couldn't go backwards, and he had to stay there and he mustn't stay there.

And at that point he got overwhelmed and received further orders to evacuate and then further orders to advance, and then orders to stay there.

And having done all this, he then caught the barrage. The barrage came in from in front, you see, and he was putting out a barrage himself in front and this would have been all right except his own artillery started to lay shells into his position at which moment he again decided he had better evacuate.

But he couldn't carry the orders out, and there he is to this day – rock slamming. [laughter] The mechanical importance of a rock slam is based something on that. It's a can't go, can't come, can't stay, can't be, mustn't be, you see. It's all that.

And, in short, is a highly charged agitation. Originally, on the 20th ACC, when I was doing assessment on people's goals, this manifestation during this assessment was so strong they called it the rock slam. And actually at that time you used to go down this chain to find the rock. That is how you get the word *rock slam.*
Now, in finding goals here during 61 and 62 so far, we have had a new manifestation that was not particularly known or understood, and that was a dirty needle. And a dirty needle is only a little, tiny, persistent rock slam. That is all a dirty needle is.

So I've been spending the last week or so on very hard study of rock slams – very, very hard study, and gratuitously there dropped into my lap a criminal of the first order with a record and so forth, who I knew – mind you, I integrated this data after the interrogation and – but I knew it within this span and area – that the fellow was guilty of a tremendous overt. He had been stealing everybody blind left and right, and the overts were particularly against me.

And I was able to see a rock slam turn on and off on this one fact and it was very interesting. And of course, he was trapped, too, and it was not a goals manifestation. It was simply this fellow was guilty of everything under the sun, and I had big rock slams and little rock slams and all kinds of rock slams – the dominant one about seven-eighths of a dial wide.

And I found out something very interesting about rock slams. That you can appear to clear a missed withhold off of somebody with a great big rock slam and have it dirty as can be. The needle just isn't registering right when you've got somebody with that large an overt.

You can miss withholds, you can do all sorts of things because the concentration is on the rock slam and the concentration is not on the auditor; and it takes superlative TR 1 to get by this and make a needle register at all.

You understand this rock slam has been rock slamming like mad and now it isn't rock slamming and you ask him if you missed a withhold, and you get a clean read. Have you missed a withhold, man! Oh-ho! You've just missed all the crimes in the book, see. "Have I missed a withhold?" and you get a perfectly clean read. That's quite interesting, isn't it?

Well, I was able through various fortuitous circumstances after this interrogation to actually run down the fact that this person was guilty without any slightest doubts. I found other corroborative evidence, you see.

And I began to understand this needle better. I began to understand this a lot better. As a matter of fact, I got all the dope necessary to prove it utterly and completely.

But as far as your interest is concerned, well, this opened up a new horizon because I didn't have just big rock slams, I had little rock slams. And I had dirty needles and I had all kinds of things here. It was a most fantastic pyrotechnic array of this and that you ever heard of.

Well, this was quite interesting. And it's terribly interesting to you. Because for the first time it dawned upon me that a rock slam is an overt. Therefore, a dirty needle is an overt.

Now, you chase these things around in Prepchecking, and you go round and round and round and round with these things. And you usually can find a series of overts that clear them off the needle. You can usually find this. The auditor or Scientology or something like this. You can fool around with it and actually get some current life overts that will clean the needle, and then you go back soaring on down the goals list, and the next thing you know, you flub; you make a little mistake.
You passed by a goal without cleaning all the somatic off of it which is a very hot goal. You do your Tiger Drill poorly, and you've got bzzz-bzzz-bzzz-bzzz. And you go down goal after goal, and this rock slam keeps turning on – well, you missed the one that turned it on, you see. You didn't catch that so you – the next goal to it starts persistently rock slamming, and – and you get down four or five goals for it, and the doggone thing sounds like a buzzer alarm system going off, see. It's really fanning the air. You've missed one.

Well, the point is this: That's a little rock slam, see. It's a missed withhold.

But the mechanics of a "Failed to reveal" are simply the still point which follows the Confusion. You've still got the stable datum and the Confusion. The Confusion comes first and it holds the stable datum in place.

You find somebody with a stuck picture, don't audit the stuck picture. Find the confusion that preceded the stuck picture, and the stuck picture will blow. It's quite interesting.

You got somebody there looking – this is actually old data I'm giving you. This is from back last – over a year ago on this course. It's been around for quite a while. But the stuck picture is there gorgeously and this fellow was looking at a telescope and it just continues to sit there. And you can hammer it and you can pound it and you can do this and that. It's quite wonderful that you can address it directly and ask him to take responsibility for that picture and something will probably happen with the picture. Now, that's quite remarkable.

But of course, what is an overt but an irresponsibility. An overt is an irresponsibility. Therefore, by taking some responsibility for the stuck picture, you can make this picture move. That's the only button that will make the picture move – one of these really stuck pictures, see. It's just, "What part of that picture could you be responsible for?"

All right. But if you really want to blow that thing off the track – by the way, don't monkey with these things. This is all experimental data I'm giving you. If you stop in an auditing session as some auditors were doing last year before we grabbed them by the nape of the neck and hauled them out of the auditing chair and squirted seltzer water through their ears a few times, they would just see a stuck picture, you know, and they'd stick in the session – just a total Q and A, see.

And they'd right away start handling this stuck picture, you know. Oh, this is marvelous. Session would go to pieces in a balloon. They – you know, they Q-and-A with a stuck picture, so they've stuck the session there.

Well, if you want to get rid of that thing – this is still just background music, you see, because you don't – it'll all come off in due course and you got no business monkeying with it.

But if you were to look just a bit earlier than that, maybe minutes earlier than the picture occurred – it's right close to it – it isn't 15 years before the picture; it's more like 15 minutes, you know when you get that sort of a thing.

And you'll find a confusion there, and then if you just picked the overts the guy committed out of the confusion, why, the stuck picture will go.

Sometimes it's enough just to locate the confusion, you see, and it goes.
In other words, a confusion is followed by a still. Stills do not exist without prior confusions except in the case of a goals postulate. There must have been a prior confusion for a still. Yet you wonder why cultures in various nations have settled down and are so fixed and so rigid. Well, it's very simple. Those cultures are that way because they have prior confusions and they're stuck.

Now, if you want to really lay in a culture, see, if you're up track someplace and you're giddy enough to create a new civilization someplace or another, and you want it to stick a la Roman, you know – the Romans really made their postulates stick, man – why, you just make the whole confounded, cotton-picking area so confoundedly confused that nobody can find which way is up. And then make the people commit an awful lot of overts and then suddenly settle in a still series of mores and customs. They'll stick. They'll stick.

That's how a legendary figure such as Quetzalcoatl can suddenly walk in on a barbaric and murderous scene and put out all of the rules of warfare, see, and rules of agriculture and so forth, and have those things go floating right on up the track – just totally stuck, see. Get the idea?

The situation must have been terribly confused with a lot of overts in it before you got this stuck situation. You can settle your mind to that. Now, that is one of these very large, very important Scientological truths. If you don't know that one in auditing sometime, you won't know what the dickens you're looking at. And it's a piece of understanding you should have.

Now, you know very well that this fellow committed a whole lot of overts of some kind or another and sooner or later he's going to hang up in a still. And well, he went around, and all he did was kick people. He used his left foot and he kicked people. And he kicked people and he kicked people and he kicked people, and he now has a paralyzed left foot. See?

Well, there was a lot of motion, see, and a lot of confusion and then it suddenly settled down and he decided he was guilty or something like that, and there it is. That's the chronic somatic you're trying to handle, see. This fellow walks in and says, "I understand you're a Scientologist, and like all other doctors, why, you're supposed to cure things."

And you say, "All right."

You're knuckleheaded that day. You got up on the wrong side of the bed and you're just plain stupid, you see? And in your effort to please, why you say, "All right. I'll fix up your lumbosis," you see. Well man, he's been stabbing people in the lumbosis for an awful long time. And it has happened often and frequently, and so forth. And you still could move around his lumbosis somewhat.

But if you tried to do this in the absence of pulling overts, you wouldn't get anywhere. You could cut it out, which is what the doctors do. It's still got the engram, but now it's in an alcohol jar.

And the guy now has somatics where it was. Marvelous. But this is back of all illness, all chronic states, these principles. They are what makes chronic states chronic. Now, an aber-
ration of a human being or a miller moth or a man from Mars or total foreign alien personality, such as governmental figures – these fellows have aberrations.

And prior to those aberrations, there were confusions and overt – and the business of settling the confusion with an overt, which is the modus operandi of our existing cultures here on Earth. You always settle the confusion with the overt, you know. Guy disturbs the peace; they throw him in jail.

Eventually the society will get more and more stuck in an aberration which they begin to mistake for culture. Oddly enough, culture – well, let's not say culture; let's say politics or a political form – is an aberration caused by the collective overt of the citizenry. And you actually could forecast very accurately the next political government or political form of any nation by an examination of the overt of the individual because the next government they elect, they will try to make those overt legal.

So you just figure out what the most common denominator of overt – interesting game. You could sit around and fool around with this and you come up with some of the darnedest answers – you just examine what is the most common overt and then realize that the eventual culture will be one based on the legalization of that overt.

For instance, they – they try to lessen the overt one way or the other by freezing something into line. They lessen an overt by freezing into place a motivator and there's all kinds of mechanisms involved in this, but the general law is: is you just figure out what the collective overt is and the next political form will be one which legalizes that overt.

I'll give you an example. A criminal has to come to the conclusion that property belongs to nobody. There is no such thing as private property. He's got to come to that conclusion, see. Otherwise, he would be guilty of so many overt, he couldn't live with himself. What was the crime rate of Russia before the 1917 Revolution? Yeah man, it was big. It was heavy. And the Russki legalized theft by saying there is no property. See?

See, that's the ideal criminal, political form. I'm not anticommunism as – if I was talking to a couple of communists now, I could fry their hair. I don't say I haven't in the past. I've converted communists to Royalists, and so forth, because in the form of politics, you see, it is only opinion and aberration. There is no wisdom.

If you could figure out that the overt in any state which has become a socialized state must have been weakness. It must be of an omitted participation – a weakness, see. Because now all of a sudden they've legalized weakness. They pay it. Weakness is now paid. Do you get the examples?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Well, this is aberration on the third dynamic. Well, this has an awful lot to do with clearing. Every once in a while, I'll run into a phenomenon and stumble over it and fall over it and bump my head over it and bung my toes up on it and ruin my shins on it, and try to get around it one way or the other, and so forth, and as time goes on – if I were brighter, you see, we'd be much further ahead – but it takes a certain amount, you see, of me falling on my face over this phenomenon to finally recognize that we don't have to avoid it – we can use it. That is usually what happens, you see. We can use that in our business. But you have to know quite
a bit about one of these things to be able to use one. And frankly, we really never used the rock slam to amount to anything except a little bit on the 20th. But then I couldn't give you a packaged word that described the rock slam, so therefore, it was to that degree useless.

Any auditor who's been auditing for a little while with modern technique knows when he's running middle rudiments now, you see that little needle *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz*, and you don't bother to say, "Have you invalidated it?" or anything. You do – you skip your Tiger Drill right straight to "Failed to reveal." You got a "Failed to reveal" sitting right in front of your face, so you skip your Tiger Drill to "Failed to reveal." And you pick it up – *pow-pow-pow-pow-pow*; and then that's clean, and then you go back to your Tiger Drill again, see.

And it's senseless trying to pick up an invalidation to read through a *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz* when this is obviously a "Failed to reveal," don't you see.

In other words, this little, tiny, dirty needle is a manifestation of "Failed to reveal." Now, a "Failed to reveal" must have been preceded by an overt, and I don't ask you to vary your Tiger Drill or your middle rudiments, and delete "Failed to reveal" and substitute "overt" in its place, because there's very little to gain. There is very little gain there.

You start picking up overt – pooy! You're using too strong a weapon, see. He only had to pick up the "Failed to reveal," you see, and you'll get the missed withhold phenomenon remedied, and other things will remedy, you see, at the same time. But you should realize that while you're picking up a "Failed to reveal," you're just skimming the top of the pot, see. If that thing is going to go *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz*, there's an overt under it.

And ordinarily, you don't pick up the overt. You don't bother with it. And your Tiger Drill is quite successful up to the moment you run into a chronic and continuous rock slam or dirty needle. And at that point, that gets very desperate, and O/W has been shoved into the lineup to remedy this.

And O/W will work as long as you get your question answered but will not work if you [don't] get your questions answered or if the pc is doing something else with the auditing question.

Don't Q-and-A with the pc and stick him up on the track by demanding that he answer the question more precisely, give him – you the answer you want – he's answering it technically right. No. Use clearing the auditing command, question after question after question, but keep giving him the question and getting the answers. Don't you see? Keep him in communication. Clear the auditing command every time. Inspect the meter. See if he did something else. You know – harass him, and he finally ... He – accept his answers; but harass him.

"Oh, well," you say, "have you done anything to your mother?"

And he said, "Well, I flew a-I-I-I flew a kite in World War II."

"Well," you say, "well, I don't see quite how that answers the auditing command."

"Well, it didn't. She asked me not to."

Isn't your face red? See?
So you can only do a certain amount of clearing up of the question. But now you're getting silly answers like this, why, on subsequent things you clear the auditing command better. That's how you handle that situation. Do you understand that?

His answer technically fulfills this, but it isn't what you want. And you'll find out if he's doing something else, keep clearing the auditing command with him – not while he is doing the command but after he has answered it, and you okayed it and everything.

Now, clear the auditing command with him again. Ask if he's doing anything else, if he did anything else besides just that or if he's trying to solve something with that answer. You know, get in there and pitch a little bit, and you all of a sudden find out that he's doing fantastic things with this auditing question. That's the reason O/W doesn't work for you when it doesn't work.

You either hang up and ARC break the pc to pieces by never accepting the first answer, see, or you collapse afterwards and just accept anything because you couldn't get it straight. Well, the happy medium between these two things, you see, is to run O/W and he's giving you technically acceptable answers. Well, keep clearing the auditing command. Use that as your routine between answers.

Keep clearing the auditing command; clearing the auditing command. I did it once for an hour one night and achieved some fantastic result. Pc says all of a sudden, "What?" They weren't answering the auditing command. They were trying to solve a problem with the auditing command and they were only giving answers that fitted into the problem, and then looked each time to see whether or not the problem had been solved, which it had not, of course – because the pc had never answered the auditing question.

Got the pc to answer the auditing question, and everything was fine. But the – you use clearing the auditing command between questions. You got that as a mechanism?

All right. That's why you have O/W and it isn't necessary to go into lots of overts and that sort of thing just when you're running "Failed to reveal," you know. That's perfectly valid, just fine because you're after all running with a whisk broom.

There's no reason to get a ten-ton bulldozer in there and start plowing up the whole ten-acre field, see. You will the moment you start for overts.

If mid-ruds consisted of. "Have you committed any overts?" ha-ha, "On this goal, have you committed any overts?" Where are we going to wind up?

Well, we're on that question now, two and a half hours and that isn't the purpose of the Tiger Drill. But asking if there's anything he failed to reveal, why, we'll get it reading. So it serves the purpose, don't you see.

But you shouldn't forget that underneath that buzzz-buzzz-buzzz, there is an overt.

All right. So, criminality has served us well and because there, it was quite obvious, that integrating this against all the other data I had that I was not looking at a rock slam on the goals chain. I was just looking at a God-awful overt which the individual was sitting across from me saying he had never committed! And the evidence existed not only had he commit-
ted it, but he had committed a dozen others like it, see. This bird had his heels planted in the middle of the road. And the harder he planted his heels, the harder that thing slammed.

So you should have seen me a couple of nights ago because, you see, this was a needle manifestation, not that – don't draw the inference that everybody who has rock slams is criminal. This was just this interesting phenomenon that here was the source of a rock slam and it was characterized by overt. And this suddenly fell into the line and said, "Isn't this nice and sweet, and I wonder whether or not I can turn one on at will."

And Sunday night in an auditing session I did the unforgivable. You know, the unforgivable. Your pc is listing away beautifully, and all of a sudden you see a free needle turn on, you know.

You say, "Hey, hey, hey! A free needle! I got it. Do you want to see it? Free needle! Ha-ha!" You know? Busts the whole session up, you know.

Well I did, Sunday night. This was too exciting – on a slam – because I found out I could turn on a slam at will on a goals chain. And right away, some iron doors opened.

Actually, it didn't disturb the pc at all. The pc was excited as I was because they knew they were going right for their goal.

And besides, the pc was in-session. You can do a lot of things if somebody's in-session, and you ought to try it some time. [laughs, laughter] Isn't that mean? Isn't that mean? Woke you up anyway.

Anyway, we've had 3GA, just as given last week – understand this now – is totally workable and will move right on out and do the job. You understand that? You list enough goals; you'll get the charge off and so forth. Now, our problem is just doing it faster and doing clearing faster. And this is not necessarily even an improvement on 3GA. This is just some way to find some goals.

Understand what I am telling you and this framework. This is just ways to find goals, see. I'd probably give you dozens and dozens of these in the next two or three, four or five years, you know.

You'll be sitting there and you've gotten it down to where finding a goal is a sure cure at eight hours, you see. Suddenly look at yourself, you'll be sitting there and you'll suddenly get a bulletin, you know, and it'll say – you put the E-Meter on the left side of you, you see, and – to the right side and you can cut it down to four hours, and you have to interrupt this lengthy goals-finding activity that you're engaged in, you see, to do it shorter. You can count on something like that happening. And this is one of those things.

Because the reason I tell you this is because we have already cleared a first goal Clear who had a wild rock slam. You follow me now? As listing was being completed, a wild rock slam was on the needle every now and then.

In other words, goals had been picked off the top of the GPM, and here we had a situation, you see, where somebody went Clear and free needle and so forth. On the second goal, we undoubtedly would have gotten a second goal and there possibly would have been some
rock slam residual there, you see, and we got a third goal, and we still had some rock slam, don't you see. And gradually it would have petered out and so forth.

Now, what I'm intrigued about is while all of you are sitting around smugly whose name didn't appear on the list there, while you're feeling comfortable about this, let me tell you this horrible fact: is you can turn it on on any pc knowing these details. [chuckles, laughter]

Because right up to this moment, you thought I was talking about a specialized case. I'm not talking about a specialized case – I'm talking about you; and me. Because we're monkeying around with this last night and we turned one on at will on me – bang! You know what it is, you can turn it on. Don't you see? It's an overt. It's an overt channel.

This guy has got himself caught in the front lines with a bunch of overts and he's sitting in a ridge which has got enough confusion and enough overt behind it that he couldn't move anywhere. So, there he is. See that? And wouldn't you like a goals process which might do as follows: which might omit the first two or three goals and leave you with only four or five, you see. Wouldn't that be interesting?

Male voice: Oh, yeah.

Just cut off the first three and make it much faster to find those first the – the first goal, and just bypass some big chunks of GPM which will just blow off. Wouldn't that be nice?

Well, that's the speedup which I have in mind here. I find this very fascinating. We've already run people, found perfectly valid goals and run people to free needle and found out they had a rock slamming needle underlying the free needle.

You overlist beyond this free needle a ways – fifteen, twenty minutes, something like that – and you had a firing rock slam turn on every now and then.

Well of course, this pc was going right on down the goals chain. Well, we already see that the track is laid out in cycles. A cycle is a series of lives or types of lives associated and allied, and with – highly variable in its time element. It could be a trillion years, it could be a billion years, it could be a hundred thousand, it could be sixty thousand.

It's just the fellow starts in on this brand-new endeavor to him and he goes on through to the end where it's so dead and so buried and so gone, that he won't admit to any part of it and he doesn't even stay in that corner of the universe, you understand. That's a cycle.

Well now, actually, what starts a cycle is a prime postulate that is not particularly influenced by any earlier experience or postulate. He starts himself out with a new goal which is not a solution to his problems, but a new game.

And then he'll swish up the track quite a ways going on this, and it'll finally – finally the steam will leak out of the boiler, and he eventually lays that aside and he finds himself taking no interest in life and doing nothing and getting no place, and in no trouble and he hasn't got any ability to get into trouble with, see. You know, it takes a certain amount of ability to get into trouble, see.

And he's finally gone down through the bottom and he's lying around now listening to Brahms, you see. [laughter, laughs] Life is hopeless, you know, and he's reading modern lit-
erature and he's pretty well washed out. Well actually, he goes on out through the bottom and while out through the bottom, why, he finds himself sitting out on cloud 9, realizes he's been there for quite a while, something like this.

And he didn't report back to the area for a new body or anything like that. He feels quite perked up, you know. He perks up – up to two or three grasshopper power. [laughter] And he says, "I-I think I'll get back in the game. Let's see now, what would be a good game? To never have anything anywhere! Yeah – not even me could figure my way out of that." [laughter]

And off he goes on a new cycle. You get the idea? Every other postulate he makes after that cycle is involved with this basic postulate. And he gets in – then they're really solutions to problems caused by the basic postulate.

So he goes tearing along for sixty thousand or another trillion or something like that. It all depends on how good it is. We someday will probably have a scale up on the wall. This postulate will carry you this many thousand years, you know. But anyhow that's – that's the way it goes. Well, now that's a cycle.

Well, now those are pieces of GPM. Actually, however, they have an interrelationship even though the thetan thinks they do not. It is of interest to clean up the earliest one you can get your paws on.

In other words, bypass some of them and you'll find out the later cycles then are very easy to knock off. Sometimes you might find they might even knock off just by inspection because he's less powerful in making his postulate each time, you see. That's a dwindling spiral type of action.

All right. Then theoretically is it – it is of interest to reach as far back on the track as you can for a goal that is still reconcilable with the pc's reality on it and his ability to run it. Those are the monitoring factors.

Now of course, you get that if a goal will fire – just take it this way: If you can get a goal to rocket read, you can list it. That is your guiding principle. You can get one to fire and fire and fire – all cleaned up, you see. It's all tigered to pieces. Everything is off of it and it's rocket reading every time you say it and everything is going along fine. Now, then that goal should – if it is kept clean during listing and is listed properly and if the lines are kept clean and are firing – that goal should list through to free needle, which means the vanishment of great chunks of GPM. Don't you see?

Then you have to go and find yourself a new goal. And if you've got – find one now that rocket reads after it's been all cleaned up, why, you can list that one out. Oh, this is sequence. You're actually reaching further and further and further back.

Now, if you were to come forward and find a later goal, that would be the easiest thing you ever did, see. It's easy – it'd be easy to isolate or locate these things. And it is of interest to find the earliest goal that you can lay your paws on that is real to the pc and if it's real to the pc, it fires just repeating what I just said.
Well, weirdly enough, a thetan never gets so messed up that he fails to leave out a flag. He gets buried in the cemetery but he usually has a tombstone.

You want to know, in early work this was particularly useful. The key engram of the person's current life still had a piece of picture. And the pc would go back and forth past this picture, and you ask him sometime – you ask him, "Have you got any very innocent pictures there?" "You got any pictures that don't mean anything very much?"

And, "Well, there's – yes, there's one here of my grandfather's rocking chair. Ha-ha. That's all. It's just an empty rocking chair. I see that quite often."

Sometimes grandfather has been in it, but the more he's gone across it, grandfather has been less in it – now isn't in it at all. It's just an empty chair. Well, you go and explore this. And you can actually take off and run it as an engram if you can get the fellow to face up to any part of it and the next thing you know, the darnedest Roman arena turns up around there, and it'll be a key engram on this lifetime.

In other words, he left a little flag flying out here of an empty rocking chair. And actually, there's an automobile accident and a couple of operations, and a funeral, and so forth, that he's forgotten all about. He doesn't know anything about these. These have just slipped his mind but he did leave a rocking chair sitting there.

I think it's quite remarkable. A thetan nearly always does this. He's always got a rocking chair or a little flag or ... Now and then he sees a small inscription on something that isn't there, see. It's just a little memory tab that sticks out of the reactive bank.

You'll find this thing in many of its manifestations. And the goal has a rock slam left on it. A key goal has a rock slam on it. Now, I don't say that you can't find a goal which is later on the track, closer to present time than that, and prove it out and clean it, don't you see, because we've done it. And then find an earlier goal and prove it out and list it to Clear, you see, and then so forth.

Nor do I say that you could do this on every person because we haven't done it on every person. There are a lot of people who haven't been cleared in this world. You might like to read the papers sometime if you need any proof of that.

And the generality here however, is that you're liable to run into somebody who's just got such a rock slamming needle or such a dirty, dirty needle all the time, all the time, all the time, that you can't prepcheck them, you know, you can't find any handle to prepcheck with, and you can't find any handle to assess with, and you couldn't do a Tiger Drill on them, and so forth.

Well, it'd be very doubtful if you would ever find a goal on that person. Very doubtful. It'd take a long time to sec check, prepcheck them out to a point where the needle is readable.

Funny part of it is the needle will probably at once collapse in – back into it the rock slam and the pattern the second you hit the goals list. Because we've never had any trouble with this, except when we were monkeying with goals. Isn't that interesting?

*Audience: Mmm. Yeah. Mm-hm.*
And every time you start monkeying with goals, you have dirty needles, persistent dirty needles, you have rock slams, you have this and that, and man. Yes, it's associated with goal phenomena.

And now, you recognize that that pattern is a "Failed to reveal." But how about the big pattern? He doesn't know what he's failing to reveal. You sometimes can pull a series of overts on the big pattern against a certain thing, like an auditor, and it'll turn off.

You can fool around with somebody's goals list and find every rock slamming item on the goals list, write those few down, pull a common denominator off, test it several different ways and then ask him if he has an overt against that lately. He gives it to you, and the rock slam turns off. You get that as a method of turning off a rock slam, but it's an overt on a certain target.

One of the most fruitful ways of finding what that target is, is to have nulled several hundred goals on the pc and found that some of them rock slammed. Take those goals, write them down on a little separate list – it isn't that they're in – and look at their subject matter, and then just sort out their subject matter until it makes sense. Test it a little bit. You know, overts on this. All of a sudden, you'll be able to turn on the rock slam at will.

But this oddity gets in your road: Subject one turned on a rock slam easily and well, but it wore out almost at once. Subject two that you selected turned on a rock slam and it wore out. You knew you had it, you see, and then it was gone. It didn't do it anymore. Subject three – and it turned on a rock slam and then it was gone, too. And then subject four, and subject four turns on a rock slam and it goes on. Every time you got a rock slam, you use subject four and it turns it off. Every time, you know, it works like a charm and this button isn't wearing out.

Why did others wear out? Because they were just locks on the main button, and a very little bit of auditing cleaned them off the chain.

You'll sometimes find somebody's goal was dial-wide rock slamming. And it turned out not to be his goal, and you found another goal, and it was dial-wide rock slamming, and that turned out to be not his goal, and then you got another goal, and it was dial-wide rock slamming. Where the hell? What's happening? See? Well, it's just that they weren't, but the charge is associated with them.

In other words, the charge can trickle up the line and attach itself to different things, which are allied in subject matter.

It's like a tree. At first any branch of the tree looks like the trunk, if you're examining it blindfolded. And you'll eventually find the trunk. Yeah, you take ahold of a limb of a tree ... And supposing you were examining merely the top of the tree, and the limbs of the tree and you had no sense of up or down and you wouldn't know where the top of this tree was. They'd all feel about the same, actually.

Well, the test would be, that when you finally got hold of the top of the tree, that button didn't wear out. Yeah, but you don't feel too cocky just because you get something to rock slam madly. Because just about the time you turn the meter around to show the pc or rush out of the auditing room without calling a break to find an Instructor to say, "Look, look, look!"
you know. You'll get back, the subject's probably worn out by that time. And then you have to
hunt around a little bit to find the allied subject that turns it on. I mean, this charge that is im-
parted to associated subjects – related subjects – is about the only thing that gets in your road
going back down this track because you're happily climbing down a branch of the tree, and
you say, "We sure are getting near the trunk," and then the branch peters out and never goes
near the trunk.

There's no rock slam, and there was no bridge, and nothing, no little man popped out
of the E-Meter and says, "Go to the left; this is a one-way street." You know? No directions
are given you.

But out of all this potpourri, if you followed it down by doing a goals list and finding
each type of goal that rock slammed, and then tested all of those out, you've got a system, but
it's a very laborious system, which would peter out all the time.

Now, Scientology has a number of basic truths in it. There are lots of fundamentals
around and instead of hunt and punch, you can always go find yourself a hat full of funda-
mentals and shove them into the works, you see, and everything goes off afterwards – and
you've got some fundamentals called the dynamics.

And the goals chain begins with an overt on dynamics. It doesn't happen to be an in-
tentional overt. It just happens that the goal happens to be, in the woof and warp of life, a
hellish overt against a part of one of the dynamics.

Now, you see, let's say there are eight dynamics, and each one has a hundred branches.
I know you – they have far fewer in their exact divisions, but you get a pc rattling off of how
many parts there are to a fifth dynamic, you ought to listen to him sometime, you see. Now,
he's really stuck on the fifth. My God – there's trees and there's grasses and there's shrubs and
there's flowers, and then you have to get a botany textbook, you see. And then that gives you
all the types of trees, all the types of shrubs, and all the types of flowers – the families there-
unto, the climatic differences thereof, see? And then there's mice. And psychology isn't totally
lost, you know. They're still authorities on mice.

And you say, "Well, to you, 'rodent,' you see." This would be one part of the fifth dy-
namic. Well, in actual fact, why you should just start reading the catalog of the number of
types of mice there are, you know, let alone rats. So it'd actually get pretty broad, don't you
see.

Well, you got all of these parts of life – all of its various ramifications and forms, all
branching out from your eight dynamics.

You see, you get an almost infinite variety of life out of these eight dynamics, but you
can go back to these eight dynamics. And anybody who has made a postulate may have been
in agreement with, totally associated with, everything fine with, seven of the dynamics and
799 parts of the remaining dynamic, but it's still going to be one hell of an overt against at
least one of the parts of one of the dynamics. You can count on that; it's going to be an overt.
Because life, you see, is built in many frames and varieties of postulates and you're going to
have some part of life that is going to be assaulted by any postulate a thetan makes.

We're going to say – well, I'm going to give you a crude example.
The fellow says, "To be a tragedian. That's what I'm going to be. I'm going to be a tragedian. That — that's going to be my next cycle." See?

That's fine. But some other knuckle-duster has said, "To make everybody happy." Those two goals are going to collide. See, somebody else making everybody's "got to be happy," you see, and this fellow's a tragedian, and this is a terrific collision, don't you see.

Well, actually, it's not postulate against postulate that you're particularly worried about. You're worried about postulates against parts of life.

And you've got yourself, and you've got the two divisions of the second dynamic, and you got groups, and you got species, and you've got the fifth dynamic, see, and the remaining species, and you got the sixth, which is the physical universe, including forms, and you've got the seventh which is spirits, and the eighth which is supreme beings, et al., etc. That's getting pretty wild here, don't you see.

And you say, "I'm going to help people," and this is an overt against a god which is designed only to help people. Don't you see.

You're going to help people. You're going to cut his throat, in other words.

See, there's all kinds of crossplays. There's no reason to go into it. You yourself have in your banks several hundred thousand excellent examples.

So you can use this rock slam to find the goals channel by doing the following: by taking the eight dynamics and — assessing them to find which one has a rock slam on it, a dirty needle. Which one gives up a dirty needle?

Now, if we can't get a dirty needle just by inspection, we can always cause one by asking him to think of overts against, and pick out the dirtiest, biggest needle we get.

You have to be clever to ask that question without missing withholds.

All right. Think of committing overts against yourself, and think of committing overts — sexual overts, or against sex — against sex is better — it's all against. You're going to get one of these things to rock slam. That's for sure. Either it was rock slamming just when you read over the list, and you just picked it up like that or you had to work on it a little bit harder and make something rock slam and pick that. See?

Well, if you've got that, you kind of want to prove it out. You kind of want about — to ask about it. Has he ever committed any overts? Get him to tell you a few, you know, and so on.

Now, what would represent that dynamic to the pc? This is a list that you get. Let's say you got third dynamic. Now, what would represent that dynamic to the pc? You understand what I'm giving you here is not a set pattern; this is merely an exploratory experimental process. But what would represent that third dynamic to him, you know.

And he gives you this, and he gives you that, and he gives you the other thing. Well he might get five – you might get fifty items. But you sit there and do yourself a little Assessment by Elimination is the way you do your Prehav Scale, see, but you're looking for the rock slam.
But you don't care if that list doesn't rock slam. You merely want to find the hottest point of that list. You understand? You just want the hot point of the list. If it doesn't rock slam, we won't worry about it at this particular time. We're just going to find something hot. And that list may stand out totally independent. And it may have, on the third dynamic, it might have something like governments, see. That's hot. Maybe it rock slams, maybe it doesn't rock slam. We couldn't care. It – but it certainly was the hottest button.

If it is the hottest button, then it's the only one on the list that – there's nothing else on the list that is rock slamming. You understand?

The way rock slam is used to – in that particular little dirty needle, bzzzt. It's the only one that will.

Now, we – it's very simple. We take our pen in hand. We spread out our legal length, 13 inch by 8 paper. We put down at the top of this, the date and the pc's name. And then we write this sentence: What goal might you have that would be an overt against a government? Question mark. Number 1. Use Arabic numerals.

And the proof of this pudding is whether or not that needle starts falling off the pin.

If that needle goes crash-crash after a little while, you want any – you write down any pain the pc has or any sen, and if that needle's going crash-crash-crash on this list, you just keep going as long as that needle's going crash-crash-crash. Got it?

But if that tone arm is moving, well, ha-ha-ha-ha, got good tone arm motion, and everything is going along here lovely and that rock slam is narrowing and finally gets down to a little dirty needle, and that finally disappears on your listing – when a tone arm needle, not so much the tone arm, but certainly the needle, is no longer caroming around just because you're listing goals and your needle's got nice and quiet, if you're lucky the pc's goal is on that list you wrote.

Ain't that interesting? It's like doing a crossword puzzle. That's interesting. Now, I said if you're lucky. I hope this doesn't happen to you: That you get the rock slam and get nothing but sen and a stuck needle. You got a rock slam, but you got sen and a stuck needle. You missed some place. Something is wrong here somewhere. Because the rock slam will very shortly disappear. And you will realize at this time that you've gone to the end of a branch, not to the end – top of the tree.

And you've gone down and it petered out, and that isn't so, and the best way to handle that – the best way to handle that is just do yourself a brand-new Dynamic Assessment, and do the whole process all over again.

Now, actually you're not looking at a lengthy process. This does not take long to do. If you think it takes a session to do a Dynamic Assessment, it doesn't.

It takes me ordinarily seven or eight minutes to do a complete Dynamic Assessment with the part. There's no trouble with this, see. It's not a hard job. It's a very simple action. Old Dynamic Assessment is done by change of characteristic.

Now, if you've been unfortunate and this rock slam just peters out, you want to know whether it's going or not, just make another test. Ask for overts against other dynamics, and if
you turn on a rock slam again, why, I don't know whether you ought to do the list where it ran out or do a new list on it.

But it's the length of time. You will, I think, learn the dwindling rock slam. You'll realize that you are taking the charge off by goals listing, whereas the rock slam just didn't—it was on and just disappeared, and you don't see it anymore, see.

Well, if you've got a list by dwindling rock slam, you of course are taking the charge off of that rock slam.

Now, you make the guy do 850 goals. You do anything else with a list that had—you have been told for 3GA. Your list is already this discharged when—by the time you do this thing. You don't spend any time much listing on him or straightening him out. You just look for the rock slam. You got the idea? That's the auditor action. You still want 850 goals from this pc. What do you do with the 850 goals? Well, you put them aside carefully and do nothing with them.

You want that little, short list that went down to the bottom of the rock slam. That's theoretically the way it would work. See. That leaves you with a handful of goals to null.

Now, if the fellow's goal isn't on that, you either have missed a meter read, which of course you will never do after you leave here. You may do it here, but you will never do it when you have left here.

You miss a meter read or that goal for some reason or other—well, you didn't have it straight or it was the wrong dynamic or the thing panned out—something went wrong on the thing. Still, just repeat the operation and get yourself another short list and see if the goal's on that. That is a fairly catch-as-catch-can economical way of doing it.

Oddly enough, you'll probably have the pc wheezing, sneezing, squeezing and saying, "God, gosh—what do you know," you know. "That's me." This kind of reaction taking place and he'll tell you exactly why this goal is the right goal and you get cognitional actions.

If you do it without—there's no cognition on any case, I would be suspicious of it. If the pc wasn't genning me in on why you had to have this type of goal, I would be suspicious of it. Pc's just writing them all down on a long grind, well, you probably are running down the branch of the tree.

Your rock slam isn't narrowing. It'll eventually just disappear and it'll leave you a list full of sen. That will be the way it is.

All right. Well, there's the experimental use of the rock slam in the discovery of a goal.

Now, perhaps on some pcs, you'd have to use this system absolutely. But on most pcs, the way this is predicted, it would bypass maybe the first two, three goals that you would have to find on the case and list.

So you see, this shortens up goals, it shortens up clearing if it works properly. As you do it and work with it and run into problems, I will undoubtedly have other things to refine concerning it but for the moment, that's the way it is.
Thank you very much.
Thank you. Lecture 2, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 14 August AD 12: World Clearing Program.

_Audience: Really? Mmm!_

This is the first lecture or announcement or bulletin or anything else on the forwarding of Scientology on a very worldwide clearing basis.

Now, the point involved here is that we have a world clearing activity sort of understood. See, it's sort of understood that we're going to clear a lot of people. See? But let me tell you that simply incorporating a Foundation and putting it into your own home with no administrative lines of any character is not the way to go about world clearing. The place begins to look like a bargain basement very rapidly.

Of course, these snide references are to 42 Aberdeen Road, Elizabeth, New Jersey. I don't hardly think even the foundations of the house were left when we finally…

But such things require a plan – an agreed upon and more importantly, highly workable plan that will deliver the goods.

Now, let me tell you about this plan in – not the plan itself – but let's tell you how a Central Organization could go about clearing. I'll show you then how the plan can develop out of these mechanisms.

We have HPA/HCA – some slight degree of neglected sphere now. Terribly necessary, but nevertheless a neglected sphere.

Prepchecking is not really an adequate skill to turn people totally loose with. There is another form of auditing which has just marched into view which has terrific therapeutic value. It's goals listing. Not finding goals, but goals listing. And whatever else happens with trick ways of finding goals and that sort of thing, you've still got goals listing. And the funny part of it is, is somebody is spinning in Keokuk and they write you a frantic letter saying what can they do. Well, it's dangerous to ask them for their withholds because they sure will neglect to put one or two on and just wind up madder than hell at you.

But you can ask them for their goals. You can tell them to write a goals list – state some astronomic figure and tell them to write you some goals, and send you the list and you can carefully preserve it or see that it gets turned over to an auditor or something of that sort.
For God's sakes, don't handle one of those lists badly.

All right. There – there is this action, and very shortly, clearing assistance will definitely be part of HCA/HPA training. Definitely.

How would he go about this? A trained HPA would know how to prepcheck, particularly if given a more reliable (if more expensive) meter with a red light or something like that – or a big oscilloscope or something of that sort.

You've got a Prepcheck action this person has to take. Now, that's very time devouring. Person isn't going to stay in-session at all with a flock of overts that are right here in PT or they won't talk to the auditor. You can't get them to ask [answer] questions. You'll never be able to get the rudiments in to find a goal. Don't you see? So that's a necessary action.

Your goals listing or any trick goals listing that you care to make sure is done could be taught at that level. See, we've taken an awful lot off of an auditor now. You just look at your checksheets. Your checksheets are thin compared to what they were.

And your next action would be listing a goal. See, we've just skipped finding a goal there. We just omitted that. So an HCA/HPA who could list goals, prepcheck somebody into position for a goal – smooth the case out, get the overts off, and that sort of thing – and then could list all the items for a goal would be a very valuable character to have around, wouldn't he?

And gradually, as he went along, for sure he'd learn how to find goals if he'd gone that far, see. See that? So if you included listing of goals and listing of items for goals, as part of HCA/HPA training, you've pushed clearing a long way ahead. Because why? Because a handful of Saint Hill grads in an organization could find all the goals necessary to be found in that organization. There's where the skill and accuracy must exist. See, you're very – you got a goal and you've got to really be sharp.

Now, that's very much to the point, because if you were to list the goals for the pc or drive the pc on into the listing of goals and sessions and – as a Saint Hill graduate – and prepcheck the pc and set the pc up in all directions to find a goal, and then go ahead and null by the mid ruds the list and find the goal; and then sit down and do all the listing necessary to clear that up, man, you're looking at hours!

Now, these hours are being pushed out into a rather fabulous thing. Yes, you're listing goals here after you found one.

But I call something to your attention: that once you get slippery on finding a goal and you get used to the Tiger Drills and that sort of thing, this is less time consuming, particularly as I'm cutting down and shortcutting how that operation is done, but notice that there are no shortcuts being done, aside from the tip that you'd better clean up the goal and lines at the beginning of every session, in listing a goal out.

And you realize that a goal listing action runs as many as 2500 items per list and there are four lists. That's 10,000 items. Man, that's a lot of hours of auditing.

So if we took a Saint Hill graduate and – and moved it down to the point where he did supervision on the goals list and supervision on the listing of items – made sure this was go-
ing along all right – he makes sure of this, by the way, that at item two or three hundred on each list, that the pain is in the right place and it's, you know, all firing off properly. And he gives the goal another Instructor's check and so forth, and makes sure it's firing.

As long as he was satisfied the case was set up to have his goal found, before he found the goal, and as long as he was satisfied that the listing would continue to free needle; if he had some people around who could list goals, do the prepchecking and do the actual listing of the goals, we've really smoothed this out, haven't we?

All right. So in a Central Organization, a policy letter has just gone out that forbids a Saint Hill graduate from doing anything in that Central Organization but find goals.

And staff training has all of a sudden been given the push on the tricks of – they've all got a lot of Prepchecking and so forth under their belts now. Now, just listing of goals and listing of items, don't you see? This is part of the training program.

So very soon somebody will be able to walk into a Central Organization and get prepared, get his Prepchecking, get the listing and so forth, and find himself a greater or lesser part of his ... You see, it isn't that the Saint Hill graduate would have him for one intensive or one and one-half and – or two intensives or something. It isn't divided up that way. You don't do that that way. He audits him as long as it is necessary to find the goal. You got the idea?

He picks him up at the moment he's ready to pick him up, as dependent on whether the pc is ready and has been carried on, and then carries him just as long as is necessary to actually find and – and prove out that goal and then drops him like a hot potato and picks up the next pc. You got the idea?

You see, he – he might be lucky enough to find the goal in four or five days or he might find the goal in one and one-half intensives or two and a half intensives or something like this, you see.

At that moment, why, you'd have to have a fluidity of schedule that the pc would be reverted to a staff auditor who is not a Saint Hill graduate. See? That way, you got Central Organizations doing clearing, as long as Saint Hill graduates aren't put around in Address Section or something, you see.

Now, that's a Central Organization program. It ain't Saint Hill graduates – there's – had enough metering and enough this and enough that and need pushing around and so forth – that's what they ought to be doing.

Oh yes, well, if you're rich, you can have a Saint Hill graduate as D of P and one as D of T, you see. That's getting wealthy. That's getting real wealthy. I will go into staff clearing in just a moment.

But let's take a look now at that as an activity. You see that that would be then a workable activity. And you'd start turning out Clears and you wouldn't be wasting your skill. This is a way to do this.

Now, you're going to see some section of this program as the wheels turn here. And although it is very hard on somebody in the middle of listing to suddenly lose his auditor and have another auditor shoved on, you're going to see that gradually taking place here. But the
advanced 3GA auditor is finding goals, and the new person just moved into 3GA is doing nothing but list. Got the idea?

*Audience: Mm-hm.*

Now, where you have a group which is a co-audit, you realize that if inexactively and if rather rough to supervise, still approximates the same type of activity – roughly.

And now let me say a word about staff clearing as a special activity. Your staff could co-audit on getting the goals listed and could co-audit on the listing of items and thus form an auditing activity with the Saint Hill Graduate Staff Staff Auditor (which is what they're called) picking them out just as fast as they were ready or as he had time, and whipping down the list and finding their goal and shoving them back into the group. You see? You'd still have clearing going forward on a staff training program. See how you could do that?

All right. Now, let's take another look over here at – we're not speaking of world clearing yet. We're speaking of Central Organizations. They will do an awful lot of it.

But let's look at a wider program here. Let's look at world clearing, exclamation point. We get fifty people and I don't care what financial arrangements are made with these fifty people. Central Organizations – they might do something like this at sometime or another in PE and so on, but possibly doubtful. If you got fifty people and perhaps those people are contributing so much per week as a group, as a co-audit – and you talk to these people, you talk to them straight from the shoulder, and you say, "Here's what we're going to do with you people. You all want to be Clear. Fine. That's all understood. There's no – going to be no arguments with that. All right. We've got that taped. You may not even know what it is, but you want to be it. That's fine. You're tired of being in the muck and going through the endless cycle of it all and going deeper. All right. We can lift you out of that. Fine. That's established and understood. But how are we going to accomplish this?

"Well, the way we're going to accomplish this is we're going to form a co-audit. And you're going to be in here three nights a week" – or whatever arrangements are made in time – "and you're going to have your pc, and you're going to be somebody's pc, and you're going to undertake the necessary actions to get goals listed, and then afterwards to get the items listed, and as soon as you're ready or if several are ready at one time, you are going to draw lots with short straws."

And the Saint Hill graduates running this particular unit, probably two of them, will get that person by the nape of the neck, when that person is ready, and just on a daytime auditing schedule, auditing certainly no more than five hours in the day, find that person's goal and shove them back into the co-audit. And pick up the next one and find that person's goal, and shove them back into the co-audit and pick up that next one, and find that person's goal, and shove them back into the co-audit. You see this?

*Audience member: Yeah, I do.*

And we say, "Well, that's what you folks is going to do, and that means that within the year you – all going to be Clear. Within the year."
"Now, as far as second goals are concerned, we'll go as far on that as we can after all the first goals are found. We will keep this cycle going.

"But your main action at first is to learn something about the tools of your trade and read a few of these bulletins and try to make sense out of them, and you're not expected to study the theory of what's going on and you're not expected to do this, but you're actually expected to sit there and look like an auditor," as people in co-audit very often do quite well.

And there's somebody supervising that co-audit and the co-audit is pretty muzzled, it usually runs off rather smoothly.

Well, the financing situation of this particular character, of course, is self-explanatory. I don't know whether you would charge them so much to find their goal or something of this sort or if they'll carry it all ahead just on their weekly contribution or what you would do about this, that's up to the persons running the co-audit. I myself would rather favor a fairly liberal weekly contribution – not a small one – and base it on the numbers I had that would make a perfectly adequate income running through the place. Even a princely income running through the place so nobody is having to dive sideways and audit some psycho from north Manitoba just because the center needs some money, you know. This is the wildest, most uneconomical thing to do and yet centers and field auditors are always doing this, you see.

They all of a sudden audit for free, audit for free, audit for nothing. The light bill keeps going up, you know, and the rent goes unpaid and then all of a sudden they have to go on some wild wingding of accepting pcs that they never would have dreamed of just because they were too bashful to ask for a certain constant contribution from people who are around that center. You got the idea?

All right. Now, we take this as an action. What damage would it do? Interesting question to ask since very naturally, you're going to have some interesting blowups in a co-audit. But if you have these people – if they've got any withholds or looking blowy or something like that – you, sir, make sure that they tell you about them whether they tell their auditor about them or not. You can probably keep this thing cooled off. Don't you see?

And you make some screaming set of penalties for anybody's pc blowing. Just don't let them have pcs that blow. In other words, make them take some responsibility for this fact, you know.

Take the other mechanisms which come into account or whatever other mechanisms are necessary to keep the group together and keep it going, you see.

Now, that group is going to be very hopeful. You're going to have to do a certain amount of training. If you don't do a certain amount of training, why of course, you'll find yourself around the bend with this activity.

Well, the thing to do is to do the training at first, but get some goals listed so your program isn't stopped waiting for goals lists or something and you take the person that is the best trained and looks the best or take – that – the few that are, you know, pretty good. You get the goals list in a hurry and get this program of finding the goal on your weekly auditing schedule, you see, just pocketa-pocketa-pocketa and then fit the rest of it in and put it together while you've got that part of it running.
And these guys are going to go frantic. The people who aren't up to it are going to go frantic. Because something is actually happening, and you haven't got to stand up in front of them all the time and fill them full of hope and courage and all that sort of thing because they see it happening in their midst.

"There's Joe. They found his goal last week, see. And he's going Clear. He's being listed right now by Betsy Ann. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Lucky stiff." See, something is happening. Well, you've got quite a boom to lower there if somebody starts slogging it and doing nothing and muck it up, see.

Now, you could even improve this just a little bit by making the person's auditing skill a certain number of points against their – getting their goal found. In other words, you balance this off. Not only is their needle straight and their list complete, but their auditing points must be adequate to that. Some type of police action so that they deliver a proper session or have a wish to, could count against their number on the list to have their goal found. Don't you see? When it comes to select the next – now, I wouldn't select them all at first. See, I'd grab them in handfuls of three, four, five at a time. I'd never get it plotted ahead more than about six weeks.

See, on the people who have not had their goals found, I would never get it plotted ahead more than a few weeks. You see why? There's this one bird says he's got to wait for eight months until his goal is found, do you see – just arbitrarily. Well, he's going to ride. He's not going to try to jockey himself up into a more favorable position by getting – making a better show out of it. You get the idea? Some type of mechanism of this character would be highly desirable.

Now, you might think that this would cut people off from going and getting trained. No, no – far from it. Far from it. There's somebody – he's looking pretty bad and – he's had his test – let us say he's had his taste of auditing. He's had this and he's had that. All of a sudden he'll propose to you the novel idea that he could be of more help to you if he went down to the Central Organization and took a course and came back because he isn't about to have his goal found in the next three months anyway, and why doesn't he go and take a course and come back in the meantime, and he'd be straightened out by that time and so forth. You'll find out this kind of randomness occurring, and far from discouraging it, you should encourage it. You wind up with more help. Don't you see?

All right. You continue on along this particular line and you will wind up at the end of a year – if two auditors had fifty people – you would wind up at the end of the year with a high probability of having gotten the lot.

You would have released into the community fifty first-goal Clears – thud. That would do things, man.

Now, you shouldn't multiply the number of franchise holders or co-audit-type groups doing this by the number of years and arrive with the figure of how many people will be cleared in ten years. This is not the way that would go at all. It would go by arithmetical progression. This stuff would start taking off on a high climb, you see. About the only thing that limits it is how many people could be put through Saint Hill. That's a limiting factor. And this
of course, is, you know, rough and at no time will I ever downgrade an auditor's skill just to let him go home because his wife is dead of starvation or something of the sort. These are minor affairs. Are you a good auditor? That's what counts, you see.

Because actually you lose the whole game, see. I let an auditor go out of here that can't audit, can't handle cases and that sort of thing, the whole game is lost. Any time he's been here is actually lost.

Now, that number actually could be stepped up without reducing quality too fantastic-ally by various refinements and so forth. But there are an awful lot of old-time Scientologists around. Lots of them around the world. You'd be amazed.

So I've instituted a new program of putting them in touch with franchise auditors. And I'm now in the process of getting all the names and addresses of everybody who ever thought he wanted to be trained and sending them to the nearest franchise holder, wherever they are in the world, see. So that in his own town, why, somebody may have quite a few HPAs, HCAs, that sort of thing that he hardly knows of or that have ... And then we – I'll write these people and tell them to contact this center, and the center can talk to that person and get that person in and cooperating in some way or another, you see. And well use our backlog. Well use our carefully built-up backlog.

And that backlog I, of course, have been carefully building up over a long period of time. And it's rather sizable. It'd surprise you.

Now, that gives you some semi-trained assistants right at the start from – for administrative action or it gives you people who would simply come into the group for this particular purpose or various other uses. Don't you see?

Well, this is – this is a jump-off. Now, that's not a very startling arrangement, is it? That doesn't stun you, but it's, it's a terribly simple arrangement. And if you think that in a single year, there's a possibility of releasing twenty-five Clears into this community and fifty into that one, and thirty-five into another city and this will start to look interesting. I think it'll look far more interesting than you realize at first glance. So this is a sort of a kickoff.

Well, now I've been waiting until we had a proven-up procedure. It was going along and it was doing all right. And of course I'm working on refining the speed with which goals can be found which is a single pin that would extend this program out too much. And we've got something in the run. And that is kind of the way I figured it out. I have talked to a couple of people who know on this and they seem to think this is a very feasible program. It's essentially very simple.

But don't get so crazy as to believe that you can audit twenty-five hours a day and carry forward the program. There must be a finite auditing period and I certainly would never audit more than about five hours in a day. I just wouldn't. Five, pardon, five – five and a half hours. That's about what a staff auditor does and if I, myself, were working in this center, I think I would probably work about, oh, I'd maybe do four or five hours of auditing a day, and I'd spend some time in the evening on training and making sure the co-audit was running all right.
And I'd have some Reception assistance – somebody to answer the phone and carry the money to the bank. It's nice to have such people around. I've always found them quite useful.

Now, as we expand this... That is a basic world clearing activity. Now, of course, the workhorse of Scientology is the Central Organization and always has been. It brings in new people quite consistently with it's PEs and it does various things.

Years ago, Central Organizations only existed as information centers and after that just as means of, well, training. They've always existed for training but as far as pcs are concerned, means of demonstrating results and keeping up the level of results and that sort of thing.

Now, we started out on a program which was not necessarily premature, but I just got the word around, that we had a certain number of people we're going to clear out in the field: former HGC pcs and that sort of thing. And a Central Organization ought to start getting those lined up, using this other program of clearing, see. It isn't a question of if they're going to come in. Because most of these pcs come into Central Organizations are rather scattered around. They're in the oddball places of the world, and so forth.

And they come in; we're going to run them through this same type of program I just described to you, see, that in Central Organizations they start getting these people lined up. Not a question of if they are going to come in; it's a question of they were on this list of people to be cleared. When are they coming in to get their preparatory actions?

And everything I've been doing is trying to improve quality of auditing up to a point where it could be tremendously trusted. Well, you're going to have trouble with that in any organization. You're going to have trouble with that on any co-audit – is to keep up the auditing quality and not let it be slipshod and not let it skid. That's always a fight. It's always a fight.

Because a bunch of green auditors can think up ... You think you can think up – God! Gave you a lecture an hour ago about Dynamic Assessment and there's going to be some of you asking the Instructors, "What do I do now? I have two dynamics rock slamming equally. Now, what do we do from that point?" You see?

Well, there's going to be a problem there. That's for sure. But you think you can think up problems. Well, most of your problems make sense. [laughter]

Man, you get a co-audit going – you get a co-audit going, the problems you get make no sense at all. You can't figure out how the devil this ever came about. It should happen to you, you know.

It's pretty weird. This guy's been mooning around and worrying and worrying and worrying, and you've never quite been able to figure out what he was worrying about and finally one day he levels with you and so forth. He can't figure out whether this is theosophy as it ought to be practiced.

And you say, "Huh?"
He's been there for six months, but he thought he was in a philosophy group of some kind. You'd be amazed at some of the wild things that happen. And, of course, you have less control over people and they get themselves fouled up. Well, you know, you can foul up pcs and students pretty badly on the second dynamic, other regulations when they're missing. Well, things can get awful kind of gruesome around in a unit, but how about one over which you have no control of any kind, you see, whereas the people are in their work-a-day life.

You also have the problem of they try to adjust it with you when they can get off, and so forth. And I just never would Q-and-A with that at all. I don't care when you can get off. I can only tell you what week you must take off because you've got to be here.

And the fellow says, "Yes, but if and if and if and so forth and I'd be sure and be fired if I took that particular week off."

"Well, get another job. Don't worry me with that part. You're supposed to be here." [laughs]

You can get that straightened out pretty well.

They have a tendency to muck up your time. You can watch a Central Organization. You know exactly what point the public is impinging against because it'll be that point that is the most scrambled and mucked up. It's the most off-line. And man, it's really off-line. It'll be – it'll be something in – wherever it directly contacts the public, that hat you've got to put back on about every three months, see, because it'll go sailing off, and Reception is now expected to empty the wastebaskets. Lord knows what's happening, but this has gone out, you see. Routing of bodies – body routing lines and that sort of thing.

Well, that can happen in a Central Organization. It sure can happen like mad on scheduling, and so forth, on co-audits. And your main danger there is not maintain – maybe it doesn't make any sense to you, but let me tell you very severely that the main danger is with your limited staff and the small number with which you are operating that the public shoves your time scheduling madly out and you just got to be meaner than a gut-shot bear.

They're going to tell you ... They're going to wander in there at eight o'clock when they should've been there at seven-thirty and that sort of thing. Well, you just got to learn to lower the boom. Because the point they'll most mess up is time.

Time is the single source of human aberration in actual fact. There'd be no aberration if it weren't for time. Old Dianetic Axiom.

And that is the point where the craziest ones will louse you up the most. So it's the craziest ones, of course, that you want to keep in line hardest. So if you want to keep the time line most severely walked, you will also be imposing a tremendous amount of good control on those that are the worst in the group and it's an excellent control factor.

So if you control time, if you control the group's time, you will find out there's less enturbulation and aberration visible in the group. And they will want you to audit them after the co-audit at night for two hours, you see, or in the afternoon from 1:37, you see, to 3:18, you see, because they have to pick their mother up at school, you know. [laughter]
And if you let them – if you let them move around your time factor, you've let them control you in their sessions. That's just something that you should use. Because the first thing they try to do, it'll be the hardest front for you to hold, but once you're holding that front, you'll find out that you will win in many other zones and areas that you never dreamed of winning in. Just hold that time.

Guy is there at 7:31, he is supposed to be there at 7:30, you've already started to tell them what they were going to do this evening and how they're pairing off. And you're reading their schedule at their roll call, and somebody walks in. For heaven's sakes, greet them effusively. Don't let them ever sneak in. Greet them effusively – just stop the whole operation. Be happy they glad – were glad to come tonight. And they'll be there at 7:30 after that.

And make sure they know that you think that scheduling is important. And as soon as they find out that you think scheduling of what you're doing with them is important, a lot of other marbles will start concatenating with other marbles, and the next thing you know they won't have lost their marbles so inaccessibly. They'll start to reassemble.

And they'll say, "Well, this outfit means business because everything fires off on time," see. It's a method of controlling people who are otherwise quite unruly.

Now, that's the – that's the basic action of control, but you've got to keep – you've got to keep a certain amount of administration running, and if you have just a couple of auditors and nobody doing any administration at all, you all of a sudden are going to waste an awful lot of auditing time. An awful lot of auditing time gets lost in answering the mail and filing the letters, you know, and answering the telephone and so forth, and answering foolish questions. And it's – you've got to save a certain amount of time in order to get broad clearing effective.

Now, I'm speaking about time merely because it's a primary control point because it's a primary aberration point.

These people, out of – given any fifty people – will rather string out to the degree of preparation if you have a single thing they have to pass. They will actually sort of sort themselves into the leading order of hens on the length of time they will pass this certain thing. It doesn't much matter what it is, see. Because of this: the longer they take to do anything, why, the more reactive bank is in their road. In other words, the more reactive bank is in their road, the less understanding per unit of time.

The reactive bank actually is composed of no time at all. And they get up into a total timelessness so they never have any time to do anything. So this has various ramifications, but it plots out just this way: Time is a single source of aberration and such a person requires or any – well, people have different periods of time to register the same recognition, see.

We hang a sign on the wall and it says boojum. And if you actually had a – reaction meters wired up to every person in the room that could plot it on a drum of some kind – it'd fire off – you would find out that everybody in the room would have taken a different period of time to have recognized what the word was and what was hanging on the wall. And it would get on down from anything from a hundredth of a second down to ten minutes.
And that is a direct index of how much bank is in the fellow's road on study. Do you understand? Some students require longer than others to absorb the same data. Now, if it were just a pan-determined factor, that is to say if it were just a factor which nothing – it existed the same on all subjects – this would be very easy to plot. We'd say this person is a ten-second character, see. In other words, it took this person ten seconds to really register and soak in any one item the person was looking at. Unfortunately, this isn't true.

Human beings vary from subject to subject, dynamic to dynamic because their goals are sorted on the different dynamics and they're stupider on one thing than they are on another. So it takes them longer to absorb one thing than it does another.

So you get a certain unevenness running through all this because of the variability and there actually isn't a real general constant. You take some – some girl and you show her – you show her a slide rule. And she looks at this thing, and she looks at it, and she looks at it, and she looks at it, and she looks at it, and all she's supposed to find on this thing is it's got numbers on it, see.

And she looks at it, and she looks at it, and she looks at it, and she turns it over, and she looks at it, and you're waiting for this girl to recognize that there are numbers on the slide rule. And she just looks at it and looks at it and looks at it. An hour later she's still looking at it. And there's only one thing you have asked her to recognize is that it has numbers on it. She just won't do it.

And you show her a cake recipe that's full of numbers. She goes bzzzt bang, practically knock out the cake together to throw it in the oven before you could spit. Get the idea?

It's just where her goal sits. See, here was numbers in one form and numbers in another form. And in one form she just knows she must not ever understand this. Well, of course, that's practically an infinite time non-understand, see. That gets in the road of your meter reading. A person's ability to read a meter is dependent upon the amount of aberration they have about meters.

In actual fact, in ten minutes, person B, who is very aberrated on the subject, has less time spent in recognition – you follow this? See, out of ten minutes there is less of that ten minutes used in actual recognition, than person A who is not quite so aberrated on that subject, who only observes it for a tenth of a second. There is more recognition for person A in a tenth of a second than there is for person B in ten minutes. Do you see?

That's why you hand the meter to one person and they have a hell of a time seeing the needle. They stare at it and stare at it and stare at it, you know. Well, hell, it read seconds ago, and they're still looking. And another person, the thing gives the barest tick, and the person is right there, Johnny-on-the-spot, see. He's recognized that, digested it and put it out. It's on the subject of a meter.

Conversely, we might take this same person, give them a very complicated bulletin – this isn't necessarily true. There is some coordination between these two points, but not necessarily – and we give them this bulletin and they fire off on the bulletin brrrrrrr, and they go in and they pass it, brrrrrrr. They understand all of it. Everything is all fine and so forth and they take the meter in the hand and ... "When did it read?"
Well, they'll stare at it as long as they haven't got time in which to recognize it. A very sane person has fantastic quantities of time. I almost made one – somebody faint one time by telling them the local program for this planet. That is, this quarter of the universe program for this planet. This person has – was just going ahhaaa. You could just see the exhaustion coming off of this person. Oh, my God!

That – just embracing a plan that had that much time mixed up in it, see. Real time mixed up in it. It just wore them out.

I was tossing off things – well in 5,000 years this is what's supposed to happen, you see, and then this is... Actually we're in a dead period right now which is absolutely true. There isn't anything much going to happen here for about 5,000 years, so there's a little time to stretch.

But after that, why, there's several programs firing off and so forth and the actual allowed time for this particular planet was 15,000 years, you see, and plot this, plot that, and so on. And that's a fairly rapid program. That's fairly rapid, you know, speedy program. That's a sort of a rush program.

This person was dying at the idea, you know, of planning something out for 5,000 years. Well, hell, I've seen a billion years planned out on the track, down to its smallest detail. It gets to be fantastic, you know. I mean how much – how much time is time. And it has a great deal to do with the amount of recognition a person can experience per unit of time.

So anyway, here is your source of aberration. Your basic source of aberration is time. If you didn't have any time, you wouldn't have any motion. Don't you see. You could have no havingness either. The unit velocity of vibration, so the possibility of having any matter would be quite slight.

All of these various other things all add up and the more bank a person's got, the less time he has during the longer period. Do you follow that?

A rock can sit there without any recognition at all for a few trillennia, you see. Speed of recognition depends on how much time a person can actually have.

Present time for some people is a thousandth of a second and for some people as much as a second or two. And you can expand that out to about ten minutes, and then it becomes frightening. If your present time was to be expanded in this split second here – I mean you just – I snap my fingers, your present time was expanded to ten minutes, so that you knew everything that was going to happen in ten minutes. Do you realize you would be able to see the consequences of everything that was going to happen and correct it before it occurred.

Audience: Mm-mm.

You certainly would make no mistakes, would you?

So the number of mistakes a person makes is actually proportional to the amount of present time they have. Present time is a band. Present time is not a – an instantaneous instant.

And the saner a person is and the better they are and the freer they are – let me put it that way; let's forget this saner – but the freer they are, the more present time they've got. It gets pretty wild sometimes.
Somebody with ten minutes of present time, you see, he can unturn all the corners he shouldn't have turned before he turns them. But this guy who has got a thousandth of a second as his present time never foresees the difficulty of doing anything. He never foresees it. He does the most impulsive and stupid things you ever heard of.

You'll find him always driving up the side roads and backing out of those to get back onto the main highway – driving – always! See, he's just in a total confusion all the time, all the time, all the time. He never can foresee anything. There isn't any time to foresee anything.

Foresight is not really brightness, but PT. There's nothing beats looking. You can be pretty smart and think your way out of things, but nothing beats looking your way out of things.

Of course, if you were able to foretell the future for a thousand years with complete accuracy, your first thought is that you would be bored stiff. Well, I don't know. How did you have to have excitement that way – whereby you have excitement only because you're stupid? That's quite interesting, isn't it?

Anyway, this basically gives you a very fast index on pcs. I didn't mean to talk about it so long. It gives you a very fast index on pcs, co-audit members, and so forth. It gives you very, very easily assembled groups and so forth.

Not necessarily dependent upon APAs and OCAs and that sort of thing, you see. Not necessarily dependent upon their intelligence and that sort of thing. But the amount of time it takes them to recognize something.

And you could almost break down your group in advance into when they would get their goal found. Do you see how you could do this? It's by measuring how much time is required to find out something is there. And this is useful in numerous ways. It's meter useful.

Put something in front of somebody and wait for a ping on the meter. Yeah, that's the most direct index I know of. You put a little red light or a statue of a snake or something like that on the desk in front of them – put it down with a thud and look at your meter. It'll finally register. But on some people, when you put it down, they register it instantly. You don't even have time to look back to your E-Meter. The thing has been recognized. You got the idea?

Well, the length of time it takes them to absorb auditing information would be the length of time it would take them to be reliable. There is some coordination between these two points. You shouldn't be too – don't yourself be stupid in classifying these people or in pairing them up. And you should pair up comparable recognition periods, if you want to call it that, rather than comparable social interests or comparable ages or something like that. It has nothing to do with it. It's comparable recognition period. And these two people in a co-audit will be fairly satisfied with each other.

It will seem reasonable to both of them, and if you've got somebody who's got a ten-minute recognition period or something like that, and you put them with somebody with a ten-minute recognition period, the other person will sit there quite happily. He knows how long it takes and understands.
But you mix up a tenth of a second recognition period with a ten-minute recognition period and they'll both drive each other batty.

Now methods, I haven't even explored, actually, many methods of determining, actually, what the recognition period is or anything like that, but such methods could easily be developed and easily be used for dividing up and separating and putting together co-audits that would be highly successful because your co-audit will break down on the basis that some member thinks the other members are stupid. And if you keep them segregated at comparable levels of recognition, they're not going to get this.

_Audience: Mmmm._

Now, all of that is in technical lines, but how much should you teach these people in a co-audit? Well, I'd just irrationally demand perfection out of them. I wouldn't cut back my sights. Never make a practice of tolerating bad auditing. I don't care who's doing it. And you demand this out of them, you'd be amazed how closely they will approach it.

Of course, it'll probably be utterly hopeless when you were ten feet away at first and then they'll let you be fifty feet away, see. They're okay as long as you're there. And then because you're running the group, they will be all right. I wouldn't count on them ever taking any vast responsibility for cases individually, don't you see, because they the ... But they work all right as long as somebody will take some of the responsibility for it. And you'll find out they work fine that way.

You'll find out in any co-audit the amount of gain in the co-audit is to some degree proportional to the amount of responsibility which the Instructor of that co-audit is taking for those people. And if he's taking very little responsibility, you'll have very little gain.

Regardless of what process they're running – people always come around asking me for a process. Well, there's thousands of processes. You, an old Scientologist, could sit there and dream up auditing processes day and night. They'd have – all have some workability. But you haven't got to waste any time on this co-audit by dreaming up processes of this and that. You have a present time problem process which is independent of O/W and responsibility.

You have "problem of comparable magnitude" going back even further so as you don't have to get too much into O/W in exchanging these terrible confidences that they don't want to. You can dodge these things to a very marked degree. You can set this thing up to run quite successfully. But your best bet is to just put them right on the project they're supposed to be on. They're there to list goals and list items.

Well, God help 'em, they'd better be studying or listing goals – doing something, or prepchecking goals lists or doing something analogous to a goals list right up to the time when they get their goal found, you see, till a person's goal is found.

In other words, put them on quite real actions. Start them out on a Prepcheck. You always got two or three in a group you've had something to do with. And you cleaned them up to a large extent yourself. Start in with them and get them with a goals list so their goals list is prepared. Start the others in with a Prepcheck type of action. That would be enough for staggering. Then really keep them – keep them quite germane to getting the – getting the goals list all straightened up and squared away, you know.
Spend lots of co-audit time on the actual fact. And don't try to dream up side panels just to keep them busy. Because if you've got to keep them busy, you can always give them something to study that would advance their skill.

And if you're up against keeping people busy, aside from swamping up their present time problem, and you – they've got everything else done and they're just on wait, make them study. You see? Make them study listing. They'd study that with considerable enthusiasm. You get what I mean? See, try not to occupy people's time because people have to be kept busy. But try to utilize the time available to you in that co-audit. Try to utilize that time in the most productive, possible way that's contributive to the situation.

Now, I don't know how many co-audit people could be handled by one auditor. I think one auditor handling it, it would get fairly lonesome. I'd hate to be in that position because I've been in it for years, see.

It's not a very tenable position. You got no datum of comparable magnitude. You're always on parade, you see. You never take your boots off in the barracks, you know. It's harder on you than you – than you would think. And many field auditors just practically go out through the bottom just because they're all by themselves. It's – they get lonesome. They got nobody to talk to about this. They're always explaining, always teaching, you know, and there's – there'll be something missing in their vicinity.

Now, as you see, a co-audit in a Central Organization could be organized also along these lines. There's no reason why a Central Organization shouldn't run such a group of its own in its immediate vicinity. But its group certainly would have nothing to do with whether or not such a co-audit group was running elsewhere.

Now, we speak of whether or not a group so running should be a franchise holder or a city office or something of this sort.

For a long time, I've been trying to decide this myself. In actual fact, we're moving up toward a better proposition as a city office. A franchise holder doesn't feel like he belongs as much as he should. There are many things that are a little bit haywire with this and actually, these characters are holding an outpost, don't you see, of some kind or another. They're holding an exact point of reference and if that point of reference isn't firmly on the map, they to that degree are being scanted.

Because they move around and fold up and pass on and that sort of thing, it has sometimes been difficult to maintain a center of control. I mean not control the point, but the point's control of the environment. The operation ebbs and flows to too great an extent. But I expect a greater stability will occur in the future and I expect to see franchises more or less turning into city offices. Had very little to do with income – it has a tremendous amount to do with the influence in the area and the erection and maintenance of a worldwide communication channel. You'll find out that your communication channel falls off to the degree that the person is outside the organization and comes up to the degree that the person feels he is inside the organization. You understand, that's just feels. See? It's quite amazing – quite amazing the difference this makes.
And what I'm looking forward to is that every such area and held down of course, is simply a city office. It's a perfectly official office.

People walk in there, if they don't and it's in communication with everything else and it gets itself in trouble, and it's got somebody to scream to and then the persons there don't feel that this is an outsider, you see. They feel well, that's one of the gang. We've got to pitch in and help, don't you see.

Any way we could promote this, I would be very happy to do so.

But we're advancing now toward a necessity to make everything neat – as neat as possible, because it's going to blow up anyway. I'm a great believer in blowing up neatly, you see.

For years now in Central Organization design and communication line design, I have tried to make those lines expandable, and yet I find out any time a Central Organization doubles its business, its lines blow up.

And what you really do is try to make the lines as expandable as you can and then be an expert in putting it back together again. Do you get that, see? And then you're smart. That's a very smart measure to take. Then you're not always dismayed because it somewhat fell apart.

For instance, I know that in every Central Organization the body line between the D of P and the Registrar must be put in every three months. See? I'm an expert now in patching that line up. I'm willing to be reasonable and talk to them about it and give them all kinds of unreasonable answers. You see, I work hard at this. All right. That line – because the public impinges against it totally – blows up every three months in every Central Organization in the world. All right. So it does.

Well, I used to knock my brains out and be very unhappy about it all the time because it fell apart. And now I've realized that it's perfectly all right for it to fall apart because I can always put it together again. Get the idea?

Well, any time increased traffic hits a network of communication lines, you can expect the seams to open and the water to pour in here and there – no matter how carefully you planned it. And if you're so sold on perfection that you go out and commit suicide because your plan wasn't perfect every time, so help me, you don't get much accomplished. You're just picking up new bodies all the time, you know.

But the point I'm trying to make is, is you start throwing sixty Clears, fifty Clears, thirty Clears into this community and that community inside of a year: well, we haven't got enough telexes, we haven't got enough personnel, we haven't enough administration, we haven't enough file cabinets, we haven't enough printed books. You understand?

Well, we're walking into this in that full realization. Just go ahead and realize it. And then realize that we can still put it back together again. You understand?

And it'll look a lot better to you. Because the second you start putting this much traffic and this much strain on your own communication lines, remember, you're putting an equal amount of strain, which actually is multiplied for various reasons on the public at large, and
they're not organized at all. They go into a total confusion, they hit your lines, they blow up, and any patch you've put on blows off at that moment, you see, and it's pretty bad.

You must be skilled in putting something together. Not skilled in holding the same old line together, see. You see your lines gone, well, don't waste your time and energy and sweat in screaming and saying how terrible this is. Just be an expert at putting the line there again.

You see it's gone: put it back. Don't scream at me and say "Do you realize that for four months there has been no HCO Secretary in Chicago." You know, like a what do you mean? Isn't – wha – what – what's the matter with you, see. I mean what are you doing that for?

Why don't you send me a cable and say, "I just found there's no HCO Secretary in Chicago and Janet Woods would be fine for the post. Is she appointed?" See? That's much more effective. Then all I have to do, I don't have to wade through the scream, you see. All I have to do is say okay. You see.

And all of a sudden you've got that area in order again or it's being put in order. Do you get how this is?

Well, you're not in a position of holding the world together. So you might as well get used to the idea of putting it together.

So any co-audit or Central Organization entering in on a clearing program should design it so that it'll operate perfectly – without a single hitch. Please do. And get the exact people on the post that should be on post. And get the exact files that should be there exactly filed and in place. Just plan it down to a – to a split hair and then put it all back together again the second it blows up. See?

Because you never do an expansion or a forward action of this character without coming apart at the seams. The public sees to that.

Now, you hold the fort with time, with good regulations, with discipline, by not compromising, by not throwing everything out of line, just because one person goes out of line. You hold it together and you realize that world clearing is on a basis of "you somehow make it." It isn't a planned juggernaut that rolls on smoothly down the highway. Look, there isn't even a road there. And until recently, hasn't even been a vehicle. So if you start bumping and so forth, look down and you'll find out you're going over tree trunks – don't scream, just make a better road. You got it?

No, it's something you do off the cuff. You follow policy as far as you can. You put it together the way it should be as best you can. And then you make it work. And as the thing goes all out of size and so forth, and you've got the city council also in the co-audit, suddenly, don't blink longer than is necessary to hand them the enrollment cards.

Go ahead and do whatever you can. But don't do this. Don't scant technology.

Don't fail to deliver the goods when you promise it. And don't fail to turn out Clears.

Those are the only mistakes you can't make. You can't make those mistakes.

See, you can make any God's quantity of mistakes and the world will forgive you. Okay?
Well, I didn't mean to preachify at the end, but this is the first word I've given you on world clearing, and it's quite important in actual fact and I think you, particularly, that are gathered here this evening, will find it quite exciting.

Thank you very much.
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LRH: Okay. There you go. A little bit forward please. Thank you. Now, what's going to happen here is very elementary. I'm going to put in the beginning rudiments, if we can get them in. And going to do a Dynamic Assessment, and you should realize in doing this that there is no standard drill for Dynamic Assessment at this time. It'll probably get most awfully patterned later on, but now it isn't.

Pick up the cans, would you, so I can see what this is all about here. Okay. You're sitting on... Give them a squeeze. Thank you. All right. Thank you.

Now, all we're going to do is just put in the rudiments, take the body of the session, I'm going to do a Dynamic Assessment...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... and then I'm going to, if time permits, list...

PC: Yes.

LRH: ... the – a few goals. And then if time permits we will tiger drill the goals, okay?

PC: Yes, fine.

LRH: That's all if time permits.

PC: Yes.

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

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, here it is.

LRH: Start of session.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. Session started for you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: Well, to get the dynamic assessed.

LRH: Right. Another goal?

PC: And to list some goals.

LRH: All right.

PC: To not be shy in this matter.

LRH: Good. All right. Got it.

PC: And to help you all I can, help me.

LRH: All right. Very good. That do?

PC: That will do.

LRH: All right. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: Yes, to, um – clarify uh – clarify my doingness in the future, for myself.

LRH: Right.

PC: That will do.
LRH: All right, very good. Are you – am I missing a withhold right there at that point?

PC: No, no, no, no.

LRH: All right, very good. You're not holding something back?

PC: No, no, I was just thinking that this is just one session, so that that would do for life or livingness.

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you very much. Okay. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Okay. A bit of a prior read, there. Have any thought on this?

PC: No. I just wondered how the needle would react to this question, just scanning over to see if there's any difficulties I wouldn't be prepared to talk to you here and now.

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check it again. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Okay, there's just the tiniest tick on that.

PC: Well I was hoping that the difficulties of – uh – marital difficulties and so on wouldn't necessarily have to come up and be flogged out here.

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you. Very good. Well, what is the answer to that then?

PC: Well, that despite that, I am still willing to talk to you about my difficulties.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Okay. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, unfortunately, it is still falling slightly. There it is.

PC: Well, that – oh that's a – um – a nervousness that – uh – sort of stage fright I...

LRH: Oh really.

PC: ...experience, but I'm having to talk to you about it, obviously, now.

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yep.

LRH: Good enough. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? All right. Well – mind if I check it again?

PC: No!

LRH: Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Now, do you have an ARC break on this question? There is what it is.

PC: Well, what immediately comes to mind is there shouldn't be any doubt on the subject that I'm willing to talk to you about my difficulties.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now let me check it. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. Thank you. All right. I audited you so long ago that I'm just going to skip that part of the question.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. And I'm going to ask you straightly, do you have a present time problem? And do you?
PC: No. Not as far as I know.

LRH: All right. Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right, very good. Well we got over that hump. Well, the reason I say we got over that hump is mostly because on a Dynamic Assessment of this particular character, person knows one's coming up, if he knows what it is, he's liable to start getting a dirty needle early.

PC: I see, yea.

LRH: Now, right now I'm not even vaguely upset if you have a dirty needle or if you had any kind of a needle, so don't worry about that for a second. If the needle doesn't go dirty, I'll start worrying!

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Now, I'm going to take several dynamics here, and I'm just going to run them off in line. ...

If you'll excuse me here for rolling this down. I'm rolling it down for you, personal, in particular.

PC: Yep.

LRH: I'm making up a dynamic list. ...

All right, we got it here. That's fine. Now, I'm just going to take these dynamics, and I'm going down the line of these dynamics, and I'm going to turn me on a dirty needle if I can.

PC: All right.

LRH: And what I'm going to ask you to do, is just, when I ask you to consider something, why just consider it. In other words, I – I'm not asking you to do anything with it particularly, you – just consider it.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right. And the first one, I'm going to ask you to consider yourself. All right, good enough. Thank you.

Now, consider sex. Okay. Consider sex. All right. Thank you. All right. That one's out.

All right, consider family. All right. Consider family. Okay. There. There. There is our first dirty needle. Thank you very much. So, that one's an R/S. Thank you.

All right, you feeling at ease?

PC: Yes, quite at ease. May I scratch my face?

LRH: You sure may.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. We got one to go on. See if we can get some more here.

All right. Consider groups. Consider groups. Doesn't – out. That's out.

All right. Consider people. All right. Consider mankind. Consider mankind. Mankind. Well, it's almost. Almost. I'm going to put it down as such, anyhow. It won't do us any harm. If it isn't it, it'll fall out. [-0° 10']

All right. Now consider living things. Living things. Yup. Thank you. All right, that's out.

Now, consider the physical universe. The physical universe. All right, thank – ah. What did you think of just then?

PC: Well, first of all I had a – sort of got the idea of the planet, and then I sud-
suddenly realized that the stars were also included, and I sort of flipped out to consider them as well.

**LRH:** Well, we're going to add that one in, since I got a momentary one.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** All right. And now, consider forms. Forms. Consider forms. Okay. Consider forms. Well, that's a little, tiny one and just to make sure, we'll put that one down, all right?

Now, consider spirits. That's my boy! How nice. Thank you. Nice rock slam on that. Okay?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. Now, consider God. All right. Good. Consider God. Well, there - there's been enough here to warrant putting it down, but I'm not going to worry about it particularly, I'm going to put it down.

Now, consider religion. Religion. Now, that's all there is to that. That's out.

Okay. Now, let's go over these things again and see what we've got here. By the way, you're very easy to do a Dynamic Assessment on. It's a – it's quite interesting. Most of the time you get a little dirty needle and you have to make it bigger and smaller and…

**PC:** Um-hm.

**LRH:** ... and go over it and over it and over it, but yours is right on the button.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** All right. Now, this is almost textbook! All right. Now, we're going over this again. Okay?

Consider family. Consider family. Consider family. All right. Once more. Consider family. Man, that is… Well, there's just a hint of it left. So I'll say there's a tiny R/S there. Ah, it's just a hint, just a little bit dirty at the end. So we'll leave it in.

All right. Now, consider mankind. Consider mankind. That does a little dance. Tiny little bit, not hardly anything to bother with. A little bit better than family now, so we'll put down a tiny R/S.

And now, let's consider the physical universe. All right. Consider the physical universe. All right. Consider the physical universe. Man, that's the most microscopic…

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** … momentary one I ever saw. Probably anybody watching this thinks I'm looking for instant reads. I'm not looking for anything but whether or not we get anything, essentially. So you needn't worry about it here. That's why I ask you two or three times, just to see if I can keep it going, see? So we'll put down a tiny R/S there. I'm being much more particular. If you and me were just running an auditing session we would have had it by now. But we're going by the textbook. Okay?

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** All right, forms. Consider forms. Consider forms. Man, that's clean as a whistle. All right.

Now, consider spirits. Okay. Consider spirits. All right. I want to put in some middle rudiments here.

**PC:** All right.
LRH: If it's all right with you, right at this point. All right. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? I got a bang.

PC: That was when you said forms have gone out, I suppressed commenting, "Well that's one up on John," because he was running me something on form, when we were at HASI.

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you. All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Got another one?

PC: I suppressed commenting that – when you said you weren't going to do the withhold rudiment.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very, very good, thank you. All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. In this session, is there anything you have invalidated? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Good. You got any afterthought, there?

PC: No.

LRH: All right, thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Got a little bing there. Is there something you failed to reveal?

PC: Well, I failed to reveal what I was going to reveal had you asked me the withhold question.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very, very good. Now, let's see what we've got here. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Equivocal. In this session is there anything that you have failed to reveal? All right. Do you agree that's clean enough?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? I got a read.

PC: Well, I was careful to hold a cough when I wanted to.

LRH: All right, thank you. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Got another read.

PC: I've been careful to listen to you, put my attention onto you.

LRH: Very good, thank you. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Got another one.

PC: Well, careful to do the – to do the process – questions when you asked me. They seem too glib to me... I can't think of anything else.

LRH: All right, thank you very much. I'll check that here. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right. I've still got a bing here, of some kind or another. Well, it's still acting up.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: It's probably different. It's undoubtedly different than what you have said, but – there it is, right there. What is that? Bing.

PC: Careful to sit still?

LRH: Well, all right. Okay. All right, in this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, that's quite equivocal. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? You know, I'm – I'm getting something that looks like a read, here.
PC: All right. Um...

LRH: It's an anticipated read, but it's still a read.

PC: Well, I'm being very careful now to try and find out what it is I've been careful of it!

LRH: Well, all right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? And we get a read.

PC: Well, I was careful to ask you if I should scratch my face, before I did.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I was overcareful, I think.

LRH: Thank you. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Check that again. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Thank you. All right. Now, in this session, have I missed a withhold on you? I got a little bing.

PC: Yes. You missed a withhold then, when you asked me had you missed one on goals.

LRH: Hm-hm. [~0° 20']

PC: Um – it was to do – it had something to do with the – the go... it didn't seem very real to me to ask for goals for life or livingness in this session, just for one session, do you see? I mean, if I was sitting down for an intensive, well that would be fine. But, if one wants to achieve something in life you would set it – I would set it down as a session goal. Do you see? And a protracted period, well, then you probably would set one for life or livingness. So I think the question was a bit unreal.

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: All right?

LRH: Thank you. All right. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? I'll check it again. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? I've got a read. Something else now.

PC: Well, this has to do with the dirty needle. Um...

LRH: That was it.

PC: Well, it was to hope that I had a dirty needle. You wanted one, but – no – hope that I still had a dirty needle, in other words, for you.

LRH: All right.

PC: Now, I did withhold commenting when you said it was a nice – it was turning on nicely, that I was very – that was very – I was very pleased about that.

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you. Very good. All right, let me check this on the meter now.

PC: All right.

LRH: Oh, all right.
LRH: In this session have I missed a withhold on you? You agree that's cleaner than a wolf's tooth?

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let's carry on here, shall we?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right. Consider spirits. Good. Consider spirits. All right. Consider spirits. That's good enough. All right. I knew there was a rock slam there someplace and I certainly wasn't going to miss it. All right. It disappeared for a moment.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: It was big the first time I went across it on the first run and then it disappeared. So I decided I'd better get these middle rudiments in.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Okay? All right. I'm not instructing by putting in the R-factor, I'm just telling you.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Probably mystified why I would do that.

PC: No, I wasn't, I was – can I tell you what I thought?

LRH: What?

PC: I just thought it was very nice to be told what you were doing. It was...

LRH: Oh, yeah? All right.

PC: Yea.

LRH: Yeah. Well, we had a – we had a wide slam, you see. I actually thought because I suggested it was a wide slam to you, or something like that, why, I might have upset you.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right. Consider God. All right. Consider God. Well, we'll call it a tiny R/S. See what we can develop out of this.

All right. We have five tiny rock slams, here, now. Microscopic. Now, let's go over and see if we can really turn these things on, huh?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Consider family. Consider family. No, I can't call any part of that an R/S. So, she's out. Okay?

PC: Okay.

LRH: Now, consider mankind. Consider mankind. There we are. There's another R/S. Or are you – were you disturbed by anything, there?

PC: I was a bit.

LRH: What's that?

PC: I noticed you looked at the screen, outside, and um – over my – or looked at something over my shoulder, and I'd just noticed you'd done that. And I thought, "Oh, he's reading the meter," and then I found it difficult to get – to consider mankind.

LRH: Oh! All right. All right. I'm sorry.

PC: That's okay!

LRH: I was just wondering how well this camera was set up and I was trying to get the meter on the – on the dial.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Because I'm playing it way over here to the right.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: I'm sorry.

PC: Okay!
**LRH:** All right, we'll ask that one again. Consider mankind. Okay. Consider mankind. That tendency toward R/S. We're going to leave it in there, okay?

**PC:** *All right.*

**LRH:** All right. Now, consider the physical universe. Consider the physical universe. Okay. Consider the physical universe. Trying to find an R/S here. Had one there for a moment, but it wasn't sure of it. Consider the physical universe. There. I'm going to leave that one in.


Okay. Now consider God. Yeah. That's good enough; we still got one. There we are. We still got one. Very tiny, but we still got one. Okay?

**PC:** *Um-hm.*

**LRH:** All right. Now we're sitting here, with one, two, three, four still in. Okay?

**PC:** *All right.*

**LRH:** All right. Here we go. All right, consider mankind. Consider mankind. Okay. Consider mankind. Yes, yes. Still with us.

All right. Now, consider the physical universe. Consider the physical universe. That did a little dance, eventually. What were you thinking of just then?

**PC:** *Stars, and so on, I was getting...*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *... slight external view of the – of the planet – this planet, but ah...*

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Okay. Good enough. Consider the physical universe. Consider the physical universe. Consider the physical universe. There we are – onto something here.

**PC:** *Yea, I'll tell you something.*

**LRH:** What?

**PC:** *Well, I get the feeling, when you say consider the physical universe, I just all of a sudden I got the idea, well, Christ, yes, I'll consider the physical universe and – and it certainly wasn't from here!*

**LRH:** Oh, yea?

**PC:** *Uh – way – it seemed to be way back, and sort of, well, we'll consider this physical universe now!*

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** *As near as I can put it.*

**LRH:** Okay. Good enough. All right. Consider the physical universe. Yes. We've still got an R/S. Thank you.


Consider God. Consider God. Consider God. Consider God. Well, there might be some tendency toward that, so we'll leave it in. Okay?

**PC:** *Yeah.*

**LRH:** All right. We got rid of one that time, we're left with three.

**PC:** *Can I wipe my nose?*

**LRH:** Hm? You betcha!
... Okay. All right. Consider mankind. Okay. Consider mankind. Definitely still a rock slam. Okay?

Consider the physical universe. Okay. Consider the physical universe. That pumped for a minute. Consider the physical universe. There it is. It does a little tendency toward a dance. Not a real good rock slam, but we're going to leave it there. Okay?

And – consider God. Consider God. Consider God. Well, we're going to have to leave that one in, too.

All right. Now let's see what we've got. We've still got three. But, a couple of them pretty faint.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right. Consider mankind. Consider mankind. What you thinking of right then? Just considering mankind?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Thataboy! She's still with us. All right.

Consider the physical universe. Okay. Consider the physical universe. Oh, definitely. All right. She is still with us. Okay.

Now, consider God. Okay. Consider God. Very nice. Very nice. It's developing now. Easier to do this now, isn't it?

PC: Pardon?

LRH: Is it easier to consider these things, now?

PC: Yes, and I'm also sort of getting – find I'm getting selective on them. I – when I sat down here it didn't seem to matter, but now I sort of, uh – saying, well, I hope it's not that one – God, for example, now that we solved that one. That's the...

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: ... feeling there.

LRH: All right. Now, consider mankind. Consider mankind. I'm going to have to let that one go. Lost one!

Okay. Consider the physical universe. Okay. Consider the physical universe. Yes, this has got a tiny R/S tendency. There it is, yes. Yes, yes. There's something about it. Consider the physical universe. Yes, that one went right into a dance. What did you think of just then?

PC: Well, it just – it seems to me that you're presenting me with a choice, here, do you see. As if you're almost a salesman, do you see, black bag, and you sort of, "consider this universe, consider that universe, or consider this physical universe, what do you think of that?"

LRH: All right.

PC: A little tally!

LRH: All right. Okay. Good enough. All right. And consider God. Consider God. Well, that's out.

And that leaves us with the physical universe.

PC: Hm!

LRH: According to that.

PC: All right!

LRH: And now we're going to do – this isn't necessary. I'm just going to do a cross-check on this assessment now. Do you want to put your cans down for a moment and rest your hands?

PC: All right. Thank you.
LRH: ... All right. We will do a confirmatory run down this line, here, and see what we get now.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. On the other one, as far as we're concerned here, we've got the physical universe.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: As far as we're concerned. I won't monkey with that, any further. Not that there was anything wrong with it.

PC: No.

LRH: But, I just want to make awful sure.

PC: Good enough.

LRH: So we're going to do this one by overts.

PC: All right.

LRH: First thing we're going to do here is put in the session mid ruds.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Equivocal. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Equivocal. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, you think of something there?

PC: I noticed you just stumbled over the word "failed."

LRH: All right, very good. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. I can't make up my mind on that.

PC: Well, I failed to reveal at one time that my – I felt a bit cramped, here. My legs were cramped. But when you gave me the opportunity to put the cans down I put it right, but before then I sort of hadn't told you that.

LRH: All right, thank you. In this session is there anything you've failed to reveal? Okay, thank you. You haven't got any afterthought there, have you? That looked like a little bit of a slow.

PC: Oh, there's one or two comments I hadn't mentioned when you've been – you know, the things I've been doing when you've asked me to consider. I haven't – yes, I haven't revealed to you exactly the way I was considering these things.

LRH: All right, very good. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Thank you. That by the way, is – it's – it's all guesswork, more or less, when you – because your "failed to reveal" reads, of course, on the Dynamic Assessment.

PC: Yes, yes.

LRH: It's all muddied up – as far as that's concerned, particularly.

All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. There was a latent read on that – do you have anything to say, as an afterthought?

PC: No, I didn't think there's anything I've been careful of, there.

LRH: All right, very good. Just thought maybe there was something you wanted to say.

PC: No.

LRH: All right, very good. Now we're all set. Now we're going to go through this one with another curve.

PC: All right.

LRH: And that is with "overt against." I'm going to get you to think of overts against.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Now, I don't know whether it'd be "consider overts against," or "think of overts against," or "get the idea of overts against." Which one of those things seems right to you?

PC: Well, any of them I – I can do.

LRH: All right, then we'll use "consider."

PC: All right.

LRH: Okay. And here's the first one: Consider overts against self. Thank you, that is out. Okay.

Consider overts against sex. Okay, thank you. That is out.

All right. Consider overts against family. Okay. I'm going to mark it out. Okay.

Consider overts against groups. Well now, that's showing some tiny, little tendency, so we're going to leave that in just for fun. All right.

Now, consider overts against mankind. Yeah, that's got one of these. Thank you.

Consider overts against mankind. Yeah, that's got a tiny, little rising slam, I'm going to take it with us any-how. All right.

Consider overts against living things. All right. Consider overts against living things. It's enough little tick there to – I'll just make a note of it.

All right, now consider overts against the physical universe. All right. Consider overts against the physical universe. All right. Consider overts against the physical universe. Yeah. There's a – a little R/S turns on with that, very tiny. All right, and consider overts against forms. Okay. Consider overts against forms. Now, we're definitely going to leave that one in.

Now, consider overts against spirits. All right. Okay. Consider overts against spirits. Well, there's enough of an R/S factor here, a shake on that, to keep it in. With a question mark.

Now, consider overts against God. Okay. Consider overts against God. We got one R/S out of it. Yes, yes. That's tiny, but still there.

All right. Consider overts against religion. Consider overts against religion. There's something there.

PC: I have to tell you something.

LRH: Yes, what was it?

PC: Form and religion seem to be associated in my mind there.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Two came up.

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right. Now, when you were considering overts, you were considering just the general idea of overts, weren't you?
PC: Well, I was considering – when you asked me, you see, I was considering what would be an overt against these things.

LRH: You're considering what would be?

PC: Yes. And to get the idea to consider ones, you see?

LRH: All right. Now listen, here's what I want you to do this time. And I'm going to change the question here slightly.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: I want you to consider you doing overts against...

PC: Um-hm. All right.

LRH: All right. Let's see what else we get here.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. I'll go down the list again. All right.

Consider you doing overts against self. Thank you, that's out.

Consider you doing overts against sex. Thank you, that's out.

Consider you doing overts against family. That's out. Okay.

Now, consider you doing overts against groups. Consider you doing overts against groups. There's an R/S. That's out. Okay. All right. That's enough to keep it in. And we got it already marked.

Now, consider you doing overts against mankind. That's out.

All right. Now, consider you doing overts against living things. Hm, tiny, little R/S, well leave it in there.

Consider you doing overts against the physical universe. Yes. Yeah, yeah – it's a little dance it does. Consider you doing overts against the physical universe. Yeah.

PC: Get a somatic under the heart on that one, too.

LRH: Oh, really? Pain?

PC: Mm-hmm.

LRH: Okay. Now, consider you doing overts against spirits. Consider you doing overts against spirits. All right, thank you. That is nicely out.

Now, consider you doing overts against God. You doing overts against God. Oh, there's just the faintest trace of something there. Consider you doing overts against God. I'm going to leave it in.

Consider you doing overts against religion. You doing overts against religion. Well, we'll leave it in.

All right. Consider – we'll go over them again here. We got quite a few in. Consider you doing overts against groups. Consider you doing overts against groups. Okay, that's out.

Consider you doing overts against living things. Well, there's enough to leave it in. Okay.

Now, consider you doing overts against the physical universe. Consider you doing overts against the physical universe. Yeah, there it is. Okay, consider you doing overts against the physical universe. Yeah – slightly dirty.

All right. Consider-consider you doing overts against forms. There it is, rock slam. All right.

Consider you doing overts against God. Yep, there it is.
All right. Consider you doing overts against religion. Naw. There's no rock slam anywhere along there, so that's out.

All right. We got living things, physical universe and forms and God. Now, let's see if we can sort this out a little bit further here. All right. Before we do this again, let's put in the middle rudiments, okay?

PC: Okay.

LRH: In this session is there anything you have suppressed? What was that?

PC: Suppressed? Um – a comment at one stage that uh – that – that's right, um – you were writing there, I looked there, and I was watching what you were doing, and you started giving me the next question, and I sort of looked up and caught you looking at me, and then I realized that I'd sort of come up there, and I thought, oh, you caught me then, or something. I suppressed pointing that out at the time.

LRH: All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Do you agree that's clean? All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Yes, what is it? There it is.

PC: Um, it's careful to – uh – when you get the idea – tell me to consider the – uh my doing an overt to these various dynamics, I-I'd been sort of mocking up something just to get – really get the idea. And then once, I sort of got the command and I didn't actually get anything – any ideas at all. And, yet it reacted, you see. And I didn't feel that I hadn't done the command, somehow, but yet I felt – of course I was overdoing it, so in other words, I was being overcareful, do you see, to do the command.

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. All right. Now you don't have to do anything.

PC: Okay!

LRH: But just consider it.

PC: Fair enough.

LRH: All right, very good. Okay. In this session, is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. Here we go now. Here's our next one. Consider doing overts to living things. I couldn't call that a very healthy rock slam. That's out.

Okay. Consider doing overts to the physical universe. All right, let me check it again. Consider doing overts to the physical universe. All right. As far as I'm concerned that's now out.

Consider doing overts to forms. Okay. Consider doing overts to forms. All right, that's out.

Now, consider doing overts to God. Okay. Consider doing overts to God. All right. I'm going to revert to the last one, here.

Consider doing overts to forms. All right, very good.
Now, how are you considering doing overts to these things?

PC: Well, uh, I've now no set pattern. I'm just trying to get – get possibly how I'd feel if I was doing – doing overts, do you see? That I'm – do it, or sometimes I get a situation where I am doing – actually getting the feeling of doing something, like with the physical universe, bashing up planets, and so on.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: Or once or twice, one or two actual overts have sprung into view...

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: ...but uh – and sometimes it just leaves me cold, as it were, you know, I'm finding difficulty to even get the idea or to get the feeling of it.

LRH: Hm. Hm. All right. Thank you. All right, in this session is there anything I have failed to find out? In this session is there anything I have failed to find out? I don't see anything hot. All right, in this session is there anything I have failed to find out? Okay. That looks clean. Now, what I'm going to ask you to do this time is not do anything.

PC: All right.

LRH: I don't want you to do anything.

PC: Okay.

LRH: You see, I want you to remain calm, cool and collected, and you let me do all the work.

PC: All right.

LRH: Now, just don't do anything at all, and I'll grab this off, here, as we go by. All right. All right. Consider committing overts against self. Thank you. Consider committing overts against sex. Thank you. Consider committing overts against family. All right, going to leave that in. Consider committing overts against groups. All right, we're going to take that out. Consider committing overts against mankind. Okay, I'm going to take that out. And consider committing overts against living things. Okay, going to take that out. Now, consider committing – now what are you doing? Nothing?

PC: Nothing.

LRH: All right. Thank you. That's all – that's all – that's all I want to know. All right.

Consider committing overts against the physical universe. Okay. Consider committing overts against the physical universe. Okay. Consider committing overts against the physical universe. Okay. That's uneven so we're going to leave it in. All right. Consider committing overts against forms. All right, we're going to leave that in. Consider committing overts against spirits. All right, we're going to leave that in. Consider committing overts against God. Ah! Now, what did you think of when we got down to that point? Did you think of anything?

PC: I noticed that on spirits – I don't know whether it was between spirits and God – I suddenly got this pain in my heart again.

LRH: It's moving around, isn't it?

PC: I hadn't noticed that. I just noticed that I've...

LRH: Just right there in the heart?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right, thank you. Thank you very much. All right. Consider committing
overts against religion. All right, thank you.

Now, we're going over this lineup again. Consider committing overts against groups. Thank you. That is out. I beg your pardon. There, groups was out. Consider committing overts against family. All right, that's still in. Consider committing overts against the physical universe. Okay, we're taking that one out. Consider committing overts against forms. All right. Consider committing overts against forms. We're going to leave it in. This doesn't matter. And consider committing overts against spirits. Check that again. Consider committing overts against spirits. Consider committing overts against spirits. Yes, there's an R/S on there. Thank you. Now, consider committing overts against God. Consider committing overts against God. That's a rocky needle, if I ever saw one. Consider committing overts – it's not slamming, it's just uneven. Consider committing overts against God. Well, I can't find anything there to amount to anything. I'm going to take Him out.

Let's go back over this again, now. Consider committing overts against family. All right, we're now taking that out. Consider committing overts against forms. What were you thinking of, there, in the interim?

PC: Just aware of the somatics. I'm getting somatics now in the – in the – right across my shoulders, and the heart one is still there a bit.

LRH: Oh, all right. When did that turn on? After I said "family"?

PC: Family, the back somatic turned on.

LRH: And it's on, now?

PC: Still there a bit, yeah.

LRH: All right, thank you. Consider overts against family. All right. Thank you. Consider overts against forms. Consider overts against forms. All right. Consider overts against forms. Consider overts against forms. All right, thank you. I got nowhere here on that. All right. I'm going to take that one out. Now consider overts against spirits. Yes, there's our dirty needle. Consider overts against spirits. All right. Consider overts against spirits. Good. Consider you doing overts against spirits. Thank you.

Now, it might interest you, but I had this, with a large R/S on the first read.

PC: Mm-hmm.

LRH: Do you remember my telling you, well if you were – just you and I were doing this, we would knock off now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Well, I went ahead, and once you've flubbed it then you have to go on and on and on, don't you see?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Now, I wasn't satisfied with just the element itself, that we finally got out on the physical universe. I went over the thing again, and again, and we finally flattened down, and we come down to where the only R/S left is on spirits. Everything else is that.

We will proceed to check this out.

PC: Right.

LRH: We'll see if we can't turn on a beauty.

PC: Right.
LRH: See, as far as I'm concerned, that was my first conclusion, and then I went ahead and I proved it and proved it, and I was getting different things.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Notice? Each time I had – you know, I got the physical universe, I got – came on down to God, here, one time, it came on down to this and came down to that, but it's come back to the one which the old man by experience knows was...

PC: Yes.

LRH: ...that. It was a honey. It was a blaaa. Well, we haven't seen it since, see?

PC: Hm.

LRH: I'm going to ask you this somewhat embarrassing question.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: If I may.

PC: By all means.

LRH: I'm not going to necessarily ask you to reveal anything because of it.

PC: All right.

LRH: But, I am going to ask you: What have you done to spirits? Have you ever done anything to spirits?

PC: I – they're very unreal to me. I haven't much reality and I always am very skeptical of anybody talking about spiritual meetings and anything like that.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: When I was a boy, I attended a clairvoyant demonstration which didn't impress me at all.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: So, spirits seems to be stuck in my mind on that basis rather than the Scientology look at the word of "soul," and so on.

LRH: All right. Good. How about thetans? How about overts against thetans? Have you ever done anything to thetans?

PC: Well, I must have done a lot, but I can't think of any, particularly on that.

LRH: All right, good.

PC: Not – on – when you say thetans like that, I mean thetan – I'm trying to get the idea of thetans without bodies, do you see? Um...

LRH: Now, nobody asked you to do that.

PC: I know! Um, well I've certainly – yes, the best one I can get – I've certainly hurt lots of people's feelings...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... by um – well, many ways. But in this, um – thinking it over, this of course is one of the things I do try to avoid doing – hurting anybody's feelings. Um – at – um – it – it's a diff- it's my marital difficulty, what I come down to, is to – don't want to hurt their feelings, you see, I want to save their face, and so on. In that way it's the – it's a big overt with me.

LRH: Mm-hm. That's it. That's got a slam, here.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Think of hurting somebody's feelings. All right. That's too nebulous. Think of hurting my feelings.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Yeah. All right. All right. Think of hurting a girl's feelings. All right.
Now, let's see if we can't turn this up to a nice R/S, here. Hm?

PC:  *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Think of overts on spirits. Think of overts on spirits. Think of doing something to spirits. Think of doing something to spirits.

PC: *Bad auditing would be doing...*

LRH: All right.

PC:  *... an overt on...*

LRH: Good. All right. Think of doing something to spirits. There, you really did think of doing something to one, didn't you?

PC:  *Well, no, I missed it. There was something there about doing something. Then I sort of skated off there and was trying to get the idea of something but it's uh – it evaded me. I know there is something there, but I can't...*

LRH: It rock slammed, whatever it was.

PC:  *It seemed to be like gathering a lot of them together, or splitting them, like splitting the atom, or something.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC:  *Um.*

LRH: All right. What represents spirits to you?

PC:  *Uh – a symbol would be – would be steam.*

LRH: Steam?

PC:  *Steam, yeah.*

LRH: Good. Good, that's fine. All right, what else?

PC:  *A ghost.*

LRH: Thank you. Good. What else?

PC:  *A light.*

LRH: Good. What else would represent spirits?

PC:  *Um, a star.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC:  *And a sun.*

LRH: Good. What else would represent spirits?

PC:  *Um, Aladdin's lamp days – a bottle, with a-a bottle with the cork out.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Very good. Now, what else would represent spirits to you?

PC:  *Um – fairies.*

LRH: Okay. Good. What else would represent spirits to you?

PC:  *Young children.*

LRH: Okay. Good. What else would represent spirits to you?


LRH: Right. What else would represent spirits to you?

PC:  *A non-solid object, I want to say, is that I can't quite get... Um – a soul.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Good. What else would represent spirits to you?

PC:  *A white sheet.*

LRH: Okay. What else would represent spirits to you?

PC:  *I'm avoiding alcohol, though – keeps cropping up. That's uh...*

LRH: All right.

PC:  *A thought.*
LRH: Okay. All right. What else would represent spirits to you?

PC: A dream.

LRH: All right, thank you. All right, that's enough.

PC: All right.

LRH: Thank you... Thank you. All right. Let's see how we go here, all right? Okay.

Consider committing overts against steam.
All right, thank you. Consider committing overts against a ghost. Okay, thank you. Consider committing overts against light. Okay, thank you. Consider committing overts against a star. All right. Thank you. Consider committing overts against a sun. That's it, thank you. Consider committing overts against a bottle with the cork out. All right. Consider committing overts against a bottle with the cork out. All right, thank you. Consider committing overts against fairies. All right, thank you. Consider committing overts against young children. Thank you. Consider committing overts against haze. All right. Consider committing overts against haze. Consider committing overts against a soul. All right. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay, thank you. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. Thank you. Consider committing overts against a thought. Good, thank you. Consider committing overts against a dream. Consider committing overts against a dream. All right, thank you. All right, we've got several of them still in here. Let's go over them again, all right? Feel all right?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay. Are you in disagreement with this dynamic that we have dredged up?

PC: No, no, no, no, no.

LRH: You're not, are you?

PC: No, no, no, no, no.

LRH: All right, that's fine.

PC: No opinion on it at all.

LRH: Huh?

PC: No opinion.

LRH: All right.

PC: I'm very good...

LRH: Very good.

PC: ... at this stage.

LRH: Okay. All right. Consider committing overts against a ghost. Consider committing overts against a ghost. All right, thank you, that's out. Consider committing overts against a star. All right. Consider committing overts against a star. Consider committing overts against a star. Okay, that's out. Now, consider committing overts against a sun. Consider committing overts against a sun. Okay, thank you. Consider committing overts against a sun. Okay, that's out. Now, consider committing overts against a bottle with the cork out. Okay, thank you. Consider committing overts against a bottle with the cork out. Thank you, that is out. All right. Consider committing overts, consider commiti-. What are you thinking of? All right.

Consider committing overts against fairies. All right, that's in. Consider committing overts against young children.
Okay. Consider committing overts against young children. Okay. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. That's out. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. Overts against a soul. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. Overt against a soul. I think I'll leave that in. And consider committing overts against a white sheet. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. Okay, we'll leave that in. All right. Consider committing overts against a soul. That's it, that's in. Consider committing overts against a thought. Consider committing overts against a dream. Consider committing overts against a dream. All right, that's in. Okay. 

Now, we just got a few in here, now. Not very many. All right. Consider committing overts against fairies. Consider committing overts against fairies. Consider committing overts against fairies. Okay, that's out. Now, consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. Consider committing overts — consider committing overts against a soul. Yes, that's in — with an R/S. All right. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. Okay. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. All right. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. Consider committing overts against a white sheet. I'm taking that out. All right. Consider committing overts against a thought. Okay. And that is in. And consider committing overts against a dream. Okay. Consider committing overts against a dream. Okay, consider committing overts against a dream. Thank you, I'm taking that out. All right. Now, how are you doing, now? Huh?

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. Let's go at it again. There are very few left now. Let's see where we wound up. All right. Consider committing overts against a soul. Thank you. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. Cons-. 

PC: Excuse me. [coughs] Sorry.

LRH: Okay. Consider committing overts against a soul. Consider committing overts against a soul. Okay. Consider committing overts against a soul. You got to cough again? Don't you dare hold back those.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. All right, that's out. That was just coughs. Okay, consider committing overt — an overt against thought. Consider committing overts against thought. Consider committing overts against thought. Consider committing overts against thought.

All right. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed?

PC: Cough.

LRH: Is there — you still got one?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Okay, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Okay, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.
LRH: In this session, is there anything you have failed to reveal? Do you agree that's – what do you got? It isn't clean.

PC: No. Um – I – I failed to reveal to you that uh – the somatic had gone off or – had gone off I didn't notice when it went. And that uh – there was just a slight suggestion of it turning on again on one of these, I don't know which one it was.

LRH: Okay. All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes, still got one.

PC: Yes, there's something there. Oh! I failed to reveal to you that for one flash, I – my attention went down. I wondered what they were thinking of this downstairs. But it's only once, I think, during this session, but I didn't reveal it to you when it happened.

LRH: Thank you. Good enough. In this session is there anything you've failed to reveal? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Thank you. In this session, is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Thank you. All right. I'm going to have to replay the last two or three of these.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Now, consider committing an overt against a soul. Thank you. Consider committing an overt against a – a white sheet. Okay. Good enough. Consider committing an overt against a thought. All right. Okay, what did you just have there?

PC: I just – that I saw you smile, so I guess I thought that it must have been reacting for you.

LRH: All right. Okay. Consider committing an overt against a thought. Consider committing an overt against a thought. All right. Consider committing an overt against a thought. Okay. There's still a tiny suspicion of an R/S on there. All right. Consider committing an overt against a dream. Well, all right, thank you. Consider committing an overt against a dream. All right. Consider committing an overt against a thought. Yes. Consider committing an overt against a thought. Well, we've still got a questionable rock slam here. I've come up with it twice now. It's a thought. The only thing we've got left here. Overts against thoughts. What could you do to a thought?

PC: Hm – Could twist it.

LRH: All right.

PC: You could misduplicate it, you could, um – not retransmit it.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Make fun of it, you can ridicule it, you could uh...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: You could do lots of things to a thought!

LRH: Oh, you can, huh?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, good. Thank you. Well, think of committing overts against a thought. Think of committing overts against a thought. All right. Think of
committing overts against a thought.
Okay. As far as I'm concerned we've
missed the boat.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: We're not trying to look good, here.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: You have had very few rock slams,
they have turned on, and then they
have gone off, and this probably is
pretty rough being audited under these
conditions. But, I wonder if anything's
missing out of this goals list. And let's
you and I go over this. Put your cans
down and stretch yourself there for a
moment. See if there's anything miss-
ing, on – I said goals list – is there
anything missing on this list of dynam-
ics? There's self, right?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Name off the rest of them.

PC: *The dynamics?*

LRH: Any – not just the eight. Name off
what you think the dynamics are.

PC: *Yes. Okay. Well on self often get body.
Um – sex, family, children.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Uh – groups – yes, it describes it very
well. You could put tribes, nations,
countries.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And humans.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Uh – mankind.*

LRH: Okay.* Very good. Okay, anything
else?

* Editor's note: The tape changes side here. It is not
clear whether some part is missing or whether the pc

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Pick up the cans. We're go-
ing down this list again. All right.

All right. First we're going to put in our mid
ruds.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. In this session is there any-
thing you have suppressed? Okay, do
you agree that's clean?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: In this session is there anything you
have invalidated? What's that? There it
is.

PC: *Something to do with matter, energy,
space and time. I invalidated, then
when um – oh, I was assessed on dy-
namics once before and I seem to re-
member, he said, to the fifth and sixth
or something, I've got mixed up.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And there was just a fleeting invalida-
tion then. What I've done, I've pulled
into this session the invalidation that I
don't think I believed him, do you see
that?*

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you. All right. In
this session is there anything you have
invalidated? Got another one? There it
is. There it is.

PC: *Invalidated myself for not knowing the
uh – always read off the dynamics.*

LRH: All right. All right. In this session is
there anything you have invalidated?
Now that fell on something or other.
There it is.

---

just didn't want to add anything to the description of
the dynamics five to eight as used before in the ses-

---
PC: I invalidated a rudiment just then! Because you said is there anything I suppressed, and I had an answer. That I suppressed a curiosity as to the time.

LRH: Oh!

PC: Do you see? And you said it was clean, so I suppose I'd invalidated the rudiment.

LRH: Well, all right!

PC: In fact, this was a suppressed rudiment.

LRH: All right. Good. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? There's still a little click on here. There is another click, I should say. There it is.

PC: Hm, yeah.

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

PC: Thought?

LRH: There it is.

PC: Um – Heh! The uh – when you read out "fairies" I – I thought, well, I hope to God I don't get landed with having to do overts on fairies, or something!

LRH: All right. Okay. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, there's something there.

PC: I didn't reveal every time the somatic came on and off.

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: That's all it was.

LRH: Okay. All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: All right, very good. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Hm.

LRH: I better ask it again.

PC: All right.

LRH: In this session – in this session is there anything you have been careful of? Oh, that's clean. All right. You had a heartbeat, or – or a sneeze or something there.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: ... and then we're going to do the other list...

PC: Um-hm.
LRH: … and see what we got here. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Think of doing bad things to yourself. All right, thank you. Think of doing bad things to sex. Thank you. Think of doing bad things to your family. All right. Think of doing bad things to your family. Yes, that is definitely a little, tiny halt there. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. Okay. Think of doing bad things to groups. All right. We still got some reaction there. Now, think of doing bad things to people. Think of doing bad things to people. Okay, that's cool. All right. Think of doing bad things to mankind. All right, we're just going to forget that one at the moment. Now, think of doing bad things to living things. Okay, and that's in. And think of doing bad things to the physical universe. All right. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Now we have got an R/S – which agreed with our first assessment.

All right. Think of doing bad things to forms. All right, and that is in. And think of doing bad things to spirits. Okay, think of doing bad things to spirits. All right. Think of doing bad things to spirits. All right. Think of doing bad things to spirirts. Well. Think of doing bad things to spirits. All right. What did you just think of there?

PC: *Um – all I thought of, your – your attention was very much with me here, and that – I – for a minute I wondered how this was going on downstairs, again. And then I thought, well, then we're very much here, just you and I together.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. Okay. Think of doing bad things to God. Okay. Think of doing bad things to God. Thank you. Okay, now we have a few little R/Ses and I'm going to do it on this same thing again – see if we come up with the same answer we got the first time.

All right. Think of doing bad things to family. All right, thank you. Think of doing bad things to family. Thank you, that is out. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. Thank you, that is still with us. All right. Think of doing bad things to living things. Okay. Think of doing bad things to living things. Okay. Think of doing bad things to living things. All right, thank you. We're knocking that out. All right. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. All right. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. All right. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Okay. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Yes, there's an R/S still there. Okay. Think of doing bad things to forms. Think of doing bad things to forms. Think of doing bad things to forms. All right. Think of doing bad things to forms. I can't make it do anything so we're going to take that out. And that leaves us with groups and the physical universe.

All right. Now, do you feel all right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Good enough. Think of doing bad things to groups. Okay. Think of doing bad things to groups. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. Okay. Think of doing bad things to groups. Definitely have an agitation on that, so
we'll leave it in, okay. All right. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Okay. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. Okay. Think of doing bad things to the physical universe. All right. For my money, that's just a part of this life.

Okay. Think of doing bad things to groups. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. All right. Having a hard time turning a dirty needle on this. There's one. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. Think of doing bad things... to groups. All right. Think of doing bad things to groups. Okay. Think of doing bad things – think of doing bad things to groups. Think of doing bad things to groups. We got an R/S here, what is this?

PC: *Well, I've got a terrific somatic right around the – right around the chest, the front down here.*

LRH: The more we go into this.

PC: *The more – been just developing as you've been going on this one.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right. What represents groups to you?

PC: *People.*

LRH: Good. What else?

PC: *Scouts.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Scouts.*

LRH: Good. What represents groups to you?

PC: *School.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Business.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Scientology.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Uh...* 

LRH: Okay. What else? What represents...

PC: *Tribe.*

LRH: What?

PC: *A tribe. A nation.*

LRH: Mansion?

PC: *A nation.*

LRH: Nation.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: Sorry. You can put the cans down if you want and stretch yourself.


LRH: What?

PC: *Armies.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *Navies.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Bands. Bands of people, bands you know.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Gangs.*

LRH: All right. Okay, pick up the cans there. All right. What else represents groups?

PC: *Clusters.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Clusters.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you. What else represents groups?
PC:  Battle fleets.

LRH: What?

PC:  Battle fleets.

LRH: Okay.

PC:  Swarms.

LRH: Swarms. Okay. What else represents groups?

PC:  Crowds. Crowds of people.

LRH: Good.

PC:  Mobs.

LRH: Okay, good. Thank you.

PC:  Um – trades.

LRH: Trades?

PC:  Trades, yes.

LRH: Trades.

PC:  Um-hm.

LRH: Right. Okay. What else represents…

PC:  Professions.

LRH: Okay. What else represents groups?

PC:  Um – a badge.

LRH: Okay. What else represents groups?

PC:  A hammer.

LRH: Okay.

PC:  Oh, I got a withhold from you then, because I was going to say a hammer and sickle, I thought I'd better not! It's not the right place to say it.

LRH: All right.

PC:  Um.

LRH: Want to put it on the list?

PC:  It can go on the list

LRH: Hm?

PC:  It can go on the list.

LRH: All right.

PC:  If it's there, it's there. Um – uh – a flag, of course.

LRH: Okay.

PC:  And a banner.

LRH: Okay. All right. What else represents groups?

PC:  A leader.

LRH: Okay. What else represents groups?

PC:  Well, you've got a king.

LRH: Okay. What represents groups to you?

PC:  Well, a king represents a group to me.

LRH: All right.

PC:  Sorry!

LRH: No, I wasn't criticizing you!

PC:  No, no. Um...

LRH: What else represents groups?

PC:  Hm. A circle.

LRH: Okay. What else represents groups?

Thought of something there?

PC:  Well, I thought of a ring.

LRH: Hm?

PC:  A ring.

LRH: Do you want that in there?

PC:  Yes. A ring.

LRH: All right. What else represents groups? Something there.

PC:  A triangle.

LRH: Okay.

PC:  And, um – a set square, like – like a solid thing – I was looking at.
LRH: A set square?
PC: *Hmm. I think it's a set square. I don't know what it is they use, but something like that.*
LRH: All right. Thank you. What else represents groups to you?
PC: *A leather apron.*
LRH: Okay. Okay. What else represents groups to you? You had a thought there.
PC: *Language, I'd thought of just then, and a country.*
LRH: What, language is it?
PC: *Uh-huh.*
LRH: All right, what else represents groups? There.
PC: *Country.*
LRH: Okay. What else represents groups? There it is.
PC: *Prison.*
LRH: Prisons?
PC: *Um-hm.*
LRH: Okay. Thank you. What else represents groups?
PC: *A hospital.*
LRH: All right. Okay. What else represents groups? There's something. What is that?
PC: *A sword.*
LRH: Does that represent a group?
PC: *Don't know why, but uh – yes it does, it does, it represents a – uh ...*
LRH: Good.
PC: *...could do, I mean I thought of one that did represent a group.*
LRH: All right. What else represents a group?
PC: *A shield.*
LRH: Good. What else represents a group?
PC: *Um...*
LRH: There it is, what is it?
PC: *Um – signet ring.*
LRH: Okay. What else represents a group to you?
PC: *Um – a standard, if I had a – you know.*
LRH: A standard?
PC: *Yes, I mean a flag sta – type of standard, you see.*
LRH: All right. What else would?
PC: *A heraldic sign.*
LRH: All right.
PC: *No particular one.*
LRH: Good. What else represents a group? There's something.
PC: *I thought of a firework, then, but I – yes, a fi – ah, a rocket, it would be – a rocket.*
LRH: All right, very good. What else represents a group? Something there.
PC: *Hm, I just felt very sort of – I felt very hot but I don't – um, oh yes! Um – a fire!*
LRH: Okay. Okay. Now, what else represents a group?
PC: *A town.*
LRH: Okay. What else represents a group?
PC: *A city.*
LRH: All right. Now, how are you coming on this, now? It seem...

PC: All right.

LRH: …fairly complete as a list?

PC: I'm having to uh – struggle.

LRH: You see it fairly complete as a list.

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: Well, does it seem complete to you as a list? I'll ask you on the meter. Is this list complete? There's still something on it.

PC: A navy.

LRH: Okay, thank you.

PC: Had that once before.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: Um...

LRH: Something there.

PC: Well, the Marines, I'm thinking of.

LRH: Okay. Okay.

PC: A sphere.


PC: Well, a butcher.

LRH: A butcher.

PC: Hmm.

LRH: Okay, very good. All right, is this list complete? All right, let me ask that again.

PC: Hmm.

LRH: Is this list complete? There's still possibly a little bit more on it.

PC: Well, the various, um – trades, the masons, a mason, you see, would represent to me a group. An accountant, and um...

LRH: Can I put those down?

PC: Yes. Yes. And then...

LRH: All right. What else would represent a group to you? Something right there, what was that?

PC: A tanner.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Something...

LRH: Okay. Good-o.

PC: A soldier.

LRH: All right. Thank you. What else would represent a group to you? Got something on it. There we are. What did you just run into?

PC: Well, I've got this pain in my heart again.

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: And I seem to be – well, all right, this is what comes up, and I don't know why it does, an armada.

LRH: A what?

PC: An armada.

LRH: An armada. All right, thank you. What else would represent a group to you? There it is, what is that? There it is.

PC: Well, a knight, but that's not quite the – Christ! This – this is painful! Um – a barbarian.

LRH: Did you want a knight on there?

PC: A knight – and a barbarian is – seems to be more to the point.

LRH: All right. What else would represent a group?

PC: A black knight.
LRH: Okay. Okay. What else would represent a group to you?
PC: Um – a dagger.
LRH: Very good. Thank you. What else would represent a group to you?
PC: Can’t think of anything else.
LRH: You think that’s about it, huh?
PC: Yes.
LRH: What happened?
PC: I don't know, I suddenly came very clear, and the room is bright, and I just feel...
LRH: Your heart feel all right?
PC: That’s all right.
LRH: Well, all right. Okay. Here we go, now. Is this list complete? Looks so. Seem so to you?
PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Very good. Now, that list is ready to be nulled.
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: That list is ready to be nulled. And we haven't got time to do that.
PC: All right.
LRH: If it's all right with you – and so on. Well, how do you feel about group as a Dynamic Assessment?
PC: Well, that's okay, I think, and – and I've only just recalled this, that this is the – this was assessed out on me before when I wa – forget what they were doing with it then, but...
LRH: Oh, all right!
PC: I know I ran through a lot of the trades on that at the time, and it was on 3D Criss Cross, I suppose. Yes.
LRH: Oh, is that so?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: The Dynamic Assessment at 3D Criss Cross?
PC: Mmm.
LRH: Oh, and you've run...
PC: I've run terminals.
LRH: … items and terminals on it.
PC: That's right, yes.
LRH: Ah! Have you had trouble with the needle since?
PC: Well, it's the only time I've – I mean he was my last auditor – you're the only person who's audited me since then, so you tell me.
LRH: Oh, all right. Good enough. Good enough. Here we go. Here we go.
PC: No, it's been very interesting.
LRH: All right. End that much of that assessment? Untruth? Said something only to impress me? Or tried to damage anyone? All right, that’s…
Said something only to impress me? What was that? ... There.

PC: *Oh, that was asking if I could blow my nose, there, that was impressing you that I was a good preclear.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you! All right.

PC: *I wanted to blow my nose, but I know the asking if I can put the cans down and doing it was being a good preclear, you see.*

LRH: Okay, Reg. All right. In this session have you done anything only to impress me? All right. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? All right, there was a little reaction on that.

PC: **Tried not to damage anyone.**

LRH: How's that?

PC: *Well, I tried not to damage Jenny.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *I tried to... Oh! No, I – that's right, it turned on to what might have been a damage because I was quite happy with the assessment that Dick had done, on, whatever had happened on that occasion, and you said, oh, since then have you dirty nee – had a dirty needle, do you see? And which uh – so what I'd said might have damaged his reputation by having left something wrong, you see.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. Thank you, I got it. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? All right. I'm going to have to read that more carefully – In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Okay. You have a half – fall on "damage" for some peculiar reason. Thank you very much. You agree that's clean?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Hm? That all right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, very good. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: [chuckles] What was that?

PC: *I'd – once during the – during the session, I was aware of moving my finger a bit, and I hoped that it hadn't influenced the meter, but you weren't doing anything on the meter at the time, so I thought, well that doesn't matter.*

LRH: All right, very good. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Thank you. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Very good. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? All right, there's something on that.

PC: *Well, you've asked me lots of questions, and some of them I haven't answered you've been relying on the meter – that I personally haven't answered, I've assumed they'd been good on the meter, but apart from that the answer is, I haven't.*

LRH: Very good. All right. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Very good. In this session, have you decided anything? What was that? There. There. There.

PC: *Decided to cough? Once.*
LRH: There. What – what – decided to cough? All right, I'll check that. In this session, have you decided anything? Okay. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you very much. In this session, have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out about? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Did you expect the other rudiment there?

PC: *No, I wasn't expecting anything.

LRH: Thank you. In this session, is there anything that was misunderstood? In this session, is there anything that was misunderstood? Okay. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. In this session, was the room all right? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.

LRH: Very good. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, do that again, squeeze the cans. All right. What's your Hablingness command?

PC: *I think reach was the last you ran on me, reach or feel.

LRH: All right.

PC: *Uh – feel – uh – feel or touch, I mean.

LRH: Feel or touch?

PC: *Um-hm.

LRH: All right, put your cans down. All right. Touch the table. Thank you. Touch that sign. Thank you. Touch that ashtray. Thank you. Touch the can. Thank you. Touch the telephone. Thank you. Touch your jacket. Thank you. Touch the top of your head. Thank you. Touch the table. Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. That's much better. That was the last command.

Okay, you can put those cans down now. All right, in this session, have you made any part of your goals?

PC: *Uh...

LRH: Did it get dynamic assessed?

PC: *Well, we've done that.

LRH: Yes. List some goals?

PC: *Well, we've partly done – we've got – made some progress on that, certainly.

LRH: All right. Not be shy?

PC: *I don't think I was very shy.

LRH: All right. And, help you help me?

PC: *Yes, well I've done my best, perhaps too much at times.

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Now, any gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *Well, yes, I – the uh – I think I've blown one or two of these, um – somatics that I get occasionally on across the back.

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: *And so on, they seem to have gone.

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I certainly feel lots brighter than I did when I sat down to session.

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Plus there's always the gain of being audited by you.

LRH: Hm?
**PC:** There's always the gain of having a good session from you.

**LRH:** Oh, well, all right. Good thing I don't have to go back past the "impressed," but I'll accept that! All right, very good.


All right. Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?

**PC:** Well, I want to say thank you very much for a very good session.

**LRH:** All right, well you are quite welcome.

**PC:** Okay.

**LRH:** Here it is: End of session. Has the session ended for you?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

**PC:** You're no longer auditing me.

**LRH:** All right.
Well, I had a previous lecture engagement. That's why I'm just a little bit late. I have to keep the children posted on the adventures of the famous Sussex witch, Ermaltrude Godhelpus. [laughter] And I've just been... So if I happen to throw some spells out to the left or the right while giving this lecture, why, you'll know why.

All right. This is lecture one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And, what's the date?

_Audience:_ Sixteen August.


The subject of this lecture is Dynamic Assessments.

Now, we have made a slight improvement in processing lately. I hope you won't object too much to the change. [laughter] I hope so. Because I know that you don't like change ordinarily. I know this is a very bad thing, but I'm sorry that I had to introduce this change. It reduced finding a goal from two hundred hours to four hours or something like this. So that's the maximum on the minimum, see, the span and so on. So I hope you'll find it in your heart to tolerate the change. The motto of this is: If you can't beat it, join it, see? [laughter]

Ever since we've gotten into goals we have been assaulted by dirty needles, rock slams and other materials which have been very onerous and upsetting to the auditor. And finally, it occurred to me, belatedly, that this phenomenon might be utilizable. In another lecture I told you how it came about, but there's other mechanics connected with this and decided that we had better do Dynamic Assessments by Rock Slam.

By doing a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, if done properly, you have a possibility of finding a goal in four hours. And, if you don't – why, you've still got a possibility of finding it in eight, ten, fifteen, you see? It's a little bit different, isn't it? Well, that was the one point of holdup that I could see along the line of very broad clearing. This all comes out of a specific program – if you have fifty people in a group and you've got two Saint Hill graduates running the group or there are four or five Saint Hill graduates in a Central Organization and they're supposed to find all the goals of the people there in the group or as they walk in the front door, you can readily see that arithmetically, you would have to practice mitosis more than auditing. And if a Saint Hill graduate is merely going to supervise clearing and supervise listing and not do the listing themselves – they therefore could cope with this activity – pro-
viding they could find a goal in a small enough period of time. So that has been the target of
this.

Now, the most difficult goals to find were those goals of people who constantly dirty
needled and rock slammed. And this becomes relatively easy now – that's one of the easier
ones to spot. So the hardest to find becomes more or less the easiest to find.

Because some of these cool, calm, collect characters – you're going to have an awful
time trying to turn on a rock slam. And with the fellow who's already got one, that's fairly
easy – you've just got to find where it's located.

That this sort of thing pays off as far as listing and 3GA is concerned. 3GA is getting
into the swing – and now that – particularly that you're getting your meter drills down and
that the meter drills are being run very correctly, you're making hay. In fact the hay is flying
off the fork in all directions and gathering in the stacks. It's quite a remarkable proposition.

Since Monday of this week, two pcs have been listed to free needles in this unit. We
produced a second-goal Clear. And we found three goals on pcs that we were about to give up
on. Pretty good, huh? You can delete that-we weren't about to give up. But it was about to
become much rougher. Now, three goals and a second-goal Clear and two free needles. That's
since Monday. You think we're moving?

Audience: Yes.

Now, let me point out something. This is Saint Hill. You've got all kinds of talent sit-
ting around here. All kinds of know-how sitting around here. And if it doesn't know, I'll jump
them, you know. And you've got all that sort of thing. Well, you got to be good enough to run
all this on your own. See?

Now, you go off someplace and do a Dynamic Assessment and get a goal in some
fashion that winds up with the wrong goal ... I was standing the meter manufacturer's hair on
end today with the horrors of finding a wrong goal. It's horrible. Don't ever kid yourself.
You're used to running somebody on the wrong process for a while and it was all right. Man,
you run somebody on the wrong goal – and, oh brother! You see, all gods have two faces –
for every positive there's a negative. And just as you can phenomenally, fantastically increase
somebody's IQ and ability, so you can pull the floor out from underneath him – not the rug,
the floor, see – in almost that exact ratio. It is reparable. Actually, it is a little harder to make
him worse than make him better. And you can repair it. But remember, that it is a very rough
proposition – very, very rough. You see less of it, but you see enough of it to stand your hair
on end if you're keeping your eye open.

Somebody all of a sudden – his ears are about three and a half inches further back than
they have been normally and he looks about 29 years older than he has for a long time and so
forth. Well, somebody's just found the wrong goal of it and messed it up in general. And
somebody's perseveringly listing him in the wrong direction and out the bottom, don't you
see. Or he had a right goal, they didn't check it out and now they're trying to do something
else, and they're no longer listing on the right goal, see? And these things are quite catastro-
phic.
Now, the auditor's skill is tremendously challenged right from the first fundamentals of auditing. Not from any new – brand-new skill that you'll learn at Saint Hill. But the fundamentals of auditing are what are challenged. Can you hold a pc in-session? Can you keep him interested in his own case and talking to the auditor? See? How is your TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4? Well, it may have been good enough to security check somebody – but let me tell you that when the traffic starts to get some load, you know, and there's – the lines start loading up, those weak spots start blowing out. We almost released an auditor here. Well, I had quite – everything – was quite happy about this particular auditor, and all of a sudden this auditor ran into a rough spot. I mean, the pc just started blowing out at the edges – pc probably had the goal on the list and was very anxious and ARC breaky and so forth. And it just took that much more control – that much more good auditing. They had to look a lot more like an auditor and do a lot more like an auditor in that given situation, than they had ever dreamed that they would have to.

Well, all these things are consequent to having cracked the riddle. The riddle is the basic purpose of any given cycle. And the basic purpose of a man is the same, more or less, as the basic purpose of the universe. In other words, the universe has a basic purpose and so does a human being's reactive bank and difficulty have a purpose. It has a purpose – a basic purpose at the bottom of it which if dismayed causes all the rest of it to go to pieces.

All right, well, we have our hands on that. It's quite an important thing to have your hands on. Now, that it requires you to look more like an auditor and act more like an auditor and do more and better auditing, is almost incidental. We can measure up to that and we can do it if we recognize the necessity of it.

The pc's state of mind when he's coming up toward a goal – toward finding a goal, he wants his goal – is closer to the razor edge of ARC breaks than at any other time in his auditing career. When he was going nuts because his grandmother was about to divorce him or something, that had nothing to do with it. The nervous breakdown which he went through while working for the Lumbago Iron Works, that has nothing to do with it, you see. He really feels in a frantic state. He starts moving in on his goal and he gets close to it.

Well, I'll show you how far away from the goal the ARC break and upset commences. Actually when a student arrives here at Saint Hill, they start quivering in the direction toward their goal. [laughter] And actually, the longer they spend on rudiments and Havingness and Prepchecking and so forth, they "Ya – ya – ya – ya – ya! I got goals! See, I got goal." And they act more ARC breaky than a – than pcs would in an HGC any day of the week. You know? It's fantastic, the high mental tension. Well, that's just occasioned by this same thing. They're approaching – they know they're approaching solution, fait accompli, as far as their case is concerned and heh – heh – heh, it gives – it gives with nerves, it does.

All right. To accomplish this activity then, rapidly – to find the basic purpose rapidly – allowing a minimum of time in which the person – during auditing I'm speaking of, not during training – during auditing toward and directly toward his goal – the individual going in the direction of his goals should go there fairly rapidly. And this factor stood solidly in our road – is that the longer it took, the less likely it was. And, you can still write that down as a stable datum: The less time it takes to find the goal, the more certainly you will find it. Not the – not the reverse necessarily – if the goal is very easy to find, you'll find it quickly. If we put that
into a Russian translation machine, it would come out that way and that's the wrong way, you see. It's – the fact is, that the fact that it's found swiftly causes it to be found positively. The longer it takes to find a goal, the more difficult it is to locate.

So therefore, the demand was on a very sharp and certain process which would make it possible for the individual in the minimum length of time to find his goal. Now, this doesn't overthrow 3GA and, therefore, you haven't seen this under the heading of a new thing – like 3GDN or something like that, see? You haven't seen a new designation come out on this. And that's because, basically, you're doing all the steps of 3GA. And I want to hold that to your attention. It is much more difficult to find a goal on somebody who hasn't listed his goals. Because the whole bank will be charged up on the subject of goals, and you're not going to get more rock slam – you're just going to get more suppression.

So, for my money, it is highly desirable and I wouldn't want to tackle anybody who hadn't been prechecked so they could stay in-session – who hadn't listed 850 goals or so – I wouldn't want to tackle a Dynamic Assessment on that individual. Now, you could go to all sorts of shifts if you wanted to in the finding of somebody's goal, but those fundamentals still remain. We want a list. We want that – we want the bank discharged on the subject of his immediate goals. He's going to give you the solutions to all of his present time problems, don't you see – and you'll be falling all over these things, and so forth.

So let's just carry on as I've given you 3GA. And then let's turn around and not bother to null that 850 list. Let's cut right in through the dynamics and let's chase that rock slam right straight down and let's pick up the first available goal that we can get on the track. You'll find out that the goal will ordinarily be 1, 2 or 3 goals earlier and still be runnable – this is just a prediction – than if you had pulled it off the first list he gave you. In other words, we're undercutting a couple of GPMs. That's one of the tricks here that might go unnoticed. And yeah, you can find as many as two goals without turning off the rock slam and actually list them out and make the pc feel a bit better and everything is fine. A bit better – hell! Make him feel marvelous! And they still got the goal you would have found by Dynamic Assessment sitting there and it could have been available and grabbed by this system the first time you assessed them. That's worth observing.

Now, we'll know more about this in due course, with more data to hand.

But the method used then depends on having a pc who is sessionable, auditable, that is to say, and who's got a nice long goals list so that goals aren't too charged up. And then depends on the skill and meter reading of the auditor in doing Dynamic Assessments by Rock Slam.

Now, let me point out to you that we're doing ... This is right – all about Dynamic Assessments now – all right. Let me point out to you at first crack out of the box that this is not the same Dynamic Assessment that we have been doing – it is Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. Used to be change of characteristic. Well, that is good enough and ordinarily would lead you into a rock slam and undoubtedly would have value. And you'll find that many of your findings by rock slam concur with somebody else's findings by change of characteristic. As a matter of fact, you saw this happen in the demonstration last night in spite of the fact that it had been run. (Heaven help us!) Now that change of characteristic there was relatively val-
ueless because he wouldn't have found it again. So, frankly, by rock slam is a much more positive Dynamic Assessment.

Now, I maligned my poor pc last night when I said that – you notice I didn't use his list. Well, as a matter of fact, we probably will be using his list because I'm giving you a new expanded Dynamic Scale. And we'll take the dynamics and we'll expand it out, and it'll have maybe about twenty items on it. It'll have the main dynamic and some subdivisions.

Now, I learned this the hard way last night at about ten minutes of three. I don't have too much time to get my various research auditing in; and of course you're driving me very hard – you're walking all over my heels as a matter of fact. And, I – to be very factual and to be sure of my data – why, I've got to audit pretty fast and furious to get the thing squared away. And the session which I gave Reg last night, you heard me say it's not a textbook session, you know. You did hear that, didn't you?

Male voice: Uh – huh.

Well it's as much of a pilot session as anything else, you know. Of course I knew exactly, by theory, what I was looking for. But as far as what ramifications are introduced into doing this operation of dynamic, you know, and all written up in a nice schedule and beautifully packaged and all the warning signals all lying there – little flags pop up and hit you on the nose – these are not present in this activity. See, by theory it's dead easy, see. All you do is run down the rock slam and pull the goal that discharges the rock slam and you've got the guy's goal. See. That's all.

All right. But how do you do it? See, I've got you to worry about. See, I – it's not enough that I can sit down, you see, and audit, you see. I have to think about your auditing, too, you know. I'm going to get bowed down in an auditing chair – before I am – all these auditors on my back. Get downright round-shouldered. Because the truth of the matter is, is I don't have to – if you see, it would be relatively easy if all I had to do in auditing was just understand what I was doing and resolve the pc's case. See, this is dead simple, if you want to collide with it.

I've got to understand what I am doing in auditing – understand it much better, communicate it with a decent degree of clarity and then correct what everybody else didn't understand, see. This is an entirely added activity, so you don't wind up with a bunch of intuitives. And this is very hard on me, if you don't – if you don't mind my saying so. I'm not trying to act like the victim, but it cuts out my intuitive auditing. And, you know, I'm going to go all out of tune one of these days. You know?

I used to audit by intuition and what not on occasion, you know, and say, "Wow, what do you know, you know, I'll bet! Is it? Oh, it is! Oh, oh, well, ha – ha – haw." And there'd go the guy's case. You know? That kind of thing. But there wasn't any explaining it. See? All right. That is to say, intuition without language meant there must be a deficiency in my own understanding of it, if I couldn't communicate it. So everything I've been doing has to be analytically understood. It's all got to be up on the surface. It's all got to be communicable. None of these factors can exist in it; every one that does exist, why, other people get in trouble.
Long since I rather disabused myself of suddenly stepping up and saying, "Well, that's very easy – all I get it now, all you do is intuitivize and the pc gets well." And I've lost hope – people don't. Well, I don't know why this is. I haven't even bothered to explain it. But the other is successful. And so you take a successful route. And I will say this, because I have to articulate what I'm doing, I come to understand a lot more than I ever cared to find out about it. You get the idea? And I have to study it and understand it and make further advance on it than I'd originally thought I would. Do you get that bonus factor which keeps adding in all the time? Well, that of course catalyzes and drives forward the research. So far from being victimized by you, I'm of course considerably assisted by you. Because very often when you in the majority don't understand something well enough – well, I have to step back and say, "Hey, wait a minute, maybe it isn't understood," you know?

Somebody said the divine doubt was the beginning of all wisdom. It's very true. You know, Kipling – Kipling had that, "If" – When you can hold up your collar studs when all about you, you know, are losing theirs and blaming it on you.* Whatever that was. Anyway ...

Well, you know that there isn't anything to holding your nerve and course when everybody about you is doubting and blaming you – there isn't anything to this. There's a much more fantastic level of approach. If you can doubt yourself, too, while all about you are doubting you, and still carry through, why, you see – you'll be an auditor, my son. [laughter]

And I have to decide every once in a while that there's some part of this I don't know anything about. And whenever I decide that, why, you get a rather interesting advance into the situation because a new piece of understanding turns up, a new polka-dot piece of the puzzle suddenly shows up and so forth. I suddenly cease to think that you are all being very, very stupid, you see, and it suddenly dawns on me that I might be either uncommunicative or kind of dull myself. And at that moment, of course, I'll start looking hard.

When you've had as much trouble as you've had over the last year or so with dirty needles – we didn't follow through this particular course of action on Dynamic Assessments of me deciding that you were having an awful time and that I wasn't having this time and so forth. No, I decided I'd make it easier on all of us because I've run into dirty needles, too, see? I'm right in there with you. I've read them with a magnifying glass, and at great cost of eyesight and midnight oil. I have read dirty needles which finally turned out to be meter interference. [laughter]

And you needn't feel too bad about reading a meter because the manufacturer of the Mark IV, this afternoon, had to be furnished a magnifying glass and almost smash his nose on the front face of one of these things to realize that it had a considerable amount of noise in it. It was jittering like mad, a particular meter that I had up there. It was just whizzing at a great rate. And he thought it was dead still, even under a magnifying glass and everything – until I pointed it out to him and he finally said, "Well, yes, it is pumping, isn't it." But first he said, "Well, it's just smoothly rising." "No," I said, "that is jittering; there's noise on that." And I moved it over into the Set pattern over here and carefully moved it down so he could see exactly on both sides of the needle blade, gave him a big powerful magnifying glass and let him

---

* Editor's note: In this and the next paragraph LRH humorously alludes to Rudyard Kipling's poem "If".
look at it for a while. It took him the longest time to see that that needle was vibrating. It was very plain – you or I would have seen that it was vibrating by just glancing at the meter, see. Nothing wrong with his recognition; but it wasn't a trained recognition. He builds the things.

All right. Now, having this much trouble with a dirty needle brought about various other observations which brought about this fact – that we never really had much trouble with dirty needles till we had something to do with goals. Hmmm! Here's an interesting coordination. Never had any trouble with them, all of a sudden we start assessing for goals and we have trouble with them. Well, I decided we might as well look in this particular direction. I particularly learned what it was.

After all, a dirty needle is just a small rock slam and a small rock slam is what you get when you get a "Fail to reveal." And therefore, if a goal is a "Fail to reveal," why, it must underlie a big rock slam. And furthermore, if the goal is an overt against one or another dynamics, it of course, will react as a big overt, which is a rock slam. And all you have to do is find the dynamic it is an overt against – and then list the parts of the dynamic and find the rock slam on that and then list the goals and then find the goal that rock – that goes down the list and makes the rock slam cease and peter out. You just list goals until you got no rock slam or until the rock slam isn't riding there steadily. You can assess that goals list and having assessed it you will find the person's goal on it. Quite interesting, isn't it?

In other words, you're tracing a series of overts against a dynamic. And that's all you're tracing. And the person has those overts against that dynamic – not because he has overts against a dynamic – that isn't the genus of the goal. It's because accidentally what he postulated is particularly an overt against that dynamic. You must learn this very well. It is not an intentional fact that he's all messed up with that dynamic. Now, listen very carefully here. It's not an intentional fact.

Spiders, as far as he's concerned analytically, he can take them or leave them alone. He doesn't want to have anything to do with spiders and yet his goal, peculiarly, is aimed at the heart of all spiderdom. He does! He hates spiders and he – he mopes on the subject of spiders and he gets a big black eye and turns on a rash around his medulla oblongata every time he sees a spider, you know? And there's lots of physiological reaction to spiders and so forth. And this is very puzzling to him because in – when he first postulated this goal or basic purpose, he didn't have spiders particularly in mind. You see that?

But then by the structure of the dynamics, he actually can't postulate in this universe a goal or a basic purpose without trodding upon the toes of one or part of one dynamic. It is inevitable that if he acts in this universe he will act against something. No matter what else he benefits – no matter what else he intends – he's still going to act against something.

Now you can work this out. A fellow says, "I'm going to sit out here in the sun and enjoy myself." Now, let's take as innocuous a goal as that. This particular area that he sits down in happens to be a very attractive spot for bees to gather pollen. And after a few bees have crawled over him and stung him, he, of course, goes out and gets himself a can of "anti-insecti" and blows it about the place, in all innocence. Direct consequence of this goal, don't you see? Not necessarily an intended consequence, but a direct consequence of the goal, you see?
So he's going to lie in the sun and enjoy himself. Well, that's dandy. So he goes down to the beach – no bees down there – he goes down to the beach and the sand flies are all around the place. And they don't bother him so much – he hasn't got enough overts by this time really to be bothered – but they sure get over Junior. So he dusts Junior off with a good slug of DDT, don't you see? And every time he tries to lie in the sun and enjoy himself he gets all mucked up with insects.

He goes to a picnic. He lies down in the grass. The next thing you know his mouth gapes open and he's chewing on ants. [laughter] So he bites up a few ants and spits them out. You see?

And it just seems as he goes on down the track and the trillennia accumulate that he also seems to have been accumulating some native affinity based on the agreement of mutual hate with the insect kingdom. And he never intended to at all. He had no idea of any overt when he first formed up his basic postulate.

But that doesn't mean occasionally, late on the track particularly, when they formed up the overt they didn't have an overt in – I mean – when they formed up the basic postulate – that they didn't have an overt in mind. Sometimes, you see, no matter how innocent the goal is it will result in some overt – in a chain of overts. But the funny part of it also is, is many of the goals are just basic postulates which are overts per se – they just are overts, that's all.

"I am going – well, I can think of a good game to play! Ha-ha. Ah, I don't know, that was a good, good old planet, no – no worries about it anymore, they elected too many democratic presidents. Ah, billiard-balled – there it is. Oh, well, another – another cycle, another postulate. Well, let's see, what the devil should I do? I've been sitting here for a couple hundred years and it doesn't seem to me to be very productive. Game – I ought to be playing a game of some kind or another. What would be a good game? Well, somewhere in the universe there must be young girls. I'm sure. Well, let's play a game of messing up young girls. To mess up young girls – that ought to be pretty productive of a game."

The odd thing, the young girls have done nothing to him and he'd done nothing to young girls. He isn't solving any problem. There's no purpose or basic reason for it. It just seems to him that this would be a good game. And he's absolutely right. [laughter] So whether he intended an overt or didn't intend an overt or even if he particularly wished to avoid an overt – he's going to wind up with a chain of overts – inevitably. Particularly if he wished to avoid one.

I can see it now, you know. He's been hauled off looking at this smoking ruin that was the planet, you know. He's been sitting on this asteroid whizzing about this system and he, every once in a while, sees this smoking ruin down below there – debris is spread out, you know, and everything is sort of charred. And you go near it, you know, and you can still hear the radioactivity fry. In other words, somebody held an election one way or the other; and there's nothing doing back there. You know. There's just nothing. Nothing. That's it. And he goes whizzing around. And he said, "That was pretty grim, pretty grim, to be blown up by that." He's influenced to some slight degree this way although it isn't the immediate source of his postulate. He makes a brand-new postulate and he says, "Never to hurt anybody again!"
Oh brother! [laughter, laughs] Oh, brother! Man, has he had it! This is the sort of a life he leads. He doesn't want to hurt his wife so he doesn't tell her to use Listerine. So he divorces her. Inevitable cycle, you see. He doesn't want to hurt anybody's feelings. He doesn't want to hurt anybody or upset anybody anyway, at all. And he just seems to wind up clobbering them, you know. And he never quite understands how this is. He's the most puzzled man about the whole lot. Not-hurt he has mixed up with no-communicate, don't you see? And that's where he gets messed up.

Well, we're on particularly firm ground thus far. But it was quite a series of discoveries that led us into this very rapid Dynamic Assessment. Now, the Dynamic Assessment, of course, takes advantage of the fact that no matter what goal he dreamed up, it's going to have an overt on some channel. And that you can put down as a stable datum. Any goal will wind up eventually as an overt on some dynamic.

So, if this is the case it can be found if an E-Meter would register, directly, overts. And, yes, it does – an E-Meter can be made to register, directly, overts. And I found out what it was – it's the rock slam. The dirty needle, is the registry of an overt.

Now, let's take the stable datum and the confusion. The prior confusion must exist to hold a stable datum in place – not a stable datum, but to hold a fixed datum. To hold a problem in place you must have had a prior confusion, you know, this kind of thing. Similarly, you have to have a prior overt – it's the same mechanism, you understand. I say similarly – no, it's the same mechanism; I'm just stating it in different words. You got your confusion and then that's fired, followed by a fixed problem and decisions and so forth. But you've got this mechanism working here whereby your prior confusion – it'll be expressed as an overt or a series of overts followed by a withhold. And your overt is always prior to the withhold.

There isn't ever a withhold which will register on a meter that hasn't been preceded by an overt. Every withhold is preceded by an overt. This is just the geometry of the mind. This is as simple as the laws of gravity – you hold up a fork, you drop it, it falls to the ground. Every time there is a withhold earlier than the withhold there must have been an overt, otherwise the withhold won't be withheld. You get the idea? I mean, it's just the mechanics of this thing.

Now, any time you want to prove that a rock slam equals an overt, ask somebody for a withhold and watch the meter reaction. Watch very carefully. Take it – on a quite a few pcs if you're having trouble. And ask them for withholds. Withholds. Withholds. Something they failed to reveal. And if your metering is even vaguely anything – you know, you know which side of the E-Meter to look at – you'll see that little bzz-bzz-bzz needle back of those, person after person after person, see. So much so that when you're doing Tiger Drills, an experienced operator on the Tiger Drill sees the thing go dirty needle on him, you know, he sees it go bzz. It was – it was going "To be a tiger," bzz. "On this goal is there anything you failed to reveal?" See? Nothing else – why say anything else? You're not going to get anything else unless you get off the "Fail to reveal." Well, you could pull that. But every time you see this little tiny, tiny rock slam – it doesn't matter how big the rock slam is – you've got a "Fail to reveal" back of it. And the "Fail to reveal" – of course, withhold, in other terminology – must have been preceded by an overt.
Well, now, how is this character so hung up in a dynamic? Consider the dynamic he is hung up with as a withhold preceded by an overt, and you'll see exactly what that is, see? In other words, he's hung in something – it is actually quite heavy and massy what he gets hung in. But it's the same law is at – is at the bottom of this; that is, if the individual is hung in something it must have been preceded by an overt against that thing.

We see this entomologist come down and inspect the house for termites. And he has a flat head and he's got his hair combed in a certain way to look like antenna. Most marvelous thing, you know. He's got enough overts against termites that he's finally building his own body into a termite body, see. He's hung up in that valence. We call it a valence.

All right. Similarly, you go around to a lot of undertakers and, man, if they don't – if they don't resemble corpses! Ah, not bad looking corpses, you understand, they're all well preserved corpses. Very well preserved. And no matter what their basic goal was or what they would assess out on the dynamic – they'd probably assess out something else – you can see this mechanism in the current lifetime, you see? You see little shadows of this mechanism.

Now, it goes from just a slight think-think. We get the guy on the meter and we say to him, "Are you withholding anything?" And the needle goes bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz, a little tiny, tiny, tiny rock slam, dirty needle, rock slam, simultaneous meaning – similar meaning, same thing. So we get this little bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz. Now, we say, "Are you withholding anything? Are you not revealing something?" We don't care what it is, see.

And he eventually breaks down and he tells us, "Yes, I – I thought when you sat down in session that you were in need of a shave." And the thing clears up, boom.

We don't notice that he's given us two in one. See, he's given us the overt which clears the withhold. Get the idea? We can see that all the time. That's just on little thinks and that sort of thing, you know. He said, "I had an overt thought and that is what I am withholding." He'll give you this all in one scrambled package. You see? And we'll see that bzz-bzz-bzz disappear. There it is. Unless, of course, he's got some other bzz-bzz-bzz and he was withholding something else. But there that goes, don't you see – bow, gone. Isn't anything more to that.

All right. Now, how about the fellow that we say... This guy has really – has really been at it, you see. This guy has – every time we get a Coke, see, and we take a couple of swigs out of the Coke and set it down in order to make a phone call or something like that, it disappears, you know. We're just not ever able to finish a Coke. If we ever set a Coke down it vanishes. And this is a hanging mystery with us – is what happens to our Cokes. You see?

And we get this guy in session and we say to this fellow, "All right, is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz. And he says, "Well, I failed to reveal that you needed a shave. I thought that when I came into session."

And you say, "All right, thank you. Is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz. "Well, what was that?"

"Well, actually just before the session, why, I – I had a – well, I-I-I thought maybe – maybe your TR I wasn't so good."
And that disappears for a moment and we say, "Is there something you have failed to reveal?" And it says bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz. And we say, "All right, something else you've failed to reveal?"

And he says, "Well, yes – yes, there's something else I failed to reveal. I thought that you were a pretty poor auditor in the sessions you've been running lately. I've been looking at your pcs and they're all caving in – that's what I thought." And that clears up.

And we say, "Is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bzz.

What's happening here? What's going on?

This guy's got a God-awful overt, see. He's got repeated overts – actual overts, so, of course, the thing doesn't clean. And the little – little rock slam persists. And every time he even slightly withholds something or thinks something critical he keys in this big one. See? So it's all charged up from this.

We finally prepcheck day in and day out, week in and week out, sweating it over, wearing out the linoleum with CCHs, Prepchecking, sweating so; and finally one fine day we're particularly gifted and we happen to mention accidentally, "Have you ever stolen anything?" and the thing falls off the pin. Goes in to a big slam – acts up, slam disappears, the needle won't register on instant reads, nothing. This meter is sort of shorted. We test the leads. It still does it. "Ever stolen anything?" you know.

And all of a sudden he turns kind of a beet red and he says, "Oh-ho-ho, I did mean to tell you, the last month or so every time you, ho-ho-ho, had a Coca-Cola I hung around, ha-ha-ha – it was just a joke, you know, I mean – I picked it up before you could finish it."

And it cleans up and that is the end of it. And you have no more bzz-bzz-bzz, except when he has an immediate withhold. Then we get the bzz-bzz-bzz, and you say, "Is there something you failed to reveal?"

And he says, "Yes, I wanted to move my feet and I didn't."

And you say, "Thank you very much." And it's gone and it doesn't recur. You get that as an expanded mechanism here.

All right. Now, let's just expand it a little further, see. Every time we mentioned Papa he said, "Oh, my father actually did me in and my father has often done me in – as a matter of fact my father was a professional do-me-iner." [laughter] "He lived only for that purpose and he was very gifted."

And we find out he embezzled the old man's bank accounts and ripped the transmission out of the old man's car. And, we finally trace it back to using the old man's pipe habitually for making soap bubbles and then never telling him, always carefully wiping it off and putting it back on the rack, see. And we finally run this one out.

But all during that time we're getting a bzzzzz-bluow-blzzzz! All we do is mention his father, see. Bluzzzzzz-bzzz! We want to turn it on, all we'd have to say to him is one of two things. "Have you done anything to your father?" That would turn it on. Or just abandon doing anything to his father, say, "Get the idea of withholding something from your father."
See? Same mechanism is turned on by the two different sources. If he withholds he gets it. See? And if he thinks of overts against him, he'll get it. Either way. Either way you get the same rock slam!

Now, don't get the idea that the overt is a big one and the withhold is a little one or anything like that. They're just blood brothers. See, the same manifestation of different periods on the track. The overt is the commission and the withhold just parks it. That's all. And they register, then, as a dirty needle, a tiny rock slam, a big rock slam, a huge rock slam, a burned-out meter. The order of magnitude doesn't matter, you see. The mechanisms are all the same.

Now, there's another – now, let's look at that. There's another wider line, see. Let's not worry now about Father, let's worry about families. And what do you know, he hasn't – it isn't that he has made a habit every lifetime for several lifetimes of caving in the family. He – that isn't good enough, see. When we start bringing it over the level of families, we're bringing it across a cycle. In other words, it's fortunate for us that these withhold things run, the little light ones are a day or two or three. See? And then the next grade is almost an absolute, it's this lifetime. See? See? It's either a little period or a lifetime or a cycle. Get that? That's quite – quite interesting, you see. It's three grades. There aren't a whole bunch of intermediate grades and that you can be very thankful for. You'll occasionally see a trace of one and think you've got something, but don't worry about it because these three grades are dominant, as there's a rock slam for the cycle or several cycles, you see? It's a cycle magnitude, lifetime magnitude and very finite magnitude. It's days, you know – days, minutes, that sort of thing. After three or four days the guy – the thing the guy was withholding from you three or four days ago tends to key out. It isn't bothering him, see. And what the guy had withholds in, in a lifetime, key – tends to key out at death.

And then we've got the big great-grandpa of all. We've got those which occur as a result of having a basic purpose or basic postulate or goal which directly or inadvertently tremendously affects the family. Let's say the most natural thetan goal in the world – to be free. And then she marries this guy. And then a life goes on and she marries this guy. And, you know, and he marries her – and she, you know – the thetan as him, marries her and so on. And he always wants to be free, you see, and of course every time he frees himself, the family starves to death or something of the sort. And he comes back and they're all lying there – skeletons in the burned cabin. You know, this kind of thing. And this – this thing just is... See, basically, there doesn't seem to be any connection between these two things. But in all things, that one is the one key line. Fortunately it remains constant – it hasn't got lots of branches. Thank God a thetan is a specialist!

So, see – you see your various sizes of dynamics. Various sizes. You get this – main postulate will be about a dynamic or some major part of it, see? Your goal, see, is against a dynamic or some part of it. It just winds up that way. Or was directly that way. Or tried not to be that way. It'll always wind up this way. C'est la vie.

Now, the next – the next size is... You actually have postulates in ahead of these things, by the way, even on a lifetime basis, you see? Guy says, "In this lifetime I'm going to be good." Hasn't anything to do with his basic purpose, see. "I'm going to be good." His basic
purpose is to be free. But this lifetime he says, "I'm going to be good," see? Louses him up, you see, because it's not his basic purpose in life. But he tries to be good during all this lifetime. You can find this lifetime's leading goal – to be good. It won't do you a bit of good. If you ever try to run it, it will beef up the bank, bang!

Now, of these the only runnable things are the overts. The long-haul runnability is all overts. Overts are the main runnability. Withholds are simply the secondary manifestations of the overts. You can directly pull overts all away along the line and practically dispense with pulling withholds because, of course, as soon as they told you the overt it ceases to be a withhold.

Now, oddly enough, you can turn it around and for the purpose of rudiments you can just pull the withhold and it desensitizes the overt unless you've really put your foot in it. And most of the time you can get away with just asking for the withhold; you just ignore the overt. "Are you withholding something from me?" "Yes, I had a hostile thought." That might even be good enough to clean it. See? It might also leave you with a missed withhold occasionally. But you can pull it just on a withhold basis. You can ask for the withhold, you see, and ignore this overt until it gets too chronic – too messed up and then you're in a mess. Then you've got to ask for overts.

Hence, you have O/W which is a sneaky way of asking only for overts. And the only reason you ask for the W at all is to keep the flow balanced so the pc won't get caved in on nothing but outflow. Let him taste the inflow as well as the outflow and he can run it more easily and better and longer. That's really the reason why you have the W question in overt-withhold. See? That's "What have you withheld?" See?

Well, that's just to reverse the flow – not because you need to ask the question, see? In just the basic mechanics of the mind you don't have to ask the question at all. But for the basic mechanics of energy and stuck flows and the pc getting gummed up, you have to ask it, see? And the mechanics of auditing require that you ask it, but as far as aberratively – if you could just free all those without influencing flows in any way – of course you could just ask for overts. Don't you see?

So the mechanism, then, comes around to the fact that if you can pull the goal – the basic purpose of a human being – it pulls the whole overt line on his chronic targets. And thus wise go bzzzt and renders as nothing, all them overts. And the odd part of it is, you list it by items and he doesn't even count it off as overts in many cases. Smooth as that.

Now, also a person departing from his (quote) main goal line (unquote) is susceptible to alter-is, counter-postulate, resistance and all the kinds of other mechanics proceed from this particular action. And that he's unfaithful to himself when he disobeys that basic purpose is the main source of aberrative consequence.

But taking that – moving off into the mechanics of the thing, moving off into the energy phenomenon, mental energy phenomenon – all these various kinds of things. Why, the one thing that holds true through all these things is an overt chain. See, it was never intended to be an overt chain in most cases. But it became an overt chain and is therefore discoverable by the phenomena of rock slam. Now, you see this thing all knit together neatly now? You got it?
So all you have to do is find out which one rock slams the mostest and the most persistently to get the dynamic on which he has the most overts and trace that back. And it will wind you up with a very narrow perimeter – in which he can write down his basic postulates – a list of any one of which might be it. You assess out this hatful – very small number. You wind up with the guy's goal, merely because mechanically you have narrowed the field to such an extent.

Now, at the time you pick up this pc, he is wandering in a cloud. Pretty radioactive at that, see. He's in a cloud, he doesn't know whether he's coming or going. You ask him for his basic purpose and he says it's "to shell spikes, to build catfish, to remove universes from my path, to eat walnuts, to worship God, and to like myself." And in some cases, five thousand goals later, he will be going on with that type of list. In that it takes you one minute to null one goal you don't want them five thousand, nor even one thousand, long. It takes too many hours to null them.

So all this other work is very rapidly done and you come into the small perimeter where you maybe have a hundred or two goals, something on that order, at a guess, that you null by the Tiger Drill. The guy's goal falls out of the hat, the bank's all discharged, it lists like a breeze.

Now, the heavy work, the long work, becomes listing. And accurate listing and keeping the goal cleaned up and so forth. And you're sailing right straight toward Clear.

So with this mechanism and with having worked out this path – this tightrope walk – why, we've got a high road to Clear.

What we need is an auditor sufficiently skilled to do a Dynamic Assessment very exactly, very accurately – know a rock slam when he's looking at one.

But there's one thing that stays very greatly in our stead. You might not be able to read an instant read of one tick, but I defy you not to read a half-a-dial rock slam.

Thank you.
FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
21 August 1962

Audience: Hooray! Hooray! Hooray!
[Audience cheers enthusiastically.]
Thank you.

Ah, that's very good, that's very good. I thank you, my goal thanks you, my auditor thanks you.*

All right. Got some announcements here right off the bat; we're going to christen the new building as soon as I get back, but you are going to be using the chapel here in just a few days, as soon as they get a floor in it, why, you've got it. And we'll have a bit of a party when I come back and because we'll have some space we'll have some party there for that, now and then, on a weekend. And we've also got a canteen planned out there, small size and a few things to make life more livable for you. I am leaving Thursday on the Queen Elizabeth for America and I'll return here, be back here the seventeenth of September.

Now, I've given you an extra lecture so that your Thursday unit doesn't mess up. But actually you are only losing two weeks of lecture because one of them is blank anyway. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Is it all right with thee to do this?

Audience: Yes.

All right, thank you.

I always ask the kids is it okay if I go, you know, and they always think it over very carefully and tell me yes. [laughs]

* Editor's note: Assuming from this remark and the unusual cheering at the beginning of the audio recording, LRH has probably just before announced that his goal was found in auditing. This is confirmed by what LRH says on page 10 of this transcript.
All right. And the Washington congress goes off on Labor Day and so forth and I'll be saying hello for you and so forth and I'll tell them how good you are so it's up to you not to make a liar out of me. Okay? [laughter, laughs] All right.

Okay. We have some new students amongst us. Probably some of the older students are already telling the new students about the – they should have been here in the old days when... [laughter] You know, you know. I'll bet – I'll bet this has already occurred, "You think it's tough now, well, you ought to have been here last June." [laughter] I suppose this is already happening.

All right, we've got two lectures tonight – both of them are quite fundamental. The first lecture is the "Dynamic Assessment," the other one is the "Basics of Auditing." The other one, depending on how embracive the material is and that sort of thing, will be a lecture which you better take to heart because you will be using this very lecture in training students.

But this particular lecture, this first lecture, lecture number one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course – date?

Audience: 21st, 22nd.

Somebody says the 22nd, somebody says the 21st.

Audience: 21st.

Twenty-first, all right, thank you. Had me mixed up there for a minute. I was in two days. All right, the twenty-first September, October, December, what's the date?

Audience: August. 21st of August.

August, the 21st of August. All right, AD 12. Thank you very much.

The way I start my stories to the children, Saint Hill, England, planet Earth, solar system, this galaxy in this part of this universe, see. Once uponet a timet.

All right, Dynamic Assessment. Now, there has been a considerable advance made and I gave you the Tiger Drill. I told you at the time when I gave you the Tiger Drill that I really didn't much like releasing it. But you needed it, it's released. All right. Similarly, you've been walking on my heels with Dynamic Assessment. I've got the whole story here on Dynamic Assessment all the way down the line.

The first thing you should realize about this is that ordinary Routine 3GA, exactly as you have had it a week or so ago – a couple of weeks ago when I gave you the full rundown on the thing – that is totally valid, there is nothing wrong with it anywhere at all. The Tiger Drill can be a little bit improved by which you null the goals, but I'll give you that improvement in this lecture.

Now, but that's perfectly valid. You go out and you say to somebody, "Do 850 goals." You find the goals list is still charged. You ask him, "Who would oppose your goal?" you know, and get that four-way list and get, "What goal might you have?" as a separate list. And you just use all of these things and then you just start from goal one and you go on through and in a large majority of cases you'll find the pc's goal before you've hit the mark 500. Okay?
Providing you do a good job of nulling. You understand that's a perfectly valid procedure. That's in the can.

Now, another one is this: There is a fancy way of finding a goal and this fancy way is by Dynamic Assessment. And this will be done by a Class IV Auditor.

You could probably find a goal on anybody, even though he was riding 8,785 goal-type case, don't you see. I mean you could have him run goals and goals and goals and write goals and goals and the paper is accumulating. You use a small shopping cart, you know, coming back and forth from the auditing sessions in order to carry all the goals list, you know. Thing has to be put on IBM microfilm, you know, special projectors to read the stuff off; because otherwise, it would take up the space of the Library of Congress or something like that, you know.

Now, this character – the goal is almost impossible to find on him and that comprises a large percentage of the cases, about 25 percent. You are not going to find any goal on this character until you've gone out. So 3GA would find the goal on this pc. You understand that. But it is becoming uneconomical, see, in terms of time. And the difference between these two pcs is specifically and directly this: that the goal of the pc that is going to take you a long, long while, you see, in terms of hundreds of hours of auditing, to find on 25 percent of the cases is an overt – a direct overt-type goal. In other words it's an overt goal that is directly overt. You see.

And the other is an inadvertent overt goal. You get the idea? The inadvertent overt goal is very easy to find. But the one that is a direct overt goal is very difficult to find.

Now, you think that the wording of the goal is what makes the goal difficult to find. Let's take such a goal as "Not to be located," you see. And you offhand would say at once that this was the most difficult type of goal following Dianetic-phrase reasoning, you see, therefore the goal would duck, whereas as a matter of fact that does not hold true. Those goals very often turn up in the first hundred goals listed, by experience and are not the difficult goal to find.

The difficult goal to find is the direct overt goal, it's a direct overt goal. And the pc who has this can be told on the meter because in the process of auditing he commonly has a rock slam turn on which is wider than an inch or two. And that is that pc. That's 25 percent of the pcs and that pc has a direct overt goal – wide rock slam.

You run a little bit of O/W on this pc, you are prepchecking this pc, you get a wide rock slam. Well, actually, this wide rock slam is not because your ordinary pc has done something personally to you as an auditor. You could have this as a freak.

Let's say you are auditing your girlfriend or your boyfriend and you've got a dial-wide slam starts turning on and they don't have a directly overt-type goal at all. No, they've just been two-timing you, that's all. Now, you get that overt off against you, personally, the auditor. It's practically – it has to be against you the auditor to come into that classification. It must have been done to you personally, see, and you will get that dial-wide slam. But they've done something pretty wild and that they're not admitting. It's not something they are just trying to keep you from finding out, you know, nothing mild like this you know, but they were
the person who foreclosed your mortgage and threw you out on the street, see. You get the idea, they've been having illicit affairs. They have a prison record and don't want you to know it because if it came to be known of this it would do something to you, the auditor. You get the difference here.

Now, that's what this means. You just get that off. You keep testing for that as a direct overt and if a direct overt doesn't exist there, you see, or if the dial-wide slam turns on any other, this is a better test, on any other thing than you, commonly, why this is a direct overt-type goal.

The way to test this is the simplest thing in the world. You say, "What have you done to me? What overt have you committed against me?" And you fish around for a while along this type of line and you get a slam. Well, that's just the person has got a fantastic overt against you, personally. But this also can miss as a test, because you might be included in the goal. You got it?

Now, it is so infrequent that the overt is against you, personally, as the auditor, even though you are living with the person and everything else, it is so infrequent that this is the case that it can be neglected. Now, this is getting much simpler isn't it? It can actually be neglected in the main course of auditing, but only must be remembered on the off chance that it exists.

And the error that you could make is not very serious. It is not serious at all, you see, because you would simply take a course of action with this person and nothing would work out. You just couldn't get to first base with anything. Remember that there is another chance that the person has a fantastically direct overt against you, personally. Got it?

But oddly enough you could make up your mind to that far too easily, see. Because there is another factor saving it, you see, that it takes pretty heavy charge to get that much slam, you see, on a needle – takes pretty heavy charge. And even though the person had an overt against you directly you probably could find the goal anyhow. Do you see all the logic behind this? Now, it all sums down to this, that you could sort this out, which one it was; but having sorted it out, you would only know this: that you had to prepcheck the pc more carefully than otherwise.

And now wait a minute, the goal could also be found, the goal could also be found on the dial-wide slam proposition by a Dynamic Assessment even though the person had this much overt against you, providing you could read the person's meter. You understand, providing you could and of course you can't. You see, you can't read that person's meter. Person's meter is not responsive. Do you follow this? Do you follow this out?

Audience: Yes.

So although I'm giving you all this logic, it doesn't matter. I don't like to give you a statement which is a partial truth, see, so I'm giving you all the data back of this. You could just say for all working principles that any person who turns on at anytime during his processing, a quarter, half-a-dial slam – you do a Dynamic Assessment type goal and you are going to find the goal easily. Got that? If you are able to read the meter at all you can do a Dynamic Assessment, you understand?
If you can't read the meter at all and it never responds at the right points and so forth, you must also assume the person has overts on you.

But then, of course, what are you doing running a non-prepcheck pc on a goals run? You're following – you're following there? If you'd prepared the pc properly, you would have found this all out anyhow, see. You see how this is? So I just don't want to give you a half-truth.

But for working purposes you don't have to worry about it – you get any kind of slam, I don't care if it's only this wide or if it's this wide, see, I don't care if it's this wide or only this wide or if it's hitting both pins – you just take a look at that, that has occurred to the pc – just know then that your chances of finding the goal easily, by 3GA usual – I mean the commonest – not the commonest but the simplest method because you probably all will be using Dynamic Assessments on all pcs, see. I'm just telling you the limitation and you just can't – just know that you're in for a hell of a run, that's all.

But listen, on some of those cases ordinary Routine 3 old-time Goals Assessment found the proper goal – on some of them, very small percentage of them. So it probably scales it down to about 20 percent you would sweat for uahhhhh, see and then, oh my God, months later you'd come up with a goal. You get the idea? By ordinary Goals Assessment.

Now, this is the other side of the coin. All pcs can have their goals found by Dynamic Assessment, see. It is not limited to those pcs. I'm just telling you the pcs that the possibilities of locating the goal are very remote – except by Dynamic Assessment. But now on Dynamic Assessment this makes it even more easy. You are talking about a 100 percent of your pcs. You can use it on all of them if you can use it. If you can pull this card trick, why it is the fast road to finding goals. This is the high, fast, M1 superexpress, no crossroad highway to finding goals. See, this is fast.

It is fast, but it is also fatal if an auditor were to do this on a pc and bleed all the charge out and get all of the data and not turn it over to his next auditor and not sort of pin it on the pc's lapel, you've had it. Just that! You've just had it, that's all. You've got to meter this pc now and straighten this whole thing out by recalling the sessions the pc has had to get the data back.

Now I'll tell you one of the methods of getting the data back. We knew that a pc who just left here as a second-goal Clear – we knew a pc had run Clear on a goal and we didn't even have the goals list and we didn't remember what the goal is. So I told her auditor to do a list of goals on this pc in which this word occurred which we knew the pc had been run on. That was all the data we had, see. And we did a list of, I don't know how many goals were done. I said fifty. I don't know how many got done. And then they assessed this list and they found this goal back. Well, of course, it was the most obvious one. Well, we couldn't take a chance, don't you see? And we found that goal and then we went ahead and ran and listed that goal and the pc went Clear on it. Don't you see? The right goal had been found.

But remember this, you desensitize the case. You desensitize the case terribly by doing this Dynamic Assessment. Do you realize that by removing the charge on these lines, that is the only time you are ever going to get that data at the end line. You never are going to be able to do it again; it is a one shot. You understand, you are going to be able to do it once.
Now, the odd part of it is, is you can't do it once wrong. You can do it wrong a thousand times and the charge will still be on the bank. You see this now? You could do it wrong all you want to. You are not going to bleed any charge off the bank. Get the wrong dynamic and the wrong item and the wrong this, the case will just simply be a little more ARC breaky to audit, that's the final end result of that.

But do it right and then don't make the data known. Do it – do it right, find the dynamic, find the item we are looking for on this Dynamic Assessment, find all these steps and then get a goals list and don't find the goal. If we've gone this far, aghhh, this poor pc has had it. If we don't make this data known to organizations or auditors or central clearing point for such data, some pc is going to get hung, man, because there is just no recovering it, that's it. You follow me? You can't do this again.

It is something on the order of going up on a tower and pouring all the water out of the tower and there is no pump to ever get any water back up to it again except another 200 trillion years of living. Now, you go up and you empty all the water out of the tower and you are supposed to find the key at the bottom of the barrel. Next auditor comes along he can't even find the tower, much less the key, if he doesn't have the data that was found by this, see.

So your auditor's reports must note with great care – now let me impress this upon you – note with great care whether or not certain phenomena such as rock slam dwindling out was present. And you must know what a dwindling-out rock slam is, because you can do it wrong and have the rock slam occur on the first part of the list and then vanish because you are not on the list. Just like any wrong goal practically will list the first hundred items without killing the pc and even doing him a little bit of good. After that, the second hundred throws him sort of into a state of where he isn't quite sure whether he wants to go on living or not. The third hundred kills him and the fourth hundred, if you can get him to sit still to run them, of course, you bury him. That's just that, see.

It looks awful good there for a moment sometimes on the beginning of a Dynamic Assessment or list or something like that. We get a dizzzza and we say, "That's it," you know. And we go to the next step and nothing happens.

So you want to make all these things clear in your auditor's report that you did a Dynamic Assessment and you found a hell of a slam on the "physical universe" and you couldn't get anyplace else. See, make that very clear. Or, if you got someplace else, that as you were listing the items derived from "physical universe" that you got a dwindling slam or you got a slam which persisted very widely for the first ten items and then vanished and never went down to a dirty needle.

Never went down to a dirty needle, you know. Never got smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller and mash. You saw one of those on my television demonstration. You saw a type of list and it went bwow and then it didn't do a thing, see. That was one of those. See, wrong line, see. I went in the wrong corner of the slot. You were watching there actually research auditing sessions, not demonstrations, see. Trying to find out about this. Thought you could learn from it, too. Hoped it would come out all right.

Since that time I've really done some auditing, see. Man, the engrams have been flying, you know. I don't know how much auditing has happened since you last saw the last
demonstration last Friday, but it's, oh, I don't know, must be something on the order of about – what is it, about thirty-five hours, thirty hours, thirty-five hours? Almost as much auditing as there were days.

And getting this thing taped out. Getting this thing grooved because – it's always before I take trips – it was much more vital when I was still riding airplanes.

You know why I'm not riding airplanes? It's just too much responsibility. It's not whether you'd lose me, you see, but it's just my responsibility, see. My responsibility is just a little too heavy. And furthermore, I think that a thirty-six thousand-foot fall is very hard on Rolleiflex cameras. [laughter] Of course, they are shedding airplanes out of the sky these days something like raindrops in England. And – oh, you have to wear steel umbrellas lately where they are crashing airplanes, you know. But it is awfully hard on my cameras and I know you wouldn't want me to lose any more cameras. I have lost one camera for the sake of Dynamic Assessment. You actually lost two and we don't want to lose any more. We can afford so much for research, but beyond that... [laughter, laughs]

All right. Now, let me give you a packaged statement of the person you must run, in case somebody got lost here or he got confused on it, the person you must run a Dynamic Assessment on.

I'm going to hear some – hear some whistles here in a minute and "Oh, I see, oh yeah, what do you know, huh, yeah, that's so true," you know, that kind of a reaction it is. Just listen now.

The wide rock slamming needle turning on once in a while or now and then, what – but which has been known to turn on on this pc in auditing. Got it? Under all those classifications, see. It turns on and you've seen it. An auditor tells you it has turned on, don't you see. It's on a lot. It's on now and then. It's on rarely. You know, just however we've learned about this wide rock slam needle, you know, heavy, searching, hunting, banging, crashing needle, you know. Doesn't matter how we learned about it. You needn't try to find a goal on that pc by any other method than the Dynamic Assessment method because you are going to lay an egg. You are going to be up there about three thousand goals up the line and you are still sweating. Got it?

But remember, don't worry about it too much if you can only do old 3GA only, see, don't worry about it too much because a certain percentage of pcs, a very small percentage of those pcs, still have found their goals early on the list. You see that. So you are not taking your life in your hands.

Now, that's type 1, see, wide rock slamming needle, known, reported, we don't care how, wide rock slamming needle.

Number 2, a pc who is unresponsive to the auditor on the meter. You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And the pc says, "Myah, I guess so, yeah I'll talk about my difficulties."

And you don't get any knock on the thing. And you get suspicious and you sort of put the meter aside for the moment.
And you say, "Well are there any difficulties that you aren't willing to talk to me about?" Just check them over carefully and you might...

"Oh well," and he gives you an automaticity. Naaahhh, you might say it's a pc in a chronic ARC break state, unresponsive on a meter. The pc is too remote. There is no impingement can be made on this pc.

Now, it doesn't matter how good you are, this is a rare piece; not – not too rare but this is a special class of pc. You can never get a rudiment in on him, anything. The clue and key to this pc is everything is suppressed. We'll go into that later. Pc's got everything suppressed and suppresses the auditor and suppresses this and suppresses that. The clue to this is you ask the pc – you can find out what this pc is doing and establish the suppressed pc rather easily – and you say, "When I say there, there, there to you, what do you do?" Because the pc is seldom answering you.

"Well, what do I do?" Pc doesn't react to steering, you see. You say, "What do I do?" Pc says, "What do I do? Well, well, I throw aside those that you are saying because they couldn't be it." And you know that's quite a few pcs. And the only thing you have to know about is the pc doesn't answer up to steering. That's all you have to know about it. That takes care of your whole Class II pc here of this type, see. That's the whole lot. They just don't answer up to steering.

You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and you get a tick, tiny tick. And you say, "Yes, there, there, what difficulty aren't you willing to be talking about?" you know. "There, there, there, there." Pc doesn't say anything. "There, there," pc doesn't say anything. You say, "There, there, there," you say, "What are you looking at?" The pc tells you something. Get the idea?

Now, the normal pc, when you say, "There, there." Pc, "Oh well, that, yeah, well, I don't know what that is, you know. I've got a picture of a bed, I don't know what that is. Oh, I know, I know, that was where I murdered the policeman. Yeah, I guess that's the sup..." That's that, see, they give it to you, see. Give it to you as a result of the steering.

This other type of pc never gives you anything as a result of steering. So watch the steering. Keep your weather eye open on this pc. Pc doesn't react to steering, the clue to the case is suppress and the only thing you've got to do with this case is run suppress till it runs out of the pc's ears and you can make the meter operate, goal or no goal. Got it?

All right. Now, your next class of pc is a pc who turns on a dirty needle, ever. I see you like that. Now, of course, you will get a slightly tick-tickey needle on a missed withhold, you will get on a Failed to reveal, on almost any pc you will get a tickety-tick once in a blue moon. But a pc who regularly gets a tickety-tick has not got his goal found. It's not been found, it isn't on the list, hasn't been elucidated and is nowhere to be located.

Well, that was a surprise. I told you you'd say ha-ha-ha, I didn't expect you to laugh. You probably don't believe me. Any pc around whose needle is going bzzt-bzzt, particularly on the other rudiments, now that's for sure – on the other rudiments, but any pc whose needle you have to work to clean up because it is a dirty needle, you have not got the pc's goal on the
list or the pc's goal is so buried and so suppressed and it's been found a long time ago or something, but the probability is it hasn't been found at all.

A good test, which you could never find out, by the way, the data is never available, is the pc who had had a goal found sometime previously; it read with an instant dirty needle. Any goal that reads with an instant dirty needle is not only not the goal, but it indicates that the goal has not been found. It doesn't exist on the list and has not been enunciated to the pc – by the pc to anybody, see?

Does this apply to your pc? Any pcs you are auditing at the present moment ever turn on a dirty needle? Well, that pc's goal is not on the list.

Life becomes fascinating doesn't it? What does it take to make a dirty needle turn on? Well, brother, it is something like the power or force of Krakatoa which, when it blew its head gave the world red sunsets from the Sunday-Monday line clear on around and back for three years, see. There's power, there's force underneath that, see. It is somewhat like trying to sit on a plain lid on a superheated boiler with the steam accumulating, see, and as that comes up and hits the underside of the thing you'll get this little phenomenon [imitating the sound of a boiling kettle which vibrates its lid] kno-kno-kno-known as a di-dirty needle, see. It's not that the pc is feeling upset or something like that, it is that the pc is definitely and desperately suppressed with magnitude and then they are holding charge on that that would blow a nova, see. That's charge.

Now, the more goofy the pc's needle is, now let's take an E-Meter Essentials, the more pattern a needle develops, the more charge is on the goals line. And a vaguely un... well, a pc whose goal is on the list or a pc whose goal is very accessible or a pc's goal is very easy to audit or something like this – never gets a tick or a tack. You'd have to put him into the most remarkable state, you'd have to run the most weirdly offbeat processes to finally turn on a bzzt, and then you'd only turn it on very briefly.

But this pc who gets a little missed withhold – they want to sneeze and they don't sneeze, you know. And the needle goes bzzt-bzzt-bzzt, a little tiny, dirty, rock slam, zzt-zzt-zzt-zzzzt-zzt-zzt. You say, "All right. What withhold have I missed on you?"

"Well I wanted to sneeze." And it disappears, see.

Why look, a sneeze doesn't turn on that much dirty needle oh-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho. Uh-uh, takes more than that, man. It takes something like enough force and power to blow the whole planet to pieces, see, sitting down underneath the bank for a person just to think that they don't want to sneeze and turn on a dirty needle because these are a series of reversing currents in the reactive bank. How jammed in does a fellow have to get?

Now, how about the fellow, now that boy – that boy, you could probably 3GA him, Routine and find his goal, see. You probably still could do that rather easily.

But how about this guy? You get a quarter-of-a-dial rock slam and you say, "What was that, what was that, what's that, what-what-what-what's happened?" You know, "What-what-what's the matter?" you know.
He says, "Well, I was – suppressing a sneeze." There is only one method of finding that character's goal, by Dynamic Assessment, unless somebody has a shot in the pants with luck, see.

Find my goal the other night, one of my – for that session one of the session goals was "to be lucky." And we were. First time I ever put it up as a session goal.

Now, look I'm probably wasting a lot of your time on going into the ramifications of this and that, but I'm just trying to tell you who this is – should be runnable on and who it's best on. But remember it can be run on anybody.

Now, exactly what do you do? Now, let's go into the one, two, three, four, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. Well, the first thing you do is you get the pc to write 850 goals and then you strip the list one way or the other. And then you save that carefully and you save any goals list the pc has. You got all that? He does that on his own, bang, that's just 3GA, see.

All right. Now, if you are a goals-finding auditor and you just get this pc – you get a pc by the scruff of the neck and you've got him – somebody else has prepared him, they've prepchecked him and everything like that. You set him down and you just go right in and you do this action, bang, bang, bang, see, you do this action. You make him build the wheel of life, see. Make him build the wheel of life. You give him a lot of samples. You give him a basic wheel that's got eight parts. That's just your eight dynamics, see. It's a lot of little pies can be put into this thing and the reason you use a wheel sort of a thing, not that it is easy to assess, as it is not, but it gives him the idea of entirety. It's good symbolism. And you give him some sample lists. You give him some samples, you know, like there's these, you know. There's sex divides into family, children, marriage, wives, so forth and other things you might think of, you see, other things you might think of, you see. And he can draw all these things out and he can find these things here. Get this?

Some old-time Scientologist, say, "Well, what are the dynamics according to you?" And he gives you thirty, bang, that's items on it. That's simple. The raw meat pc, mysticism rears its ugly head, see. The whole track opens and gapes, you see. You say, "Do an entirety of existence." He won't even be able to embrace an entirety of existence unless you give him some symbolism of some kind to help him. You say, "This is the whole of existence, this thing. And it's divided into eight segments here, as you can see and there is all this and that. Complete it and here's some samples on the back. We'll give you some of them," see. And you can draw one up. Give him a whole bunch of samples. You know, divide marriage up into homes and cooking and, you know, anything. And he just goes ahead and he fills this out. Well, I don't care whether he does that in session or not, see. It's a good thing when you first hear of him to go around and hand this to him with all of its directions on it. He's supposed to complete the wheel of life before he comes in and talks to you, see. You can sit there with your turban on, you see. [laughter, laughs] I don't care whether you call it this or not, I'm gagging to some degree, but it's just your old eight dynamics, see.

But there is – you want some additional segments. And it's a good thing to have a whole list of them of various, optional segments that might be part of it according to him, see. It's a good thing and – but coax him at the same time to believe that there might be a lot more missing. Sort of give him the idea that unless he solves this puzzle, all of his auditing may be
held up, which is absolutely true. You tell him to solve this puzzle and get all of it on there, see.

An old-time Scientologist has already solved the puzzle. He's thought over this and he's sat around and he's said, "Well, let's see, there was four in the first book and then there was four more and I think there are also this many and these really divide this way." And he's given you several subdivisions of the sub-divisions, see. And he's got his own ideas of what these things are and he's just laid his case in your lap. Savvy?

I made a mistake the other day. The reason you didn't see a good session is because I didn't take the pc's list. Don't often make an error. For Christ's sakes profit by it.

All right. Now, look-a-here. You got this thing now, see and you assess by rock slam and you just go around this thing calling everything off that is on it until you get a rock slam. And you go round and round and round on this thing, see. And it's just Assessment by Elimination, just that. The ones that are in, you go over them a second time, the same way you do a Prehav Scale and everything else.

But the auditing command for this assessment is entirely different than an old Dynamic Assessment. And it is not a common Dynamic Assessment. *It's overts against,* so you say, "Think of doing bad things to" or "Consider committing overts against (dynamic)," see. And you just keep that up, keep that up, keep that up, keep that up. You got it? And "Consider committing overts to sex. Consider committing overts to children. Consider committing overts to marriage. Consider committing overts to home and family," whatever he's put down there, you see, as these sub-divisions, you know. And you go round and round and round on this thing and you mark each one to its reaction – that reacts. But you are looking there, not for a necessarily instant reaction, but one in the vicinity of it.

And I'll tell you something. The more – if his item is on there, you'll get instant rock slams and if his item isn't, you won't. Got it? Isn't that a nice indicator? I do you a favor every once in a while, see. You are not going to get an instant rock slam if his item is off there. The read is late and scrubby and all this sort of thing. The item is off that list. So if you see that this isn't instant rock slam, don't break your heart. Go around on this thing and if the first couple of times around you haven't got something rock slamming; takes maybe about three times around to do the whole thing till you know for sure, my God is this thing "spirit," you know. You hit spirit, it's bzzzzt, boom, boom, knack, knack, boom, boom, spurp, spurp, spurp, blurp, you know. Like one of these electronic plays you hear, the ions going around inside the tube, you know. Crash-crash-crash-crash, it is unmistakable. It is something like the difference between driving on a rough country road and hitting a tree, you know. You can tell the difference.

If you don't get that kind of a reaction after about the third time around and haven't already made up your mind, you better get him to do the wheel of life again and just pat him on the back and say, "Well, son, you haven't solved this and I think you'd better just take this up and you'd better consider this more," and so forth. You can let him consider it in the session, but why waste your time. You could say, "Now, let's get down to business here. There are eight basic dynamics, you realize that, according to Hubbard there are eight basic dynamics. What you've got to do is correct him on this because there are obviously more. What are they?
Now, you've obviously left one out here." Give him another list of things to study like Webster's International Dictionary, anything you want to.

Now, there will probably be lots of tricks of the trade as to how to get this wheel of life out of the pc, but everything else depends on making sure that's complete. Okay? Everything depends, because what you are going to get if you follow through an incomplete list of the dynamics is they will all come down to little *dzzzs-dzzzs-dzzzs-dzzzs*, and then they all go out and then maybe a dirty needle stays on everything. And then you say, "Well, this dirty needle is more than the rest so we will list it." And the whole thing lists to a little dirty needle and you get down to the end, you've got a little dirty needle and there's a little dirty needle and he gets a rock slam, there's a little dirty needle and you ask him a question, he gets a little dirty needle and ... You know.

It's definitely laundry work to hand, see, and all of that is caused because the dynamic that you want is not on this wheel. That whole phenomena is caused by just that. There is a piece of life that he thinks is an integral section of life that he hasn't put down.

Now, the odd part of it is he may not think of it without some suggestions, so some lists will sometimes be necessary. Maybe if you could divide marriage up into thirty parts. "Which one of these are actually parts of marriage?" you see. You know, I mean, second dynamic into thirty parts, "Which one of these are actually parts of the second dynamic?" you know. Let him choose one or two, because he's going to be too random for us to make a patient basic list. He's going to be too random.

You'd be surprised but toothpicks will be a necessary dynamic on some pc. Toothpicks, that's the seventh dynamic, yes. Maybe so, but if it is, man, will that assess out. You get the rock slam on it. It's an integral part of life. Life consists of God and self and sex and he's not sure about mankind or species or living things of the physical universe or that sort of thing, but *toothpicks*, see, there – that's what life consists of. And he'll give you this item.

Now, what do you do with this item? Now, look, don't monkey with it if you haven't got that item. That item will sit there and rock slam. You are not going to wear the rock slam out of it as long as the pc stays in-session and he isn't all ARC breaky and so forth. He can even ARC break and you still get the rock slam. It's a nice, hefty rock slam. Everything else eventually disappears and the *whole* reaction goes into this thing. It's usually a couple of divisions, three divisions, somebody with a decent needle, you see. It's a nice, nice, heavy scratch-scratch-scratch-scratch-scratch-ach-ach-ach-ach. You read him the next one to it, nothing. It's also instant. Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang, bang-bang-bang-bang-bang, you see. "Physical universe." Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang. "Physical universe." Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang. "Spirits, God, self, sex," *bsst*. That's one time around, "Sex," *bsst*. And then, "Physical universe." Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang. You got the idea? Unmistakable. It's not one of these equivocal things. No matter how lousy the needle is, this will do.

Now, something else I should tell you is it doesn't matter how lousy the pc's needle is to do this. It just doesn't matter. You should get him into session somehow or another, but it really doesn't matter how lousy his needle is because you are going to address this subject, he's going to have a lousy needle. Doesn't matter how clean and whistle clean his needle was
before you brought up this nasty subject of the wheel of life, his needle is now going to be dirty and you start assessing it, it's going to be a mess. You got it?

All right. You take that one you found and this is what you do with it. You say, "What represents the dynamic you found (it's the one that rock slammed) to you?" And you just make a list of this and you go on down and you make a list of this and this is the way it ought to look. And if it doesn't look – it can look three ways. Everything is dirty needle. That's wrong. These items as you list them each one goes bzzt. He says these, you know, bzzt, bzzt, bzzt. It's undiminishing. It never diminishes, never gets smaller, never gets less. Little tiny dirty needle – well, you did a lousy Dynamic Assessment in the first place for that to have happened. The dynamic wasn't on the list. You went and guessed at it out of desperation or you did something corny, see. Something wrong was done at that point.

Now, the next action is, is it goes, (and this is also a wrong one) it goes crash, crash, crash, crash, for the first five items and then you don't have anything. Big rock slam for a few items and then you don't have anything. Well, that's also wrong, so you haul off of that one.

No, the exact proper phenomenon is big rock slam, slightly less, slightly less, slightly less, slightly less, slightly less, slightly less, diminishing each item he gives you. He may give you a couple of null items, but the next hot item that is on the list you've got bzzt, bang, brrr, bang, brrr, bang, brr, bang, br, bang, tick, tick, nothing. Got the idea? It's almost like going down a river which has got less and less water in it and you finally go aground when you are at the end. See the idea.

In other words, you steer into this thing called the wheel of life – the dynamics – you steer into this thing and you find a channel and you go down through this channel and it's wide, rock slam all the way down this channel, see. And you get to the end of that list of "What represents " and you shouldn't have anything left. There should be no reaction to the question "What represents (dynamic)?" There should be no reaction to (dynamic). There should be no reaction to anything, don't you see? You run that totally ... "Do you have any more items? Is the list complete?" All this kind of thing, you see. That's gone, that's dead now.

The list is relatively short. It certainly seldom will exceed, I think you'll find in actual practice, a couple of hundred items. That would be a rather hefty list, see.

All right and that's gone, but it sort of dwindled away, don't you see. It is sort of like going down a cone. It just dwindled away and got to be nothing, see, the charge was less and less. In other words the phenomenon of bleeding charge off of this thing is definitely present.

When you see this you'll say, "Well, how did Ron know that?" you know. Well, I'll ask the same question.

Anyhow, our next action now is a little unexpected. And this is all new stuff now. You take the item, you assess the thing by elimination and you'll get this nice, big, rock slam back, but it won't be quite so big. And one of them will rock slam. This is not any – you do it by elimination, you don't do it by Tiger Drill or anything like that. One of them rock slams and that thing is it. There shouldn't be any question in your coco but what that is it.
Meantime, you've found the dynamic. For God's sake write it on an auditor's report in capital letters so it can be seen, so it doesn't get lost anywhere, because no auditor coming in your wake is ever going to find it again because you found it by bleeding the charge and the charge is now gone. Okay?

Now, you do the next action, see. First the dynamic, then you've listed the dynamic. Then you assess by elimination on that list and you find this item which is now rock slamming and now you take that item and you say, "What represents that item to you?" And you do another list and that will do the same thing. That will come down and it will be rather slight. This list is much less, probably less lengthy, less charged and it should dwindle away, too and leave one item in it rock slamming. And maybe it's the same item you found, but maybe it's slightly different. In other words, you are asking him to rephrase this item and then you are finding the rephrasing by assessment. You got that? You got that?

Now, all you've got to do is take a Prehav assessment, the old Auxiliary Pre-have Scale, do it by elimination. But, by the way, all these assessments are, you know, "What represents this to you?" That's not dynamic against, don't you see. You follow this? It's not considered "Committing overts against these items," it's just "What represents to you," don't you see. It's as simple as that. You can assess that way.

But you can also assess by, "Consider overts against these things," and you could go down the line that same way, don't you see. This would again pep it up and that sort of thing, but in actual fact, the thing will just rock slam if you just assess it. You got that?

Of course you can, you know, "Think of committing bad things against these" – of this item list. You could do that, see and "What represents that?" In other words there's a couple of ways you could go about this thing, neither one of them wrong.

Now, you can take the old Prehav list and take your final item and that was catfish, see. "Ha-ha. It was fish, see. It was dynamic's fifth dynamic. What assessed out was fish on the first list and you've got fish again. All right. What represents fish to you?" And the fellow gives you this and that and the other thing and the other thing. And you find out it was catfish, ha-ha-ha-ha, wasn't fish, it was catfish, ha-ha-ha-ha. Now, you can actually do a Prehav assessment on the subject of catfish. "Should you (dynamic line) catfish? Should you withdraw from catfish? Should you leave catfish? What should you do to catfish?" You got this? And one of those is going to rock slam and you've got the guy's goal in a bucket.

There'll be a fee for all this heavy work. I mean I'm not going to work for nothing on this. That's a real fancy Dynamic Assessment. Actually you don't have to be quite that fancy to come up with the answer, but that's getting real fancy, see. You not only found the dynamic, but you found the item that represented the dynamic and then you found the item that represented the item that represented the dynamic. That brought you in awful close didn't it? You practically got the exact thing that the goal is worded with and then you did the Prehav assessment to find the verb. Ha-ha-ha, ho-ho-ho-ho-ho.

You may get such a thing as, "to withdraw from catfish," but you know damn well that it is not exactly this type of goal. See, it's not exactly "to withdraw from catfish." So now you've got to have a list of things, goals he might have that would express this action, "to withdraw from catfish."
Now, there's only one hole in this. If it's an inadvertent goal it may be entirely different. But an inadvertent list, remember, was a non-rock slamming, not upsetting... You do the same thing and you'll get the same phenomena and everything else will turn on. It will all go up according to Hoyle, but if it's a non-overt – no, I mean it's an inadvertent overt, see, not intentional. It's just the fact he wants to make steel and you know, he wants to make steel. That's the goal, you see. And oddly enough they make fish hooks out of steel and he's committing an overt continuously against catfish with fishhooks, see. He didn't have catfish – he didn't have catfish in mind. That's the inadvertent goal - the inadvertent overt goal. He didn't have catfish in mind, but it's collided with this thing just in the natural course of the events.

This other goal is to take catfish and do something very overt to them. See the overt – the direct overt goal will probably contain the word catfish and the inadvertent goal won't. So if the list wasn't much charged why it's probably inadvertent.

Now, here is the way you get around that. You give the pc – after you've done all this, and you also then do this list of goals and that runs charge out until there is no charge on it. But the fact there is no charge on it is no guarantee that the goal is on that list. That is not a guarantee. You got that?

It is no guarantee at all. You could actually ask him to do a couple of hundred more goals, just off the bat. He could go ahead and do that.

Here is why you wrote your 850 list. You say, "Now, go back to the beginning of your goals list," and give him a purple pencil with red polka dots, see. And you say, "You mark in every goal there that would be an overt – would express anything like withdrawing from catfish, see. You just mark any goal that would even vaguely mean this or any goal that would be an overt against catfish. Any goal – any goal, see, you just mark in anything." And he starts in at the beginning and he marks in every one of these goals which would be.

Now, when you take his goals list to assess it you take the 850 list, the items he's marked in and run it from the beginning, forward. See how you do that? He did the 850 list before you fooled around with the Dynamic Assessment. But now he knows where the goal is targeted. There is no slightest doubt in his mind about where the goal is targeted. And you know whether the goal is the right goal or not. Of course you know whether it is the right goal at that, but you can get a goal there that – you spend time on these goals now.

Now, the only other thing that can go wrong with this type of assessment is the fact that there is a hole in the original Tigers Drill that I released it to you. That is, that's – things can be suppressed below the level of meter read. You got that?

So you prepcheck Suppress. One of the best ways to handle this, the offhand pitch is you prepcheck Suppress with the meter laid aside, see, when I say Repetitive Prepcheck, see, with the meter laid aside. Don't look at the meter. Look at the goals list and say, "On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" And you are looking straight at the pc and he says, "Brrjrrnm." You say, "Well, answer it, has it or hasn't it been? Try to think, any suppression on this goal?"

And he says, "So-and-so and so-and-so."
Then ask him, "Do you have any additional answers?" "Well," he says, "so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "All right, now. I'll check it on the meter. See. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" And only then can you promote a tick.

A goal can be so suppressed that the Suppress won't read and if the Suppress won't read nothing else will read and you've got to promote the read. And when you are checking an old goal and trying to get it alive again, don't worry about the meter until you've got the pc flat on the Suppress on the subject of goals, on the subject of clearing, on the subject of – you know, your Prepcheck. But don't do these things down the line the way it is in the policy letter, see, and forget to ever go back and check any of these things. When you finish one of these sections on that Prepcheck, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, you better check all of those over and see if there is anything else on.

In other words, you've got to clear each one of those sections, not just run over it differently, one item at a time. Let's find out if there is anything else on this thing. Do a fast check on them after that. You find out this thing has hotted up and the suppress may have hotted up on you again because suppress is the only tricky button.

Don't worry about the rest of them being tricky. You'll find the reads on those, but you won't find the read on Suppress. If you don't find the read on Suppress you can't get the read on the rest of them. You got that? And that's the only hole in goals finding and that's how your goals disappear and that's how goals can't be found and that sort of thing. You got it?

Now, on the beginning of any goals list by Dynamic Assessment and so forth, you make awfully sure that you have the pc's goals that have been found before. Put those to the beginning of the list. I don't care who prepchecked them. I don't care what he did with them. I don't care anything else.

My own goal was found last June and has sat suppressed ever since. And five wrong goals were found on top of it, one right after the other. And only by accident after Dynamic Assessment did that goal blow into view again and of course it was the perfect overt. It was an inadvertent overt. That was why it was lying there sleepily. You follow this?

Now, I don't care whether you do the Prehav assessment or not. I don't care whether you do that or not. It is just another string to your bow. Got it? Just another string to the bow. That will give you the item, the goal is an overt against. But an inadvertent overt goal won't have the item mentioned in it. And it might be far wide of the point, too wide for the pc to guess. So that is why you go back over the first 850 goals and have him mark in those that it would be an overt against whatever the final item was.

He may start marking in too many, but don't upset him too much about it. The probability is, is the goal is in the first few pages. Maybe he's only marked in twenty on the first – in the first 300 goals, you see. That's a lot different than doing 300 goals isn't it? See, you are saving time all the way and you know what the goal is – looks like. See, you know about what it is.

The pc may badger himself around all over the place trying to find out what this goal is, but you can locate the goal.
Now, there are probably other tricks by which you can define and make the goal de-
finite and so forth. Those tricks can be developed from time to time. Ideas can come up
about this. We know exactly what the anatomy and structure of goal charge is and exactly
what it leads down to. Now, you can probably do a tremendous number of things with that,
but that is Dynamic Assessment as it exists right now here on the 21st of August, AD 12.
Okay?

Thank you.
All right. This is lecture number two, 21 August AD 12, the Basics of Auditing. The Basics of Auditing.

Auditors keep asking me for rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules. And then they goof in session, and they ask me for more rules. And then they goof in sessions and don't apply those rules and ask for more rules.

I think it's about time I gave you a lecture on the subject of the basics of auditing. This is very fundamental material I'm about to give you. It is probably more fundamental than HPA. But, it's a very strange thing that fundamentals usually come at high ranges of training. In other words, the fundamental auditing can be understood only after one has audited perhaps by rule for quite a while, and he runs into what the fundamentals are.

Now, that I'm giving you this lecture makes a fundamental change in training. Training from Class Y on up remains completely the same, you see, but training of the W and X units are shifted by this. That is your very low basic training, and HPA/HCA training is shifted by this.

Let me tell you what an auditor should be able to do and thereby you will understand it far, far, far, far, far better. An auditor should be able to get another being to be interested in his own case and to talk to him. That is the way that is. That's what he should be able to do.

Now rules and tricks and all kinds of things of that particular type – rudiments, auditing positions, various types of upset preventers – all of those things are contributive to getting this fact to occur. But remember they're only contributive to getting this fact to occur. Your E-Meter is only contributive so far as it applies to rudiments in body of session. Your E-Meter is only contributive to this fact as far as it applies to rudiments. Of course, the E-Meter has an entirely different function, which is assessment. But where you're using the E-Meter to get somebody into session and to audit him, you continuously go astray and become completely unstuck, because you try to do with the meter what you can't do naturally, if you ever have trouble with sessions. You're trying to make the rules and the meter do something that you can't do. Now there would be some reason why you couldn't do this.

That is to say you didn't want pcs to talk to you or you were trying to make them sane because they were so crazy, or someone's basic purposes get in his road on this. But some auditors, all they got to do is sit down in the auditing chair and the pc ARC breaks. Well, do
you realize that this is getting worse? It is more apparent in sessions these days than it ever
was before. It is more apparent.

Why? Why are ARC breaks very often these days so much more catastrophic and ex-
plosive than they were perhaps five or six years ago? It's only been in the last two or three
years that you could really make an explosive ARC break, and that's the period we've been
using meters.

Well, that's because the auditor can do this interesting fact: The difficulties that an
auditor encounters are his own difficulties. And the mechanics he is using force the pc into
session with an auditor who doesn't want the pc in-session or who doesn't understand the pc
should be in-session or why the pc should be in-session. You follow me? And these rules
have made auditing so powerful – the rudiments themselves have made auditing so power-
ful – that where the auditor is actually incapable of getting somebody interested in his own
case and to talk to him, and yet is using all these rules to put a person in a state of mind – see,
to be interested in his own case to talk to him – but the auditor doesn't want the pc to be inter-
ested in his own case and talk to him. He thinks auditing is for something else. See?

The rules drive the pc into session and the auditor drives him out, and it kind of drives
the pc around the bend. You see how this could work? Do you see how this could work?


This is very, very vital. This is very, very vital. How could this work?

You have the auditor sitting there looking like an auditor. The rules trick the pc into
being into session. The pc suddenly finds out he's made a mistake. The auditor does not want
to hear what the pc is saying. The auditor doesn't understand the basics of auditing. The audi-
tor's just auditing by some kind of a set of rules. In fact there is no auditor, but the technology
is sufficiently powerful to create a pc.

The technology with the auditor busy auditing – understand this – the auditor busy au-
diting, you see, with all these rules but not auditing then leaves a pc without an auditor. Do
you see how this is? And this can be the most maddening thing, and a pc really doesn't know
what's wrong. He's actually – a lot of tricks have been used on the pc to get him into session.
And now he's in-session and interested in talking to somebody about his own case, see, and
interested in general; and there's no auditor.

Now, look-a-here. We've been blaming meter reading, missing meter reads, cleaning
cleans and that sort of thing. This is just another technical rule. Now a man who is auditing or
a girl who is auditing by the basics of auditing – understood the basics of auditing and could
audit by them – could actually miss reads and clean cleans on rudiments and session material
and still have the pc perfectly happy and in-session.

_Audience: Yes, yes._

Do you see that? But, a person who is cleaning cleans and missing reads must also be
committing this other error of not auditing by basic auditing but auditing by rules which force
the pc into session. Now the pc is only facing rules and a meter. The rules may be right, but
the meter is wrong. There's nothing else holding the pc in session. And as a result, you get a very, very upset condition on the part of the pc.

Therefore, it's very necessary to know what basic auditing is. And I'm going to tell you the gruesome fate of the Ws and the Xs at the Saint Hill Course, including those who are present at this moment in those two courses.

The others who have graduated above those courses are fortunate unless they have been peculiarly unlucky — it's always "unlucky," see, it's never any reason for it — in not being able to handle pcs. And then they will be graded back into this W, X type training.

The first moment somebody appears here — we've got some more auditing space coming up shortly so we can do this — they're going to start auditing. See? If they appear here, they're going to start auditing. I'm going to take the meter away from them. They're not going to have any meter. And they're under orders to put all of their rudiments in and move on up the line — not with Havingness, see — move on up the line with some salient Prepcheck questions. And they can get out of that unit when they can have all of those rudiments in, checked by a meter, after the session.

We're going to make some auditors. We're going to make some auditors. It's a horrible thing to do to some people, perhaps. Think of it. You're sitting there and you got no meter, and you say, "Willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And there's the pc, and the pc is in a particularly 1.1 frame of mind that day. [laughter]

Says, "Yes. Talk to you about anything," you know, the frank-eyed stare of the criminal just after they robbed the First National, you know? "No, I wasn't even there. Um — I wasn't even near the place." Greenbacks in their pockets, you know? And be able to go through all of those rudiments, do some Prepcheck questions, get those all clean, miss no withholds of any kind, catch all the missed withholds, bring them out the other end with the end rudiments and no missed withholds, and an Instructor can check that all on a meter and find every single one of them in. See?

Well, they can do this, because they're going to learn the basics of auditing beginning with this tape.

Basics of auditing in rapid fire are very easy to state — very, very easy to state. Why does auditing exist at all? In the last two issues of Certainty magazine, published in, I think, July and August in London, you find a critique of psychoanalysis. It's an "old" article — 1956 — but is possessed of several terrible and unavoidable truths of what psychoanalysis did wrong. It's pats on the back in there for old Papa Freud. I'm not kicking Freud's head in particularly. But we had to know what psychoanalysis was doing wrong. What did psychoanalysis do wrong?

Frankly, no auditing ever existed in psychoanalysis. Nobody in psychoanalysis was ever permitted to be in-session — never permitted to be — but went into session accidentally. And it's no accident... now this is a figure that you — it's something like "All jewelers — jewelers never go anywhere." You know, it's one of those horrible, broad generalities.

Thirty-three percent of people going to psychoanalysts, according to the records in the United States based on the 40s (and these records, you see, are not very public), in the first
three months (this sounds incredible) wind up in spinbins or commit suicide. That isn't given in that pair of articles. But that's the truth. But the data of why this is occurs in those articles, and any interested auditor's attention is directed to that, because it was a rather careful breakdown based on old technology as far as we're concerned – not particularly up-to-date in Scientology. But nevertheless, that told you why psychoanalysis didn't work: no, the guy could accidentally go into session and he never had an auditor. There he was down the track, and all of a sudden, "And my mother did this to me." Motivator, motivator, motivator, you know? "My mother did this to me and my mother did that to me and my mother did something else to me and awham-ijjuh-er-ooo-rowrr. And I-I was so abused when I was a little child, and oh, yes, everybody interfered with me sexually. Yes, everything was terrible," and so forth.

And he's way down the track someplace, and the analyst says, "Well, it's five o'clock now. That's the end of your period. Thank you very much. I hope you do well now, Mrs. Jones. And goodbye."

Just look at that, man. This could happen to a dog, you know? Nobody ever brought them up to present time and squared them around or anything like that. Hypnotists even have rules on the subject. For God's sakes, wake your patient up and slap him in the face and pour cold water on him. Don't let him walk out of the door and out onto a busy public street, because they very often do and get themselves killed or run over or injured, because they're still hypnotized when they leave the session, you see? Well, that's a hypnotist, see? Even a hypnotist knew. Psychoanalysts didn't know. I'm not jumping on Papa Freud. Papa Freud perhaps had all kinds of rules about auditing that we'll never hear of, see? Because he's not a well-recorded man, if you recognize that. He has fantastic numbers of interpreters. And he himself didn't write enough or put out enough dope, and he was not really scientifically oriented. He was more mystically oriented.

All right. Well, that just gives you an example. See, they made a lot of mistakes. Well now, do you realize that we could walk forward into a lot of mistakes unless we examine the basics of auditing. What, why is auditing – and these basics are very few. There's the mechanics of blowing something; why auditing works. Ask yourself that question, that burning question: Why does auditing work? See? There's such things as asking an auditing question, getting it answered. Now, there's just that fundamental, you see? There's make the pc feel better. An interesting thing that gets overlooked – just that. That's quite incidental to auditing, but is a – is an underlying factor in auditing. I won't say that I have never given a session that made anybody feel worse. But in recent years, I give somebody a session trying to get something done, see?

That's fine. I'm very happy that they feel better, but the point is that, God Almighty, they could fall through the bottom of the chair and break their arm, and it wouldn't stop me from getting done what I'm trying to do.

Let us say we're – let's say we're trying to check out some Prepcheck questions and make this per – self – that this person is going to stay in session, don't you see, while we do a Goals Assessment. See, that's what we're trying to do, see? Well, I just get in there and pitch and hammer and pound and do everything else, and they go to the end of the session and they feel better – wasn't even intentional. I don't care whether they felt better or not.
It isn't that I don't care whether people feel better or not. I do. But in that particular session, see, they could have – as far as I was concerned – could have wound up at the end of the session feeling like hell and they would have been better off, because we were now up along the line to do our next step and get closer to clearing this guy. You see, it's quite incidental. But nevertheless, the pc felt better.

You do a Security Check on a pc; the pc feels better at the end. See, this is an underlying thread. This is the golden thread that goes through all good auditing, is the pc always feels better. You've really missed the boat if the pc feels worse.

Let's say we're doing a Goals Assessment. It's one of those horrible sessions where we have not found the pc's goal and it lies somewhere behind us and we haven't found it out yet. And the pc is just blowing his stack and is upset, and we can expect everything going to hell in a balloon. A good auditor should be able to bring that session off with the pc feeling better at the end: goal missed, everything missed, everything gone to hell, you see, as far as the pc is concerned. The pc feels better at the end.

Now man, that's asking something, because the most fruitful source of a screaming ARC break is a missed goal. That's a missed withhold with magnitude! Do you realize that's why human beings are so inhuman to humans, just because every one of them has missed the basic purpose of every other one of them. This is what makes your Torquemadas.

Possibly the basic goal of Torquemada was to make people happy. But nobody ever found that out. So he knew how to make them happy. Most of them could be happy if you tortured a few. Ha-ha-ha! You see how wildly astray the man could have gone? Why? It's a missed withhold. Nobody believes this Torquemada. Nobody believes this fact. He actually hadn't hidden it – just nobody ever finds it out. He could even have told somebody someplace on the track that he was trying to make people happy. Nobody ever believed him. He never got off the withhold, in other words. And eventually it got to be more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold. And we find a book that dear old Torquemada bound with his own little paws, which is in the Carmel library, by the way, off at Pacific Groves, California. It's bound in human skin. This was the great boy who made Spain safe for Christianity or something. Actually, there is a copy of that book bound in human skin. Interesting. That was our boy, see? Maybe his basic goal was to make people happy, you see? And he turns into a complete beast because everybody has missed this withhold.

So, you say – originally, the pc is sitting across from you, you got a missed withhold on him to begin with. You haven't got his goal or any of his goals, plus you haven't got any of his overts, plus you haven't straightened out anything that people have missed on him in this lifetime. Hu-hu! What's that make? Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. It makes a cabinet minister or something, you know? This makes a boy. Ha-ha. There he sits. We all know how it feels to be like that, because before we got into Scientology we felt like that. We knew what life was all about. Rowrr.

Now, the earliest part of auditing is the roughest part of auditing, therefore. And an auditor who can handle new cases has to be far better than an auditor who is handling a case who has gone along the way for a while.
Now, this is fashionable in Scientology to believe that Scientologists are harder cases than raw meat. And that's only because you mainly get Scientologists to audit, see? You really don't collide with raw meat. Ha-a-a-a! Let's go out to one of the Johannesburg mines and just tap a black boy on the shoulder, just at random. Let's not get somebody who has reached for Scientology. He – that already tells him that he's accessible for auditing. He's reached!

All right, we just tap this boy on the shoulder and we sit him down. And we say, "We is gonna audit you. Ha-ha-ha-ha."

And he says, "Wus dat?"

Well, that would be an interesting test of an auditor, wouldn't it? Yet an auditor ought to be able to do that. I've put cops, newspaper reporters, all sorts of weird characters into session while being interviewed. And occasionally have them come around and ask for auditing – occasionally audit them; get their rudiments in. You know, that kind of thing. And let me tell you, when I haven't done it, I've usually been sorry.

But I very often think that the guy is too rough or something like that, or he's too this and that, you see? He's too far gone. He's unauditabl e, and it's very hard to get him into this type of session, and I let him go.

So you see that type of fellow who is dead set against it, and so forth, he could be very rough. He could be very rough to handle. But you would be surprised at who will go into session and who can be audited.

The Detroit police, one time, came down with a crash on a center in Detroit, and they did the incredible thing, which has never been repeated anyplace, of seizing a whole bunch of tapes. And they had fourteen cops, I think, listening to these tapes in relays down at the police station. And twelve of them resigned from the force. [laughter] That's a record, isn't it? That's truthful, it's factual; I've had the reports from it now. And that shows you that there are – people are auditable if you approach them right. [laughter]

An auditor has got to handle the pc's problems. An auditor should be able to get a clean needle so a pc can be assessed and made to feel better. I don't care how he does it. Whether he even does it by Dynamic Assessment, he should be able to do it, you see? An auditor should be able to get things done in an auditing session and not audit for the purpose of auditing.

Don't audit to audit. Get things done in an auditing session. That's an interesting fundamental that is, interestingly enough, missed. People all will sit down sometime, and they will audit. And they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they never get anything done! Get the idea?

We had somebody – a team going here. I mean, won't mention any names. I had a team going here for a week. I was saying via the auditing section – I was saying get this one little thing done on this audit – on this pc, because this pc is having a rough time. This pc has continued to have a rough time, and a check back shows that in one whole week of three-hour sessions this auditor was unable to get done this one little thing. There wasn't anything else to do for the case. It's just clear up a couple of questions, see, something like that. Had to get it
done or the auditor couldn't have gone on, and yet for somehow or another went jockeying
back and forth and just auditing on and on and on and on and on and on. For God's sakes!
Fifteen hours! And never got this one little thing done. You see, so busy putting in rudiments
and making out the reports and handling the E-Meter and starting sessions and ending ses-
sions and giving breaks and doing this and doing that, doing this, doing that. [scrambling
around with the stuff on his desk, audience laughing] And they substitute looking like they're
doing something for getting something done, see? They look awful busy, but you check up at
the end of a period of time and you say, "Well, all right. That's fine, son, but what have you
got done?"

And the individual says, "Well, we – we've got the pc's goals list in his folder."

"Yeah. Well, did you do any part of that…"

"Well, we didn't do anything. That was – that was completed before we – we started in
there."

"Well, all right. Fine. Now have you – have you set the pc up? The pc got a clean nee-
dle here in order to be…"

"No. Well, the pc's needle is pretty dirty. We – we – it gets dirtier almost every day, I
think." [laughter]

And you say, "Well, have you prepchecked out the subject of clearing or you got
something accomplished that way…?"

"Well, no. We were going to start on that here next week."

And you look at this long span of auditing time and nothing happened in it, see? Noth-
ing got done. They did other things in order to get something done. You get the idea? Other
things. They did a lot of other things, but they never got anything done. Seems like whenever
they'd start to do anything, they would hit some sort of a via that led them into some other
type of action, which led them into some other type of action; but somehow or another they
never did get around in the session to asking the girl if she had a missed withhold on her hus-
band in order to cure up these PT problems which have been coming up for the last twenty
sessions. See? Never did get around to that, see?

Now, auditing actually consists of little accomplishments. It's a series of small accom-
plishments. It's getting something done. It is not going through motions.

Now, you should be able to get somebody into session without a meter or anything.
You should be able to get somebody into session. You don't need a bunch of – you don't even
need rules or anything. You get somebody in session. How do you do that? A lot of people
have this as a sort of a gift they call it. They make terrific auditors. They've already crossed
this little bridge, so they can get somebody interested in their own case and willing to talk to
them. That's all it takes, see? And that's without any artificial aids of any kind whatsoever.
And they can get somebody in session.

Now, an auditor should be able to allow a pc to blow something. That means an audi-
tor must permit the pc to talk to him. And you'd be surprised how rare this is. You would
really be surprised how rare this is: that the auditor will let the pc talk to him. A large trouble in auditing is differentiating between a Q and A and TR 4 – and this is another thing.

An auditor must be able to differentiate between Q and A and TR 4. And an auditor must be able to handle the session and do things the pc wants done without Qing and Aing. And auditors who have trouble with this are just having trouble. It's almost willful. I mean, you have to practically sit up all night to have trouble with this. You have to work at this trouble.

I'll tell you the basic differences between Q and A and doing something. Q and A is a very simple thing; it's just not accepting the pc's answer. That's all a Q and A is. You question the answer of the pc. I mean, how simple can it get? Isn't anything more simple than that. Don't question his answers. And everybody comes around and they want to know rules: how you're not supposed to question their answers. Oh, no! Please. I can't substitute for somebody's lack of understanding of anything. Oh, I can do a lot, man, but that's pretty – that's asking it, you know?

In other words, let the pc talk to you and you'll never have any difficulties with Q and A. See, people who Q-and-A do not want the pc to talk to them. That's all. So they use a Q and A to keep the pc from talking to them.

You can just see them sitting there with an oar in the auditing session, and they use a remark – an evaluation, you see, or a comment or a request for more information or – perfectly, occasionally to ask the pc for more informa... you don't think he answered the auditing question, you better ask him for more information. But usually this doesn't apply to this, see? Or, the pc is asked another question without any acknowledgment of what he just asked [answered], you see, or he's asked a question which is wildly off what the auditor was trying to do in the first place, you see? It's all a defensive mechanism. Or the auditor does something every time the pc says something. You know that will break down a pc quicker than anything else? TR 4 be damned!

Once in a while a pc gets so hot, so smoking, ruddy hot in the room, he can't stand it. He can't stay in session and he says to the auditor, he says, "Please open a window."

And the auditor says, "Well, I mustn't Q-and-A. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Let him sit there and roast. Ho-ho." That makes Ron good and wrong, isn't it – doesn't it?

*Hell's bells! Go open the window! Say, "You feel better now?"

Pc said, "Yup," and you go on in session.

An auditor who never does anything that the pc wants him to do will drive a pc mad. I guarantee it, man. And a pc – an auditor who always does something when the pc says something will also drive a pc crazy.

Pc says, "Well, why were you going over that goal there? I had a little bit of withhold there. I mean, I th – I thought to mys – ha-ha-ha – thought to myself that's silly – ha-ha-ho-ho-tha's silly; that goal is silly. That's what I thought."

Well, there's a variety of courses open to the very bad auditor.
He can say, "How was the goal silly?" See? Completely psychotic comment, see? He can say to the pc, "All right. Uh, ah, thank you." (That's good TR 4, isn't it? Ha-ha. That got the TR 4 in there. I – you understood the pc thought the goal was silly.) And he says immediately, jumping out of the middle of his Tiger Drill, "Has that goal been invalidated? No – no there's no read on there. Hummm. Wonder why not?"

Well, why not? The pc got it off just now. See? This auditor is in a fog, man, if he does a thing like that.

The pc said, "Well, I-I think that last goal, ho-ho, the last goal up the line there – I thought the last goal up the line there, the one that you just went across, I-I-I actually thought that would stay in." You know, the pc has dared open his yap, see? He's dared be in-session.

And the auditor said, ("I'll fix this. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. I'll fix this. Ha-ha-ha.") "I'll check that for you again."

What's this? That's using session doingness to prevent communicatingness.

Now, there's two things that pcs do: They ask the auditor to do things which, if the auditor doesn't do them, the session is just going to go round the bend, let me tell you; and they originate. And auditors who are having hard times with pcs never differentiate between these two facts. They never find out when the pc wants them to do something or when the pc is originating. They can't tell from the tone of voice or something of the sort. You could do all sorts of weird things, like make bargains with the pc, and so forth. You don't need to do that.

The pc says, "Heh-heh-heh, he-heh. That-that-that-goal that-that…" He's pointing at you, your goals list upside down, you know, with his can sort of, you know, "Ya-ah-h-h-heh, to ca-catch catfish-to-to-catch catfish. I-I can't believe that that's out. How – how – how can it be out? I-I-I think you've missed a suppress or something!"

And the auditor says, knowing he mustn't Q-and-A, you know, audit by the rules, says, "All right. Thank you. To be a tiger. Has that goal been suppressed?"

He finds this pc hanging by a rope from his neck in the barn, don't you see? He can't keep the pc in-session; he keeps wondering why. He's auditing by all the rules, isn't he? Never Q-and-A, never do anything the pc says, never this, never that, see? Never, never, never, never, never. Well, actually, basically, he's not doing any basic auditing. So he just doesn't know his business. He doesn't know his basic auditing. He's auditing by some kind of a bunch of silly rules. Trying to make – you know, he's trying to make me wrong through having said a rule some time or other.

This is a rule that you can follow. Every time the pc says something – a Q and A is challenging, questioning the pc's answer. See? Also doing what the pc tells you to do is a Q and A. Well, that's for sure, but what's the order of magnitude here? There's a hell of a difference between running, "How many times have you gone unconscious?" as the process which the pc demands, and rechecking a goal the pc thought was in. There's a hell of a difference between these two things, you see? You sacrifice no session control of any kind whatsoever when just being a civil – a civil auditor and saying, well, cheerily, "Oh, right – let's see…" You're supposed to help the pc, man. Well, let me tell you. You don't help the pc ever by run-
ning his processes. You never help a pc by taking the process he knows should be run on him. Oh, never. Pc doesn't know.

The pc knows this is his goal, so the auditor says, "All right. He knows it's his goal, so therefore, we'll take it as his goal and we'll list it even though we can't quite check it out," see?

Well, there's a hell of a difference between that, you see, and just civilly – the pc says, "There's a racket out in the hall, I-I just can't stay in session. There's just this racket out in the hall," and so forth.

And the auditor civilly says, "Well, it will probably be over in a minute. Why don't you put down the cans. Why don't you put down the cans and have a smoke." And they do. And the racket subsists or the auditor goes out and say, "What the hell is going on out here?" See?

And somebody says, "Well, we're just changing the mop pails."

And the auditor says – shouldn't say to the person, "Well, you must never change mop pails while I'm auditing." For this is nuts, see? He should say, "When will you be finished?"

Well, the person says, "Well, couple o'hours."

Well, you better find something – do something yourself or find somebody in charge. Let's get this thing squared, you see? Let's not keep running into this. Let's not demand of the pc that he stay in session under such impossible circumstances, don't you see?

At the same time, it may be a situation where, well, it's raining on the tin roof and this gets on the pc's nerves. Now you say, "All right. Look. Ha-ha. I can't do a thing about it," you say to him. "I'd like to help you, but I can't do a thing about it. It's just a tin roof. And this is the only place we've got to audit, and there's the reality of the situation. It's going to audit on the tin roof." And then say, "Well, does it remind you of anything in particular?"

And sometimes the pc looks at this terribly reasonable attitude on the part of the auditor, he says, "Well, yeah. When I was a little kid, I used to have nightmares all the time. And you know, I used to have nightmares all the time and slept in a room that had a tin roof."

"Oh, yeah. What do you know? Oh-oh, okay. How do you feel about it now?"

"Well, I guess I can get along in a session," and he goes on in being audited. It's handling the pc.

Handling the pc isn't making him sit still and talk when he's supposed to and not talk when he's not supposed to you know? That isn't handling the pc. The pc, as far as the auditor is concerned, is a rampant reactive bank that is influencing an analytical viewpoint, and there's limits that you must not go beyond, of course, in helping out. And anything serious like, "Well, in this session today we're going to prepcheck."

And the pc says, "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to…" (This is the roughest part of auditing, is why I'm picking up goals, you see?) "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to – uh – gee. What the hell! God damn! I sat up all last night doing this list and now you're not even going to go into it!"
And the auditor says, "Well, I've got my orders here from Mary Sue to prepcheck you this session." [laughter] Gives him Mary Sue, you see, as an auditor. He just backs out of the session totally, you see?

No. An auditor on the ball handles that. And he said, "All right. I would be very happy to go into this. I'd be very happy to do this. However ... it ain't reading very well. And some time here in the very near future, we're going to find your goal and all will be straight, and I'm not going to desert you, and I'm going to raise hell if I get transferred off of you. I'm going to find your goal. Don't worry about it. From where I sit here, I think we ought to have a Prepcheck, and I think this Prepcheck will straighten out a lot of things and smooth the whole thing out and that's why I'm doing it. And if you can give me a hand here, why, we'll get through this thing, and of course the more you help me get through this thing, why, the faster we'll get through it. And we might even be able to get onto a few goals today. Ha-ha. How about that?"

Zip! Zip! Zip! Zip! See, you get a Prepcheck all down the line. In other words, you use the force of the protest to get your auditing done. A lot of tricks. You could probably learn it by the rules, but actually there's no substitute for an ability to understand and a feeling of humanness. See, there's no substitute for these things.

Now, why does auditing work? That is the burning question. Why does auditing work at all? Well, you could theorize on the subject of ventilation, and you could theorize on the subject of as-ising. But let's not theorize. Let's just take ourselves a look at the basic-basic basics of the basic-basic.

This guy has been going around haunted for a long time, feeling that the whole nation was after him, and then you find out he was Benedict Arnold, and this somehow or another blows some charge. This wouldn't be a normal action. You find a goal will blow charge. But actually just finding out the character was – you know, or something like that. This might do an interesting thing, you see, for the case.

Well, all right. You've gotten something done, and so forth. But how did this do anything for the case? It's because as long as only he had his attention on it, and as long as he had to keep anyone else from having an attention on it, it bothered him. And when he puts it out where somebody else can see it, too, and he can see it, too, he all of a sudden sees it, too. And we don't care what other mechanics occur, don't you see? You can find them all in the Axioms and that sort of thing.

But look at the condition of the guy who is withholding. He is not letting anybody else see it. All right. So he lets somebody else see it. And the other person says he sees it. Then he knows that it has been seen by somebody else and then he waits there for a moment for the roof to fall in, the clouds to collapse, Earth to open or the devil to appear complete with forked tail. What you're running into is the phenomenon of "no consequence." Axiom 10 hasn't fired. He hasn't produced the effect he thought he was going to produce. He was always absolutely sure if he ever told anybody about this, he'd, of course, be executed on the site. He can imagine hordes of people swinging in, climbing in through the windows to get at him.

I know what he feels like. I've only hit one of these on the track and it was very funny. It was one morning when Suzie was doing some coffeeshopping, and we were hitting back
along the track someplace and I was trying to pick up something of the sort. We'd had a session and I was trying to pick up something. Then all of a sudden I had the feeling like everybody was after me, see? Just for a moment. I spotted it suddenly where it was and where it was on the track and what I'd been doing at the particular point of it, and the feeling that they were still after me was almost overwhelming. It was right in present time, don't you see? I could practically feel the cops battering the door in there for about – oh, I don't know – it must have been over a second or so that the feeling lasted, see? I just knew that was what was going to happen. It puzzled me very much afterwards exactly why it happened for about three or four minutes, and then I added it up. It was a scarcity of dead families. Imagine that. Hadn't seen one for two or three billion years and all of a sudden saw one. Scared me half to death, see? I thought I'd done it! Yaw. Ooh. Horrible! And I didn't tell anybody I thought I must have done it. Somehow or another I must have produced this action, now withheld, and then I didn't look at it again. And it was just sensation of this and that. And just the process of ventilation of the thing, and nobody came in the doors, nobody came in the windows. The Galactic Empire didn't immediately send a despatch and a scout car to have me picked up for the execution, you see? Nothing happened. It's anticlimactic, whatever else it is.

Well, he hasn't made an effect with that one. So he drops it like a hot potato. And we don't care why auditing – we do care – but we don't have to go into why auditing works by what phenomena exist and as-ising and so forth. Let's not go into the actual complications of as-ising and all this sort of thing. Let's just look at this one interesting fact: that when the guy has presented something to his own view and the auditor's view and the roof hasn't fallen in as a result of it, or if the somatics turned on didn't actually kill him – and they never do, you know, unless you're listing the wrong goal – you get a sudden feeling of relief. You have ventilated something. They – various phrases have been applied to this basic phenomenon, you see? What you've done is, his attention doesn't have to be on it anymore because he doesn't have to hold it in. You've freed up his attention is what you've really done in the most common action. You presented something to view. The auditor hasn't knocked his head off.

Now supposing the auditor did this. The guy says – in this particular instance, the guy says, "I think I was, ohh, dead family lying there in a log cabin, and I think I killed them. Uop!"

And the auditor says, "...You what? You murdered a whole family? Mmmmmmmmm. Well, I don't know whether I care to audit you anymore." See, we let the bird create an effect with this thing, you see? We let him – we haven't ventilated it. He still has to hold onto it. It hasn't been presented to view. I mean, it doesn't fall with a thud. You get the idea? I mean, a lot of things here go on. And, man, that thing will persist like crazy. Let's just look at that as a fundamental that something happens. That is blowing something. You call it colloquially, "blowing something." The pc blew something. You do it all the time. You call it all the time. Well, that's what you're describing.

An auditor who will not let the pc answer an auditing question will not let the pc blow anything. And auditors have interesting mechanisms by which they forbid the answering of the auditing question. They use the meter. "Has anything been suppressed?"
And the pc says, "W – ." He's about to say, "Well, actually a – quite a few things. Yesterday, why, I was thinking about this and I suddenly said I'd better not think about it because I was supposed to study this bulletin, see? And so forth. And there was yesterday and a suppre – . I was about to say that." See, the pc is about to say that.

And you say, "Anything been suppressed in the area?"

And the pc is just saying, "W – ." He gets about that far.

And the auditor said, "Good. Well, that's good and clean. Thank you. All right. Has anything been invalidated? Good. That's good and clean."

The pc had about ready to say, "Well, yes. The suppression I just had was invalidated. I was just about to say that, see? But..."

"That's clean. That's good. Ha-ha-ha. Fine. All right. And all right. Is there anything on this you failed to reveal? That reads. That reads there. What was that? What was that?"

And the pc says, "Well, wasn't able to re – ." And he's about to say...

"Well, yes. Well, what was it?"

And the pc says, "Well, I-I was going to – going to – to tell you, there's a – there's a suppress – press – press read, and – uh-uh-uh-uh..."

"Well, what was it?"

And the pc says, "Well, I'm tr – trying to tell you. There's a – it's a-s-s-ppre-pre-a suppress read, and-an-an-an-and I was going to tell you about that, too."

"Well, what was it here, something you failed to reveal?" [laughter] "Right here. There. There. There. What's it? Where? What's it? What's it? Well, all right. I'll ask the question again now. Is there anything you failed to reveal? That's clean. I told you it was clean." [laughter]

Well, of course, no auditing occurs at all. You can actually tiger drill with complete impunity if your intention is well understood by the pc. You're just asking the meter and trying to check and that sort of thing. You're not interested in getting the thing answered. But there's even a way to do that, see?

You say, "All right. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" And "To catch catfish."

"Ah, well, that's – uh..." And the pc is saying, "Uh – that's, uh – I-I-I had – had – had an answer, you know? I thought of something that's suppressed. And – and so forth. And, uh – I had an answer there. I felt kind of suppressed in the session, just early on in the session, you see?"

"Oh, you did, huh? All right. Well, I'll check that. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed? Yeah, well, it's – it reads now. What was that?"

The pc says, "Well, I just told you. I mean, I um – umf – give me a session, I felt something, bzzzzz, that heh-heh."
"Oh, well, yeah. All right. That's fine. But there's a read here. And what's that? This is the one I want."

"Well, that's the one I'm trying to tell you."

"But well, this is right here." [raps on the e-meter] This read. This read. Suppressed. That's the one I want."

"This is what I'm trying to tell you."

"Oh, all right. Well, what was it? What was it? Go on. Well, say it anyhow, and then we'll clear this up. On the goal to catch catfish, anything being suppressed? That's it. That's the one. That's the one right there."

"Well," the fellow says, "pft-ft. I've told you."

"Well, it's reading on something here."

Pc said, "Well, it's probably an ARC break."

"Oh, well..." Auditor knows now he mustn't Q-and-A so he can't ask if there's an ARC break, see. [laughter] This whole thing would go completely around the bend, you see? It becomes a comedy of nonsense – just becomes asinine.

The way the mechanism works is every time the pc tells you something, you do something. You never Q-and-A. You could never be called guilty of Qing and Aing, you see? But still, it somehow works out that the pc says, "Well, at the beginning of the session, I was warm." And you go open the window. The pc doesn't quite know what to make out of this, see? He was trying to get off a withhold. You just asked him for a withhold, and he said, "Well, at the beginning of the session, I was sort of warm," and the auditor goes over and opens a window. Why, the pc realizes if he's going to get any auditing, he'd better not talk to this auditor. See that? The auditor never quite differentiates between these two things: of the pc asking him to do something and the pc getting off something. That's because the auditor doesn't understand what basic auditing is – the mechanism of blowing something. That's why auditing works. He never reads this difference in the pc.

The pc is saying, "Oh, my God! I just suddenly realized something. I have been withholding a Suppress here for the last four goals you were nulling."

Well, you got an interesting question there. That suppress is a pretty tricky button. This pc gets this off – he tells you. You say, "Well, all right. What is it?"

And he tells you what it is and so forth. "Well, I don't know." You got to put in an R-factor if you're going to do anything about it.

You say, "Do you think it affected those next goals?"

"Yes. Well, my mind wasn't on them at all."

"All right. Well, do you think it might be a good idea if we covered those again? What do you think of that?"

He says, "Well, yeah. Yeah, I better." Well, that's because he suddenly caught himself on a mistake. Don't you see? This is – you've got to have an ear for this sort of thing.
All right. Here's an entirely different situation. Pc said, "Well, I just suddenly realized that you asked me a Suppress question a minute ago and I've been sitting here with an answer to it. Well, I've been holding my breath every time you said anything because I was afraid my breathing was reacting on the meter."

And the auditor says, "All right. We'll check that Suppress question again."

Get the interesting dividing line, see? Well, the basics of auditing include the mechanism of blowing something. And if the auditor always does something or Qs-and-As and does – says something else and never buys anything from the pc, nothing is ever blown. And if the auditor never, even on a Tiger Drill, makes any allowances for the pc to say things to him and never sets it up in the session so the pc can talk to him, why, of course, the pc never blows anything. And after a while the missed withholds stack up, stack up, stack up, and it becomes painful because auditing works because the pc blows things. And the auditor is actually preventing auditing from working. Of course, the pc will stack up and almost blow his head off like he was an active volcano. It's just the force and power is built up on this thing. Oh, the pc must be permitted to blow things. It's as simple as that.

The answer to Q and A and TR 4 and all these other interestingly involved and technically difficult questions is whether or not the auditor is actually auditing the pc or going through a drill, see? That's the difference. And inevitably, if an auditor is having trouble differentiating this way and getting into ARC breaky sessions, they've got something that is – they've got a bug on preventing the pc from talking to them. Auditing can still happen under these circumstances, but it's rather rough; auditing can still be very successful under these circumstances, but it is tough auditing.

The more the pc is in-session, the more understanding and the less antagonism the auditor has for the pc, the more the pc can blow, the easier it is for the pc to go over the road he's going over, the more auditing occurs per unit of time. These are the basics of auditing.

And actually, an auditor ought to understand why auditing works; ought to be perfectly willing for the pc to talk to him and also realize that the pc's havingness will run down and right on out the bottom if the pc talks to the auditor too much. Because then the auditor isn't really being talked to. He's being talked at in some fashion.

You don't let a pc go on for three-quarters of an hour telling you about how his mother caved him in. You can't. You'll kill him.

You see these little dividing lines? An auditor has got to know these things. And an auditor has got to know that when he asks an auditing question, he's got to get an answer to that question, not some other question. And when that question is answered, by God, he's got to buy the answer to it. And if he finds himself in the embarrassing position of the question having been answered, but he didn't buy the answer but questioned it, of being graceful enough and willing to admit that he is wrong and apologize to the pc and say, "I'm very sorry. I didn't realize that that answered the auditing question." You know, bang, bang! Everything would go back into shape, and he keeps going.
If the auditor explains to the pc why he didn't think that was an answer to the auditing question and how he was really right in challenging the thing, of course, out goes the session because he hasn't let the pc blow anything.

And your pc feels better as he goes along. Now, auditing is validated for him. He becomes more willing to be audited, less defensive. If he feels worse all the time, he becomes harder to audit. And you try to get a pc with a lousy, dirty, scrubby needle that's going bzz, bzz, bzz, and you're trying to read through this thing and you're trying to do this. Now that you got a Dynamic Assessments, that cures it. You see? But oddly enough, if you're a good Prep-checker, you can also cure it. And oddly enough, you can actually assess on old 3GA on a dirty needle that you can clean. And you clean that dirty needle. And you should be able to do that. You should be able to clean up a pc's needle slick as a whistle. See? He's right in the middle of a rock slam. You should be good enough that you just clean up his needle, bang! You know? You ask him this, you ask him that, you ask him the other thing. Say, "What does that refer to?" Bzz. Bong! Bzzz. Bong! Got a perfectly even needle. You understand?

There's no excuse for trying to ask questions across a dirty needle. Of course, I will admit that I have spent as long as two hours, two hours and a half of a person's auditing time just shopping around for, "What the hell is this all about?" And then all of a sudden, why, strike the jackpot. Say, "Oh ho-ho, I get it. Yeah. I got it now." And ask the series of questions, straighten the thing out – pc assessable. Got the idea?

Pc would be prepcheckable on the thing. What turned it on? You must have turned it on somehow. It got turned on somewhere by something. An auditor ought to be able to clean up the pc's needle. Just similarly, an auditor without any meter at all should be able to sit there and just bleed every single one of these Precheck questions dry as a bone without another tick on them by just looking at the hunted look in the pc's eye, by looking at this, by looking at that; just watching that pc operate and keeping that pc talking to him until the pc looks nice and comfortable and relaxed and happy about that particular zone in question. You see? You ought to be able to do that.

You can't assess goals without a meter. At this stage of the game, you can't do it. Impossible! Period. Don't ever try it. You'll get into trouble, man. You'll have a pc so damned sick, he won't know whether he's coming or going. You're burying that boy, you understand? But you sure should be able to put a whole Model Session together without a meter within a mile of you – sensitivity to the pc. Don't get dependent on this meter to put a pc in-session. You should be able to – a good auditor should be able to put a pc in-session, put all of his rudiments in, make the pc happy as a bird, get a lot of things done and so forth. We did it for years with lots lousier technology than we got now. Ah, what's all this dependency on a meter? You put the mechanics in and take the human being out. And you should be able to get things done in an auditing session, not just audit for the purpose of auditing. And you ought to be able to allow the pc to get well, the pc to get up, the pc to have wins, the pc to do this.

If rules are so much in your road according to your understanding of the game, then you probably don't understand the rule. It isn't the rule is wrong. You just don't understand it. And it must then follow, immediately, that you're using the rule to audit the pc. And do you
know a rule will never acknowledge anything? You could set a rule down in front of the E-Meter, and it would never clean or clear anything.

Fundamental auditing, basic auditing simply consists of getting the pc in the session willing to talk to the auditor; and then, for God's sakes, let him talk to the auditor. And then be able to use the technology that you have in front of you to make himself feel better and put him in-session, square him up, bring him up smiling at the other end. You should be able to do that.

Actually, you should be able to audit a pc without a meter for an hour and bring him up at the other end – Model Session throughout – bring him up to the other end, have an Instructor check the thing and find – with a very sensitive meter – and find every rudiment in, neat as pie. You understand? If you could do that, you can audit.

And today I don't mind telling you the reason I'm giving you this particular basic data has really nothing to do with the fact that we are making bad auditors. We are not. It has to do with the fact that 3GA requires a superlatively good auditor. It's not going to get easier. I don't expect it to get easier; I expect it to get shorter. You understand? But the more you shorten it, the more tension you put on the pc. So the more you shorten it and the faster you do it, the better you've got to be as an auditor. So I have been studying basics. And that's what they amount to. And, actually, auditing consists of no more than I have told you in this lecture. Interesting, isn't it?

So wherever we see ARC breaks flying, we don't necessarily suppose we've got a bad auditor on our hands. But where it happens all the time, then somebody is auditing "by the rules" but not sitting in the auditing chair. Something or other – the rules are somehow being misused to keep the pc from talking to the auditor. We don't care about an ARC break, and a pc blowing his stack and going to hell in a balloon. His goal has been missed, and everything has gone to hell and so forth, but an auditor ought to be able to sweat it out one way or the other and get the job done. We don't care about that. We're talking about a persistent, continuous action of the pc always feels worse, the pc always feels more upset, we never get anything done in a session, the pc is always nattering, this, that and the other thing. You got that sort of thing. We're talking about that kind of thing. And that auditor must be auditing by the rules, man. He must be auditing "by the rules" on a sort of a white mutiny basis, you know? He should never Q-and-A. The pc says, "You know, there's a tack in this chair and it hurts, and that's what you're getting on the meter is this tack in this chair." [laughter]

And the auditor says, "I mustn't Q-and-A," and never removes the tack. Three sessions later – this has been going on for three sessions – why, he has a dirty needle and complains to the Instructor the fellow was unauditable. See? Well, I don't expect things like that to happen around here. Okay?

All right.

Thank you very much.
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**LRH:** All right. With all the excitement of finding fire and everything else coming along on top of it ... Have a seat. Okay. You can pick up those cans. Now, to put in an R-factor here, we're going to give you a going-over here on your Dynamic Assessment, the like of which you've never heard of before.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** All right. Now, a couple of times we've been over this and we've laid an egg and you gave me a nice list here and I didn't use it and that was my error. Okay?

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** And we're going to handle this now from that viewpoint. And all I'm going to do is put in the rudiments, give you a Dynamic Assessment, try and find an item or not find an item. All right? Is that all right with you?

**PC:** That's fine.

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

**PC:** Yep.

**LRH:** All right. Here it is: Start of session. All right. Has the session started for you?

**PC:** Yes.

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

**PC:** I want to work well in the session.

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** Feel better at the end of it.

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** Find the dynamic and the item.

**LRH:** Find the dynamic and the item?

**PC:** The item. Yeah.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Any other goals?

**PC:** No, they'll do.

**LRH:** All right. Are there any goals you'd like to set for life and livingness?

**PC:** Oh, to be more able.

**LRH:** All right. Anything else?

**PC:** Yes. To get through my sea – first big sea voyage without mishap.

**LRH:** Okay. Good enough. Is that it?

**PC:** That's it.
LRH: All right. Good enough.

Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Sure.

LRH: All right. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? All right. Looks smoother than ice. Okay?

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, when was the last time I audited you?

PC: Last Friday.

LRH: All right. Very good. Got that spotted?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?

PC: No, I don't think so.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Check it on the meter. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? All right. I'm not accustomed to this meter face, I'm going to have to check it again.

PC: Fair enough.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? Looks clean.

PC: I'm sure it is.

LRH: All right. Sorry to doubt you there.

PC: That's all right.

LRH: I wasn't doubting you.

PC: No. No.

LRH: All right. Okay. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Here we are. Let's check this on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? All right. There's possibly a tick on that of some kind or another. You got any thoughts concerning this?

PC: The only thing that comes to mind is I haven't done my packing yet and there's probably a little problem there.

LRH: All right.

PC: To fit it in.

LRH: Good enough. All right. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Let me check that now. Do you have a present time problem? Okay. No afterthoughts on that? Very good.

Okay. We're going straight into this Dynamic Assessment here. And these were the items that you broke down for this assessment. Now, are there any others? There's self, body, sex, family, children, groups, tribes, nations, countries, humans, mankind, animals, vegetation, matter, energy, space and time, birds, thought, spirit, supreme being, nature, Mother Nature.

PC: Two occurred to me. One – one's plants.

LRH: Okay.

PC: And I think after the second time – dynamic I would put "wives."

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right. Any others occur to you?

PC: No.

LRH: Hm? All right. Okay. Well, let's hope this is complete. Okay?
PC:  Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. And I'm just going to go right straight through here. Now – I'm going to check this on the meter: Consider committing overts against. All right. And think of doing something bad to. All right. We're going to use, "Consider committing overts against." All right?

PC:  All right.


PC:  There's something I want to tell you.

LRH: What?

PC:  That's just that one or one or two ago I got this pain turned on again across my chest again.

LRH: When I did what?

PC:  On two items back. I can't tell you which one it was, but ...

LRH: It turned on, huh?

PC:  Yes.

PC: The somatic just went as you finished doing it.

LRH: Right.

PC: And the other thing is that I had a slight hang-up when you gave matter, energy, space and time as one. I'd gotten them in my mind as individual dynamics.

LRH: Is that so? Well, very good. I thank you very much. I'll just put those all down the line in that order. Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good. And we'll catch them next time. All right?

PC: Fine.

LRH: Anything else you'd care to say?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Very good. Here we go again.

PC: All right.

LRH: Consider committing overts against body. Consider committing overts against body. Okay. Consider committing overts against body. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against sex. Consider committing overts against sex. Consider committing overts against sex. Consider committing overts against sex. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against wives. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Okay. Consider committing overts against groups. Okay. I'm going to leave that in. All right. Consider committing overts against tribes. All right. Consider committing overts against tribes. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. Okay. I'm going to leave that...No, we're not. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. All right. Well, I'm going to leave it in just for fun. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. That is in. All right. Consider committing overts against matter. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against energy. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against space. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against time. Consider committing overts against time. All right. That is in. All right. Consider committing overts against nature. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against Mother Nature. Okay. All right. That is in. Okay, we've got a few less this time. Anything you care to say before I swing down here again?

PC: No, it's - it seems to me that it's on overts that I'm getting this pain. It's considering overts. Not that, now this pressure, seems it's like a crushing pressure I'm getting across the chest. And at one time it was even making me - well it seemed - somewhat difficult to breathe. And I sort of caught myself doing this.

LRH: Oh, it was firing - overts was firing a couple of times.

PC: Oh, I see. Yes.

LRH: And I'm sure that that's - is a source of it.

PC: Mm.

LRH: When did it turn on that time?
PC:  Almost at the beginning. We got through the first two and then I noticed it was turning on again as we got to the second dynamic, wives and so on, it got a bit worse.

LRH:  Well, all right. Very good. Okay. You're finding me not reading this very smoothly here to you. That's because I've got a very limbered-up meter here in front of me.

PC:  Uh-huh.

LRH:  It's probably running at about 64 times a Mark IV.

PC:  Mm-hm.

LRH:  And it's got a very fast dial swing. So forgive me if I seem to halt.

PC:  Surely.

LRH:  All right. Okay. Here we go again. Consider committing overts against body. Consider committing overts against body. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against wives. Okay. That is in. Okay. Consider committing overts against groups. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against tribes. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against countries. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. Once more. Consider committing overts against countries. Consider committing overts against countries. Maybe it's firing; I'll leave it in anyhow. All right. Consider committing overts against matter. Consider committing overts against matter. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against space. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against time. Okay. Consider committing overts against time. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against nature. Consider committing overts against Mother Nature. Okay. Those are out. And consider committing overts against forms. Consider committing overts against forms. Consider committing overts against forms. Consider committing overts against forms. All right. Here we go again. Getting less now... No, we're not going. Here's a ... Have you thought of any other dynamics or anything else that should be on this list?

PC:  I haven't thought of any, no.

LRH:  Haven't thought of any? The list isn't necessarily missing?

PC:  No.

LRH:  Have you thought of anything else that should be on this list?

PC:  The only thought on that line that has occurred to me is "bodies" instead of "body." Or as well as.

LRH:  All right.

PC:  That - that was the only one that seemed - suggested anything to me at all.

LRH:  All right. Anything else should be on the list? All right. Thank you. Well, here we go again. Okay?

PC:  Yes.

LRH:  All right. Consider committing overts against bodies. All right. Consider committing overts against bodies. Consider committing overts against bodies. Okay. Thank you. That is in. Consider committing overts against wives. Consider committing overts against wives. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against groups. Okay. Consider commit-
ting overts against groups. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against tribes. Consider committing overts against tribes. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against nations. Okay. That is out. Consider committing overts against countries. Okay. I'm going to test both of those again just for sure. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. Oh, there's a little ping left on there. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Thank you. That is in. Okay. Consider committing overts against matter. Consider committing overts against matter. All right. The world of machines form a dynamic?

PC: Machines. That would be the sixth. Machinery.

LRH: Machines form a dynamic?

PC: Machines ought... They could do. I'd be quite happy to have it on the list.

LRH: Well, is it or isn't it? How would you phrase that?

PC: Machinery. If anything.

LRH: Machinery.

PC: Machinery.

LRH: All right. Let's just put it on here for fun, shall we?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: I'm not missing one. We've got one.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: But we're just making absolutely sure here.

PC: Well, I just look around that for a minute, the... oh, power is the - would be the description for me of machinery and would be - would be a dynamic, you see, power.

LRH: All right. Power.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Very good. Let's put power and machinery on the list, shall we?

PC: That's fine.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Okay. Consider committing overts against machinery. All right. Consider committing overts against machinery. All right. Thank you. Consider committing ... That's out.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. All right. Consider committing overts against power. Okay. Consider committing overts against power. All right. We'll leave that in. Consider committing overts against matter. Okay. That is out. Consider committing overts against space. Okay. That is in. Consider committing overts against time. All right. That is in. Consider committing overts against forms. Consider committing overts against forms. I'll take another look at that. Consider committing overts against forms. All right. That is out. All right. Anything else you'd care to say before we fire down this line, huh?

PC: No.

LRH: Okay. Here we go again. All right. Consider committing overts against bodies. Okay. That is out. Let me check it. Consider committing overts against bodies. Consider committing overts against bodies. All right. That's out. Consider committing overts against groups. Okay. That's in. Consider committing overts against tribes. Okay. Consider committing overts against
tribes. Consider committing overts against tribes. Okay. That is out. Consider committing overts against nations. Okay. Consider committing overts against nations. Consider committing overts against nations. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against countries. Okay. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. What did you think of just then?

**PC:** Oh, just - just before you asked me. It was about um - you'd asked me about machinery and I was - you were coming up to this and I remembered it was out and I went out of session a bit. And um - wondered why you'd asked, you see, I thought, oh gosh, has he got a stage four needle or something turned on.

**LRH:** No.

**PC:** Well, that was the thought.

**LRH:** Nothing wrong with your needle. Thank you very much. All right, Thank you. All right. Here we go. Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. All right. That's in. Consider committing overts against space. All right. Consider committing overts against space. Consider committing overts against space. Okay. Consider committing overts against space. Against space. Yeah, that's out. Consider committing overts against time. Consider committing overts against time. Consider committing overts against time. All right. That's in. All right. We have a very few left here. And it's going -all is proceeding very fine. I'm reading this meter at - at top revs.

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** And all is well. Okay. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Ah, that's still got to be with us. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. That's in. And consider committing overts against power. Okay. That's in. Consider committing overts against time. All right. That's in. There we are. Well, we're boiled down now to three. And here we go.

**PC:** I've a horrible feeling that I'm about to be found out, you know.

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:** Back to the wall.

**LRH:** All right. All right. Okay. Anything you'd care to say before I sail into this next one?

**PC:** No, thank you.

**LRH:** All right, all right. Okay. Consider committing overts against groups. All right. Consider committing overts against groups. All right. That's in. Consider committing overts against countries. Okay. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. Consider committing overts against countries. All right. That is out. Consider committing overts against power. All right. That's in. Consider committing overts against time. Yes, that is in. Now, anything you care to say here?

**PC:** That's a painful operation, this.

**LRH:** Does it hurt?

**PC:** Yes.
LRH: What's hurting? Your back?

PC: Back and chest. I mean, sort of clamp. My back is pressed hard on the chair from the front, you see, and it's real intent on being crushed.


PC: That's all right.

LRH: Okay. All right. Here we go. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. Consider committing overts against groups. What does it do when I say that on the somatic?

PC: Well, it - it's pressing this – pressure particularly and pain on the right –on the spine, in the back. And uh ...

LRH: Is it that one that gives you an odd feeling?

PC: Yes. And it's - as you were saying it then I felt that all the time. I'm sort of resisting this - something from on my back, you see. It's right on me shoul... lower part of me shoulders.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: That's all I can tell you, I'm afraid.

LRH: All right. Is that "groups" that turns that on? You note it more noticeably than the others?

PC: I can't honestly tell you which one it is. it's ...

LRH: All right.

PC: It turns on intermittently.

LRH: Very good. All right. We're going to check groups once more. Consider committing overts against groups. That's out. All right. Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. All right. That's in. Consider committing overts against time. Okay. Consider committing overts against time. Okay. Consider committing overts against time. That is out. Leaving us with power. That's the dynamic. Now, how does your back feel?

PC: Well, it's easier. I'm still aware of the pressure.

LRH: It eased right up, did it?

PC: It eased right up, yes.

LRH: All right. Good. Did you notice it turning on with one dynamic more than another?

PC: Um, well after you left it this last time around and in between um - time and the one before it - I forgot what it was, power, come to think of it - it's uh - I had terrific breathing. You know, labored breathing, it was turning into; it was really quite a ...

LRH: You didn't like it.

PC: I didn't like it at all, right.

LRH: All right. Did you notice which one that turned on with?

PC: Well, I should say it would be on power. I - I'd completely forgot which one it was. It was the one before time, you see.

LRH: All right. Let's see what we've got here, all right? Okay. Consider committing overts against power. All right. We'll find out how right or wrong we were
here. Consider committing overts against power. Okay. Consider committing overts against power. There it is. Consider committing overts against power. How's your spine?

PC: It's painful.

LRH: You didn't like that?

PC: No.

LRH: All right.

PC: It's a crushing - painful. Christ, it's not a knife pain, it's a crushing pain.

LRH: All right. That turns on when I say that, huh?

PC: Yes.


PC: Well, it's - I'm getting the idea of being crushed, you see, from right across the chest. I haven't got a picture of this, but it's as if I've got something heavy on me chest pushing right down on my back, you see.


PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Now, has this item been suppressed? Yes. What's that?

PC: Uh, this is suppression of power, because - not quite in the sense of the word. I suppose it would boil down to the same thing, but in my business position, I mean, I suppressed the power. I mean, I wouldn't - hate to take advantage of it.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Suppress it to that degree.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Has this item been suppressed? Any more than that? Has this item been suppressed? All right. It seems clear at the moment. All right. Has this item been invalidated? Have a thought there?

PC: Well, it flashed on to Dick Halpern when he was auditing me on - uh - this ties up with authority. Sort of submitting to authority.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Uh, authority being a power, you see.

LRH: Mm.

PC: This would be the connection there.

LRH: Mm.

PC: That was the thought.

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Has this item been invalidated? All right. There might be a little something there.

PC: Well yes, um - this is a bitter complaint of mine that if you're successful, people try to make nothing of you. And I've been successful in - in one field, anyway.

LRH: All right.

PC: And people do try and make nothing of it.

LRH: All right. Good enough. All right. Has this item been invalidated? Looks clean at the moment.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. On this item has anything been suggested? Got any answer there?

PC: Nothing comes to mind on suggest.
LRH: All right. Anything on this item you've failed to reveal? Yes. What's that?

PC: Yes. I would secretly - not so secretly either - but secretly use power very often myself.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: And an instant occurs to mind quite recently where I wanted my own way, so I just came in with the power to get my own way. And did.

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. On the item power, is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. How does that seem now?

PC: It seems all right.

LRH: On the item power is there anything you've been careful of?

PC: Very careful how to use it. And to respect it.

LRH: Uh-huh. All right. Very good. On the item power is there anything you have been careful of? There is something.

PC: Electricity. Yes, I am careful with electricity. And I know that if I'm in doubt at all then I'm ultra careful. As long as I know it's all right. But I am careful with electrici - electrical power, in other words.

LRH: All right. Thank you. On the item power is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Does that seem neat to you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. On the item power has anything been suppressed? What's that?

PC: Well, thought of a rhyme on it - compressed - for some reason or other. The chest has been compressed. But, well I go around suppressing it all the time. There was somebody on this course who had an item, something, "To be the hidden secret" or "hidden power," or something. Wasn't it? And this, I thought when I saw it, well that's something in my line because here I am a pretty wealthy man and I can walk into - around London and there are people probably not so well off who get a lot of notice taken of them and are particularly avoided. You see? Because, well, it's dangerous.

LRH: All right.

PC: So I suppressed power that I would have to that degree.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. On the item power has anything been suppressed? Another one? Perhaps there's another one. I wouldn't swear to it.

PC: Well, I think I've got something there somewheres.

LRH: Yeah, there it is - ticking on something. There it is.

PC: Electricity. Yes, I am careful with electricity. And I know that if I'm in doubt at all then I'm ultra careful. As long as I know it's all right. But I am careful with electrici - electrical power, in other words.

LRH: All right. Thank you. On the item power is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Does that seem neat to you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. On the item power has anything been suppressed? What's that?
suppressed? There's something right there. There it is. There it is.

PC: Well, yes. I don't seem to be making myself out a very good man... Why I suppress power is that um - I suppose what I'm fighting though is doing an overt. I'm avoiding overt here. But I suppress disposing ... I have the power to sell my business for quite a nice sum of money and I suppress the desire - suppress it. And the excuse I put up here is that I wouldn't like to use my power again the employees. You see, they might not have such a good deal with another employer. I'm not so sure that that is the truth of it, Ron, but that's how it looks to me. That's what I see.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Probably worse than that.

LRH: Okay. All right. On the item power is there anything you have suppressed? It looks clean at the moment.

On the item power is there anything you have invalidated? Looks clean. Have a thought?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. On the item power is there anything you have suggested?

PC: I don't get anything.

LRH: All right. On the item power is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's good.

On the item power is there anything you have been careful of? There is something.

PC: Careful. Oh, yes, this is, whenever I've been up against anybody who in my estimation is more powerful, then I have had to be very, very careful and adopt evading tactics or something like that.

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. All right. On the item power is there anything you have been careful of? All right. That looks clean.

PC: All right.

LRH: Okay. I'm just going to say this item a few times now. Power. Power. Power. All right. Now, let's use the question we were using.

Consider committing overt against power. Consider committing overt against power. Okay. Consider committing overt against power. Yes. It's firing.

PC: Okay.

LRH: It's firing. All right. Nothing else is on the list, but it is. Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. So let's try to list this thing out and see where we land. Okay?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay. Now, let's see what we can do with this. I don't guarantee to do anything with it, but we will try. Okay?

PC: Can I blow my nose for a minute?

LRH: You sure may. Put the cans down as far as that's concerned.

... All right. Okay. Let's just see what luck we have here. Okay?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. The question is: What represents power to you?

PC: Got that.

LRH: All right. Very good. Here we go. What represents power to you?

PC: A dynamo. A dynamo.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A group of people. A group - a group of people, yes.
LRH: All right.
PC: A general.
LRH: A general?
PC: Yes.
LRH: Very good.
LRH: Right.
PC: A board of management.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Company directors. Rulers.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Kings.
LRH: Good.
PC: Women.
LRH: Hm?
PC: Women.
LRH: Okay. Very good.
PC: A lion.
LRH: A lion?
PC: A lion.
LRH: All right.
PC: I’m sorry about this one: a tiger.
LRH: Oh-ho-ho - Very good.
PC: Well now, a panther and a jaguar.
LRH: All right.
PC: Um ...

LRH: What represents power to you?
LRH: Okay. Okay. What represents power to you?
PC: A steam engine.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A steamroller.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Something that crushes.
LRH: Something that crushes.
PC: Yes. You can also describe that in another way as well, as a crusher.
LRH: All right.
PC: A fighter. Yes, a fighter.
LRH: All right.
PC: And... a heavyweight boxer.
LRH: Okay.
PC: And a wrestler.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A statue.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A statue of a - of a muscular man.
LRH: Is that a statue, then a statue of a muscular man?
PC: Yes.
LRH: Yes. All right. All right. What represents power to you?
PC: Dive bomber.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A battleship.
LRH: Okay.
PC: This is going from the sub-lime. A little seed. A little seed, yes.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Well, an atom.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A claw. C-I-a-w.
LRH: Right.
PC: A torture - a torture chamber.
LRH: Well, okay.
PC: Sun... Did you get that one?
LRH: Yeah, I got it. I'm sorry.
What represents power to you?
PC: Sun and a ...
LRH: I'm sorry I did get it. Okay.
PC: Got it?
LRH: Got it.
PC: Uh-huh... A windmill.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Wind.
LRH: The wind?
LRH: Okay.
PC: A gun.
LRH: Okay.
PC: And a cannon.
LRH: A cannon?
PC: A cannon, yes.
LRH: All right.
PC: A cannonball.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A mystic.
LRH: All right.
PC: A clever man.
LRH: Okay.
PC: An accomplished man.
LRH: All right. Okay.
PC: Could I have the question again please?
LRH: I'm sorry. What represents power to you?
PC: Thank you. The sea.
LRH: Okay.
PC: It's better described - uh - tell you - uh - is better described as "the relentless sea," for some reason or other. Volcano.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A kettle.
LRH: Mm-hm.
PC: A rocket.
LRH: Mm-hm. Okay.
PC: A flea.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Terrific power a flea has in comparison with its size.
LRH: All right.
PC: Armor.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A sledge hammer. A bludgeon.
LRH: Okay.
PC: And a morning star.
LRH: Okay. Excellent.
PC: A mace.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A crown.
LRH: All right.
PC: An orb. And a scepter.
LRH: That's an orb ...
PC: Uh-huh.
LRH: ... and a scepter.
PC: Yes.
LRH: All right.
PC: A throne.
LRH: Okay. What represents power to you?
PC: An electric battery.
LRH: A what?
PC: An electric battery.
LRH: An electric ...
PC: Battery.
LRH: ... battery. Okay. And what represents power to you?
PC: A sports car.
LRH: A what?
PC: A sports car.
LRH: Oh, yes. All right. Good.
PC: Um ...
LRH: A what?
PC: Knowledge.
LRH: Knowledge?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: All right. Good.
PC: Know-how.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Oh, authority. And a government.
LRH: Okay. All right.
PC: And a council.
LRH: All right.
PC: Supreme council. A commander.
LRH: Okay. All right.
PC: Torpedo.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Seem to have run out. Food.

Food.
LRH: Mm-hm. Good.
PC: Sugar.
LRH: Okay. There's something there.
PC: Light.
LRH: Hm?
PC: Light.
LRH: All right. Thank you. What represents power to you?
PC: Heat.
LRH: Okay.
LRH: Mm-hm. Very much so. Thank you.
PC: Clenched fist.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A big building.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A city.
LRH: All right.
PC: It's a - a city of stone.
LRH: Okay. Something there?
PC: Leader.
LRH: Okay. All right.
PC: A fire.
LRH: A fire?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Good. What represents power to you?
PC: Steam.
LRH: Steam?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Ability.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Laws.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Contracts. Agreements.
LRH: Okay.
PC: Certainty.
LRH: What?
PC: Certainty.
LRH: All right. Very good. All right. What represents power to you?
PC: Words.
LRH: Okay. What represents power to you?
PC: The oratory.
LRH: Okay. What represents power to you?
PC: A bus.
LRH: Bus?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay. What represents power to you?
PC: Force.
LRH: What?
PC: Force.
LRH: Mm-hm. Okay.
PC: Um ...
LRH: Something there?
PC: Yes. There's something on the mystery line here. It's a ... I can't ...
LRH: There it is.
PC: Invisible.
LRH: Hm?
PC: Invisibleness. Invisibility.
LRH: Invisibility.
PC: Yes.
LRH: Very good.
PC: A crankshaft.
LRH: Okay.
PC: A propeller shaft.
LRH: All right.
PC: I suppose I ought to put down "money."
LRH: Oh, you put down "money"? All right. Very good.
PC: That's them all. I'm dry.
LRH: All right. You feel kind of run dry? Let me test this question here. All right. Is this list complete? All right. Let's see what's happened to the item. Power. Power. Power. Power. Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. Consider committing overts against power. All right. Consider committing overts against power. Well, this list may or may not be complete here. How do you feel about it? Think there's something still on it?
PC: Well, I'd have to dig very hard, I mean I could probably come up with some more items...

LRH: Well, don't worry about that.

PC: ...but I think it's complete.

LRH: You think it is complete?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Do you feel it is complete? Or don't you?

PC: Yes. I-I thought it was complete when I said to you that.

LRH: All right. Very good.

Now, what - what's happened to that somatic in your back?

PC: Well the somatic in the back's gone. The crush has gone.

LRH: Mm.

PC: Towards the end there I had this heart somatic turn on and that's gone. There's just a slight vestige of it there now, but I think if I were to stand up that would have gone.

LRH: Mm.

PC: Well, that's what's happened.

LRH: All right. And they're gone now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Got any sensation of dizziness?

PC: Not dizziness. Muzziness, rather. You know?

LRH: You've got a feeling of muzziness?

PC: There's a difference to me. Dizziness you go round and round. Muzziness you just, yeaaah.

LRH: All right. And when did that turn on?

PC: Oh, whilst I was - I don't know - was about the middle of the list I should think, the muzziness turned on.

LRH: It did?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. How are these somatics now?

PC: They're all right. I've got no somatics now.

LRH: Do they exist at all?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Well, I'm going to see here ... Is this list complete? Consider committing overts against power. All right. Well, we'll see what we've got here. You apparently have listed out your favorite Dynamic Assessment's somatic. Is that right?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Huh?

PC: Overt somatic, I should think.

LRH: Oh, all right. I don't know whether we have time actually to null this list or not. But, if you will put up with the possibility that we will have to leave it and finish it at some other time ...

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: I will be very happy to begin it here.

PC: That's fine with me.

LRH: All right. We'll see what we've got here. Okay?

PC: Mm-hm.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**LRH:** A board of management. That's - yes, that's out.

**PC:** Rulers. You thinking about something?

**LRH:** He found it on you?

**PC:** He found it - he had it on his line I think, and then I think it came out when he was assessing me or something.

**LRH:** Oh, yes. All right. Rulers. Rulers. Rulers. Rulers. All right. I haven't got anything on it. It's out.

Kings. Okay. Kings. All right. That's in.

Women. Okay. That's out. What'd you just think of?

**PC:** I just thought Dick had ruler or something. He found that - that item on me.

**LRH:** He found it on you?

**PC:** He found it - he had it on his line I think, and then I think it came out when he was assessing me or something.

**LRH:** Oh, yes. All right. Rulers. Rulers. Rulers. Rulers. All right. I haven't got anything on it. It's out.

Kings. Okay. Kings. All right. That's in.

Women. Okay. That's out. What'd you just think of?

**PC:** I just thought that I'm feeling very nervous. Just noticed that I was nerv... feeling very nervous, for some reason or another.


**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** And we're going down the line on this on the subject of overts. Okay?

**PC:** All right.


**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** Any somatic turn on?

**PC:** There's a different one. It's something up in this shoulder now.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Not worried.

**LRH:** All right. Consider committing overts against a crusher. Okay. That's out.

Something we forgot to put on the list. All right. Okay? You don't mind my putting that on your list?

**PC:** You're welcome.

PC: No. That's all right.

LRH: All right. What's the matter? Anything in particular?

PC: You just started to say consider - you started to say committing without saying consider first.

LRH: Oh.

PC: On that one. And then you asked me if something was the matter. And it went right away.


PC: Oh, no.

LRH: Got it? All right. Consider committing overts against a gun. Okay. That's out. Consider committing overts against a cannon. Yes. Consider committing overts against a cannon. Okay. That's out. We're going to make it very easily here. Anything you'd care to say?

PC: That's very good. Glad of that.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Glad of that.


**PC:** Unless it's just in the last four. That's up in this shoulder again. It's into the chin. Nothing very serious, but just noticed it's painful.

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. All right. Consider committing overts against authority. Thank you. I'll check that again. Consider committing overts against authority. All right. That's out. Consider committing overts against a government. Consider committing overts against a council. All right. What thought did you have? That's out.

**PC:** I thought you were going to check on "Consider having overts." You stopped when you said overts - presumably the needle went off or something.

**LRH:** When was that?

**PC:** Just then. And you said, "Consider having overts" and then you said again, "Consider having overts against a council." I thought you were checking on the word overt.


**PC:**  *All right.*

**LRH:** You're all right? Put your cans down for a minute. And you're actually surviving?

**PC:**  *Yes.*

**LRH:** All right. Very good. I thought you might like to rest your paws for a minute.

**PC:**  *Thank you.*

**LRH:** Going to tear down the line here, we should have this very shortly.

**PC:**  *Mm-hm.*


**PC:** No.

**LRH:** All right. Fine. Got a few left here and we'll be tearing down the line. Any somatic turn back on again?

**PC:** There's bit this way right across here, right in this area.

**LRH:** All right. All right.

**PC:** Comes and goes.


Well, the charge went someplace else. Let's see what we've got now. There's not very many here now, so let's see what we can do with these. Okay?

Consider committing overts against a group of people. Okay. That's out. Consider committing overts against kings. Thank you. That's out. Consider committing overts against a jaguar. All right.

**PC:** Fine.

**LRH:** All right. Good enough. Consider committing overts against a jaguar. All right. That's out. All right. Consider committing overts against a clever man. Against a clever man. Okay. That's out. Consider committing overts against a bludgeon. Consider committing overts against a bludgeon. Okay, that's out, and that's that. All right. Now on this list - on this list has anything been suppressed? Think of anything on it that's been suppressed? How is your somatic?

**PC:** Just had a - I suppressed telling you then that when you said a clever man, I did get a - quite a sharp somatic in the - I don't think it's in my heart there, but it's in the - in the chest there.

**LRH:** Is that so?

**PC:** And I was rather - I thought, well, you know, I was rather surprised it went out. But I suppressed telling you that.

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. All right, on this list is there anything you have suppressed? Something there?

**PC:** I only suppressed something I thought whilst you were running it, but it has nothing to do - Oh, no, I know what it is - I suppressed telling you at one stage that I had gone out of session, in my mind, Id missed quite a - two or three words that you read. I didn't - I didn't hear them.

**LRH:** All right. Good enough. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right on this list is there anything you have suppressed? Okay, thank you. All right. We will now check the last two items. Okay? Consider committing overts against a jaguar. Okay. That's still out. And consider committing overts against a clever man. Yes, there it is. Okay. Consider committing overts against a clever man. Okay. Now, on this item is there anything you have suppressed? Yes.

**PC:** Well, I suppressed telling you then this one: this is the only item on this list that I felt I could do anything with. Do you see?

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:** And then I suppressed telling you that it was - then I suppressed telling you that. And there we are.

**LRH:** When did you do that?

**PC:** Just -just now when you ...

**LRH:** Oh all right. Very good.

**PC:** ... when you read it.

**LRH:** Thank you, I got it. All right, on this item is there anything you have suppressed? Okay, it looks clean. Okay, let's see what we got here now.
A clever man. Okay. A clever man. All right. On this item has anything been invalidated? Yes, what's that?

**PC:** Well I must - I think I've invalidated clever men.

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** All my life.

**LRH:** All right, good enough. All right. On this item is there anything you have invalidated?

**PC:** Myself.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Some- everybody - many people. I have been told many times that I've been clever, but I've never considered myself as being clever.

**LRH:** Oh, all right, thank you. All right, on this item is there anything you have invalidated? All right. That look clean to you, too?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right. On this item has anything been... suppressed, next one.

**PC:** I've suppressed the name, the item now, clever man, clever man. I'd - I'd forgotten what the item was. I suppressed that.

**LRH:** All right, thank you. On this item has anything been suppressed? Anything been suppressed? Yes, something.

**PC:** I've suppressed the name, the item now, clever man, clever man. I'd - I'd forgotten what the item was. I suppressed that.

**LRH:** All right, thank you. On this item has anything been suppressed? Okay. You had an afterthought there. What was that?

**PC:** Well, that's that in the crazy, mixed-up way that we are, this could well turn out to be my item - to be an item anyway.

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** Okay, very good. You got a somatic on it now?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Disappeared.

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right, very good. On this item has anything been suppressed? Okay. How's that now?

**PC:** That's all right. Only little thought I had there.

**LRH:** You had a little thought.

**PC:** Yes, the only little thought I had then was that... it's got something to do with clever men. That I'm suppressing it the whole time. I'm not - I don't consider I'm clever and never - dexterous would probably be the word - dexterous would be - that's right - when one is using one's hands and so on. I'm not.

**LRH:** Um.

**PC:** That's probably what cleverness means to me.

**LRH:** All right, very good. On this item - on this item has anything been suppressed? Okay, that could be cleaned up a bit more ...

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** ... and we're going to leave it at that.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** Okay, here we go. Now, let us go into the end rudiments if that is all right with you.
PC: That's fine.

LRH: Okay? Now, is there anything you care to say before we do that?

PC: No.

LRH: You all right?

PC: I'm fine.

LRH: All right. Let me at least mark down the time. Okay, and here are your end rudiments. All right.

In this session have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? What was the untruth?

PC: The untruth was when you asked me a little while what you thought - what I thought of - you said you got a little – I said I had a little thought - you said, "You had a little thought?" And then when I came to it the thought wasn't there and I'd lost it; and I gave you an answer, but it wasn't really the answer, and that thought had just disappeared. That was the untruth.

LRH: All right, thank you very much. In this session have you told me any untruth? Untruth? What was the untruth?

PC: The afterthought was that when you asked me what I was thinking about – oh, about the meter, and you moved, that it - my pointing out rather emphatically that's what I thought about, might have damaged you in some way, you see. That is to say that you had handled a – Qed-and-Aed with me.

LRH: Oh, all right. Oh, all right, thank you. Thank you very much. Good. All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Um.

LRH: All of those? All right. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Equivocal. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right. Any comment there?

PC: Once during the assessing my grip just tightened a little bit, and I just wondered whether it had influenced the meter or not.

LRH: All right, very good. All right, in this session have you done anything here to tame this thing down. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? What's that? Something.

PC: Well, you told me to put the cans on the table when I blew my nose and then I picked them up without you telling me.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: So I'd done something wrong with the command.

LRH: Omission.

PC: Omission, yes.

LRH: All right. Thank you. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? All right, do you agree that is clean?

PC: Um.

LRH: Very good. In this session have you decided anything? That's something.

PC: Hm!?
LRH: What have you decided? There it is.

PC: Oh! This was early on in the session after you had done the rudiments, and I think a bit before session, but it seemed to me that to really be in-session you would - right here and now in present time, and your attention wasn't on anything at all - and you could damn well tell if the rudiments were out or not because immediately it was presented to you it was there, and you can tell whether the rudiment is going to be clean or not.

LRH: Is this the auditor or the pc, what?

PC: The pc.

LRH: The pc. And what was it again now? Let me ...

PC: That - is to be right here in present time.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And to, when the - when the rudiment is done, if there is anything on it at all and the meter is going to read it comes up.

LRH: I see.

PC: It's there. Otherwise your mind is just not - nothing comes there at all to pick up. And it's quite - it was my decision, I decided I knew this, you see? That is why I twisted it around to decision, but it's sort of a cognition in the session.

LRH: Well, I don't quite dig this. I'm not going to do this just to end this session rapidly, but right frankly I've not quite got this straight.

PC: Well you asked me ...

LRH: Either my attention is wandering, or I don't quite track this. What is it?

PC: Well, I decided that I knew what to be in-session was.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right, go on.

PC: And as I explained to you that to be in-session - when one is in-session - that you are right here and now, in present time ...

LRH: I get it.

PC: ... and your attention is not on anything else at all except the auditor.

LRH: I get it. All right.

PC: And it's quite something to realize, I think, because you can tell whether a rudiment is out, or - or what, and you are sort of just poised here waiting for the next auditor's command. It's quite something.

LRH: All right, very good. Now, I dig it now.

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. All right, let's see if this is clean now, check this on the meter. In this session have you decided anything? All right. In this session have you decided anything? Well, there's one more, one more, there's another one here. What is it? Another decision. There it is.

PC: Oh, oh, it's difficult to twist this around to decision, but it was to do with the sea and the - the item was the rate - no, was it the relentless sea, I think I put it down as ...

LRH: Yes, yes.

PC: ... and when this went out I decided that, well, that settles it, I'm going to have a good voyage.

LRH: Ah-ah, all right. Good enough, good enough. I shouldn't have pulled that one, should I?
PC: No!

LRH: Okay. Let me check that again. In this session have you decided anything? All right, there is still one on decided. That's decided anything. I don't quite know what to make out of this. Perhaps you can untangle this for me. There's something.

PC: I think I decided that I could, well - at some stage decided I could get my packing done quite easily in the morning. Oh, I think, I know what it was, I decided not to come into - I decided to do my packing before I came to Saint Hill in the morning.

LRH: Well, very good, very good, all right. Thank you. All right, let me check that on the meter now. In this session have you decided anything? All right, there is another decision here.

PC: Oh, really.

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: Well, I noticed your suit and the color of it, and I've got one that is light color, and then I decided that the odds against two people - two men - turning up with the same suit, pattern, were very remote.

LRH: Ha-ha, oh dear.

PC: And I just decided it - decided that the odds were rather great.

LRH: The what now?

PC: The odds against it were great, you see.

LRH: Oh, very good.

PC: I've been busy, haven't I?

LRH: All right. That's perfectly all right. All right. In this session have you decided anything? All right, equivocal. In this session have you decided anything? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah, that's clean now.

LRH: All right, very good. In this session have you thought, said or done anything I failed to find out about? Let me check it again. In this session have you thought, said or done anything I failed to find out about? All right, there's a tick here.

PC: Well, it was - well, what I think of at once, on "said", that I gave you an item, and I wasn't sure whether you'd got it or not.

LRH: That is correct.

PC: Um.

LRH: All right. That's perfectly all right. In this session have you thought, said or done anything I failed to find out about? In this session have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out about? All right. I get a bang-bang on a thought, and a said, thought, said or done. I get a thought, said and a done - the lot.

PC: Well, all right, well I moved - I moved forward in my chair once

LRH: Um-hm.

PC: ...whilst you were assessing, and I thought to mention it and then I thought I wouldn't, and I didn't.

LRH: All right.

PC: There's the whole lot for you, right?

LRH: All right, all right. Okay. In this session - in this session, have you thought, said or done anything I failed to find out about? In this session have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out about? There's a halt here. It's probably on my repeating it, but it hit the pin over here. What thought did you have while I was rolling that?
PC: Well, I thought it must be clean by now. It's - you've found out everything that's gone on in this session, I'm sure.

LRH: All right. In this session have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out about? Yeah, it's clean. All right, here we go, one more. In this session has anything been misunderstood? What's that?

PC: Oh, you misunderstood my cognition when I was trying to tell you. I had to tell you again.

LRH: All right, thank you, all right. In this session is there anything that was misunderstood? That's it, all right, good enough. In this session was the room all right? Now what was that on the room?

PC: A bit warm.

LRH: A bit warm, thank you. In this session was the room all right? Okay, once more, anything else on that?

PC: Well, I got it ready, and I - as I did it I thought well this isn't quite the job for the preclear. But it didn't matter, it was my job anyway.

LRH: Oh, I see, all right.

PC: I moved this chair, do you see, changed the chairs and wondered whether that was - that was the more comfortable chair, but I thought this was the right one.

LRH: Very good, all right. In this session was the room all right? Okay. Squeeze the cans. All right, put the cans down. Okay.

Feel the table. All right. Feel your jacket. Thank you. Feel the table. Thank you. Feel the telephone. Thank you. Feel that piece of wire. Thank you. Feel the back of the meter. Thank you. Feel both cans. Good. Pick them up.

All right, squeeze the cans. That's better. Do it again. All right, thank you very much. How's your havingness feel?

PC: It feels fine.

LRH: Feels fine? All right. Thank you very much. Now, did you make any part of your goals for this session? To work well in session?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Yes, all right. To feel better at end?

PC: Yeah, I feel very bright.

LRH: All right, good. To find the dynamic and the item?

PC: We found the dynamic but, ah - well, I think we found the item, anyway, you know yourself.

LRH: All right.

PC: Pc's never right, I know, but never mind.

LRH: Very good, all right. Okay, are there any other gains you'd care to mention?

PC: Well, I feel a lot brighter and - and that cognition about in-session was very, very good.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Got a terrific reality on that.

LRH: Good.

PC: And I think, I think I've shown myself somehow or another - we've had a look at something en route here on - about the sea voyage, you know.

LRH: Oh, all right, okay.
PC: I don't feel as nervous as I did in the middle of the session about things. I think I've gotten rid of a lot of fear, or something.

LRH: All right, very good.

PC: I might just say one other thing, that I did realize whilst I was going through, that a lot of the items I gave you were very overwhelming, and things I was scared of, and to some degree I must have done quite a bit of confronting there, and I'm sure that will have - you know, I shall notice this as an advance.

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right, anything else?

PC: No, that's fine.

LRH: Good enough. Now is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: I just want to say thank you very much.

LRH: All right, you're welcome. All right, here it is. End of session.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: All right, very good.
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Well, that's very nice of you. Thank you very much.

Well, this is what?

Audience: 18 September AD 12.

Eighteen September…

Female voice: 12 AD

… AD 12.

You realize your chances of getting out of here Clear actually occur in the first six weeks of your presence here. Somebody sighs. Some old student sighed. It was too true, wasn't it? You don't think it was true. He – he came Clear and he hasn't been the same since.

[laughs]

Male voice: That's right.

Yeah well, I'm here now. I'll fix it. I'll fix it. I know what you got overts on. Har-har-har! You didn't take me seriously did you?

Male voice: Yeah.

You should have! [laughs, laughter]

Well now, on the boat – when I was down in the cabin working like mad, and other people I won't name were up swimming and dashing about the decks [laughter] and looking athletic and enthusiastic – a remark was made to me that on the first night back with all the data I had to give you, "Well, you'll probably be here till 12:30." I wish to disabuse you of this particular fact and say that why don't I just make this a ten, fifteen minute lecture and then we all go home. Wouldn't you rather do that?

Audience: No.

All right.

Well anyway I will give you some of the data, tonight. But it might take till 2:30. Anyhow, that's…
I probably should tell you something about what happened over in Washington but I
couldn't get it into a five or six hour lecture schedule. This was very adventurous. I left here
tired; I arrived in Washington tired; I finished the congress tired; I finished my stay in Wash-
ington tired – always looking forward to this next moment when I was going to get some rest,
you see? And then finally came back to Saint Hill, tired. [laughs] I have never done so much
auditing, looked over so many goals, done so many Dynamic Assessments, talked to so many
people. And few people who were at the congress, were aware of the fact that I spent most of
the congress off the stage auditing. I was making very sure we had a goal to announce by
congress end, you see?

And also we were straightening up some of the organizations in the States. The best
way to straighten things up is an E-Meter. And I'd like to give you a tip: Instead of reaching
for an argument, reach for an E-Meter. That's a nice tip. And if you followed that tip more
often, life would run like a summer dream. That is so overbearingly true.

For instance, amongst the adventures which assailed me on this rapid passage was a
fellow coming into my room in 1827, just as we had all the baggage stacked up in the hall,
and insulting me. He said the one unforgivable thi ng that mustn't be said to me, on the subject
of how I was responsible for everything, everyplace.

And I promptly barked, growled, headed him backwards over stacks of luggage – it
was very disgraceful, I mean, cameras and briefcases went in all directions – and he got out
the front door and I hooked him back in the front door on the realization that this was not a
way to resolve a case. And so I hooked a hand around his neck and threw him back into the
house, and hooked the hand around his neck the other way and threw him into my room, and
gave him a good shove in the chest, and he sat down.

I opened my E-Meter case – it was all packed; we were just about to leave for New
York. We were going to leave for New York at two o'clock and something came up. And then
we postponed it till three and something came up. And then we postponed it till four and
something came up. And I think this happened at five.

Anyway, I just sat there and pulled his missed withholds. Put the cans in his hands, put
on my auditor hat and, just as though nothing had been happening, just sat down and pulled
his missed withholds. Just like that. One right after the other. And cleaned three buttons in the
space – I don't remember what the auditing period was but it couldn't have been more than
about half an hour to thirty-five minutes.

And I cleaned three buttons. And I wish to recommend this to you as an auditing job.
Three buttons clean in about thirty or thirty-five minutes as follows: "What have we failed to
find out about you?" (meaning all Scientologists everyplace), "What have I failed to find out
about you?" and "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" – all three clean, slick as a
whistle.

He was giving me nicer and nicer answers. The answers were sweeter and sweeter.
And he was more and more pleasant. And I think somebody out on the other coast had given
him a twenty-five-hour intensive to clean up these buttons, but hadn't ever scratched them.
That's interesting, isn't it? And at the end of that time ran a Security Check on him.
This is in the last five minutes. Told him that his goal was in opposition to Scientology after I had done so. This was a – this was – the last minute was a Dynamic Assessment. And told him his goals were in opposition – his goal was in opposition to Scientology, and that was why he'd been acting that way, because that's what the meter said.

And he said, "Well, what do we do about it?"

And I said, "Well," I said, "You go on and get yourself some auditing, and I'll see to it somebody finds your goal somewhere along the line."

And he got up and shook me by the hand and he said, "Thank you, very much." He said, "I'm going to make you a good auditor."

Now, the number of hours of administrative time that this person had already occupied on various lines in various places had amounted to a minimum of fifty or sixty. And if you don't like administration, use an E-Meter. Get the idea? And when you use an E-Meter, get something done.

Now, that may be a novel thought. That may be a novel thought. When you use an E-Meter, get something done. I see that lands more or less on deaf ears.

An E-Meter is not something that you should spend lots of time on; an E-Meter is something you should do something with. You can do a great deal with an E-Meter. Somebody's busy arguing with you left and right, somebody's busy knocking your head in, somebody's getting very uppity and monkeyed up; well, you're lucky if you can get to him with an E-Meter. You're very lucky. Because sometimes you can't. Such as the building you're sitting in is illegal, and Town and County Planning are corresponding. Now, I'm sure this will take a great many hours to settle. But if I could get these cotton-picking monkeys on the other end of an E-Meter, I'd pull the withhold fast. We might even arrange it. Oh! Well, that's another story.

Anyway, Scientology is to be used. It's for use. It is something you can use. And it isn't something that you pick up and use in an auditing session, necessarily, but it's something you can use all the time. But when you do decide to do something Scientology-wise, well be effective and do it. Yeah, that's all – just do it. And most of the rules which are laid down in auditing and in clearing are all devoted to keeping you from doing ineffective things. These rules are a path of effectiveness.

Now remember, men have been talking to men for a number of millennia, ever since they came out of the trees. And they've been talking. And they've been doing a lot of talking. Some of them are still in the trees. In fact, I saw a psychiatrist the other day wearing a swallow-tail coat. And, he had to. And, the general position of talking and discussing and so forth has been that it has been a waste of time.

Now, how is it in auditing that we can use talkingness and suddenly something happens, see? How come? How come this occurs?

And the rules by which you audit are the rules of an effective path to an accomplishment – of reaching someone, of bettering someone, of obtaining agreement and improving existence. But it's a highly circumscribed path.
Now, if you were to – if you were to look over a great many activities in the past which were supposed to cure people or supposed to make them sane or supposed to make them happy or something of the sort, you would be amazed at their numerosness. They're just almost without number. We know a few of them as the witch doctor, the *rrarh* psycho-analyst, the Aesculapian school of healing. These things – I could go on and on and on and name and name and name and name and name and name, and you'd all come down to something quite interesting, is that it had to do with talking to somebody about something or listening to somebody about something. That's been assisted from time to time with puffs of smoke and pinches of pepper as in the case of the witch doctor – juju horsetail flies with fleas in them. All of these things have a – have a talkingness, a reachingness, an effort to reach connected with them.

For instance, by the simple expedient of scattering fleas all over somebody with a horsetail fly, the juju doctor creates a confusion into which he can put his implant. You recognize that it's – fellow wouldn't pay much attention to what was coming in; it would just go in at that moment.

The – well, most old witch doctors had to learn how to scream, and you got an interrupted scream. They'd scream loud enough to kick your eardrums in and then say something and then continue the scream. And the patient thereafter didn't know they had stopped screaming, but of course had a sandwiched implant, with the statement in the middle of the scream, you see, being an implanted suggestion of some kind or another. Usually, in that stage of medicine, the suggestion was something on the order of, "You're going to die."

There's always been a talkingness and a reachingness. In other words, we found Axiom 10 operating throughout efforts to overwhelm, efforts to heal, efforts to control, efforts to make sane, efforts to better, efforts to become better. All of these various things have Axiom 10 running through their midst.

Now, how is it that we in Scientology can suddenly come along and, by certain applications of this same talk that has been going on since time immemorial without effectiveness – with this same talk, being effective? How do we do this? That's something to think about, isn't it?

Now, many a student misses this. They miss the fundamental of auditing – the most fundamental fundamental there is. Auditing has to do with a communication formula, and when a person says something and somebody acknowledges it (if the statement is truthful and the acknowledgment is received), can blow, erase, eradicate, deintensify mental charge. It's on that fact alone that auditing works. Auditing is *based* upon that fact. There is no other erudite fact on which it is based. It's Axiom 10!

Now, it actually isn't what's said by the person who is being treated. It actually isn't what's said by the person who is acknowledging. It, to a very marked degree, is what is said by the person doing the treating in the first place. This causes a momentary restimulation, and that restimulation is picked up by the pc, recognized, verbalized and blown by the moment when the acknowledgment is received. Somebody has heard him.

Now, that's your – that's the cycle of auditing. The question or the command directs the person's attention to a certain area of bank; and the person, perceiving that area of bank,
responds, and knows he has responded when he is acknowledged and receives that acknowledgment. And that is the cycle of an auditing command.

Now, it is to maintain a purity of cycle that you find most auditing rules growing up. These rules occur to maintain the auditing cycle. And techniques specify what is to be restimulated in what sequence. Now, if you've done that right and you know what button should be hit and what responses should be given, you only need add to it repetitive question and repetitive response, order of question – that is, the sequence of questions asked by the practitioner, each one followed by the same cycle as I have just named – to obtain a state of Release or Clear or Theta Clear or Operating Thetan.

In other words, it's that magical formula which leads all the way out, and don't you forget it. That is the only reason anybody goes out. It is not the charm of the practitioner, the nameplate on the E-Meter; it's not that the person believes or disbelieves Scientology – because let me point out, I think the fellow – you'd say a fellow who has been yanked around by me and javelined all over the front hall would not be in a very receptive state. In fact, he'd be in a very repressed state of some kind or another to audit. Yet, the exact button processed on the person relieved the state. In other words, the auditing was greater than the wooling.

Now, what – what might somebody come to believe? Well, if you want a list then just take all the asininarities that have been written in the books of philosophy on any planet in this universe – take the lot, make your list and you'll get how many departures there can be from the auditing cycle. And that's an awful lot. So there's really not much reason to go into it.

A salesman depends on some kind of a cycle in order to sell. He says to somebody, "Here is an automobile, buy it!"

And the person is supposed to say, "Okay. Here is my check."

And then the salesman is supposed to say, "Okay, take it away." And do you know, most cars are sold on that simple a formula. Guy's already seen the car, he wants a car, he walks in and he says, "Do you have cars for sale? Is that car – is that – that purple car in the window for sale?"

And, the fellow says, "Yes, yes, we just have one left."

And the fellow says, "All right. Oil it and grease it up. I'll drive it out the rear door."

Actually, that's what would more or less be called the majority of sales.

Now, a salesman believes, of course, he has to sell the car. And that is what cancels the majority of sales. Now, that even goes so far in some places which have done a cycle of action on the subject of business which is gone into a fine games condition, where the seller will not permit the buyer to have the product. Now that can be attained, too. I remember one time spending an hour and a half in my office, selling an Addressograph salesman on the idea of selling us a machine.

Well, that's because aberration is entered into it. But there are certain cycles of action that go along with selling. And there are certain cycles of action that go along with teaching, which are quite different than these auditing cycles of action. And then there are all these varied cycles of action that have turned up in philosophic tech since time immemorial. Zen Bud-
dhism – that gives you a stack of them that gets nobody no place. By the time it had gotten out to Japan, they didn't know much about Buddhism. I say that advisedly because I'm no authority on Zen Buddhism. I'm still sane.

Such practices try to handle some ramification of Axiom 10 – all of them. And they all go off in different directions.

Now, you get this fellow that's been a salesman for the last twenty-nine to the twenty-ninth power lives, and you make him an auditor. You try to make him an auditor, you see? So he sells the pc engrams, and the pc takes them away with him, too. He'll sell clearing, and the thetan's lucky to get away from there with any body left, because it goes from nowhere. In other words, he's trying to handle a cycle of communication which is pertinent to some other field. And he doesn't see that auditing is its own cycle of communication.

Had an example called to my attention the other day. Pc comes in and he says, "Well," he says, "I've been up all night, and uh – I been auditing myself, and uh – I kind of messed up and uh – so forth, and uh – tsk – well, that's it."

And the auditor flies into the D of P or the Auditing Supervisor – just breaks off the session right there at that point – and says, "Oh my God! I can't possibly audit this fellow because he – you know what he's just told me? He's told me that he's been auditing all night, and what can you do about that?"

Aaaaah. Ow! Do about that? Everything about that that can be done has already happened. The pc has told him. You get the idea? I mean, everything that you're going to do about it has already occurred.

Well, an auditor who will do that is on some other communication cycle. See? He's trying to sell planets or something – he's not auditing. I don't know what he – I don't know what he thinks auditing is if he does something like that, or what is supposed to happen in an auditing session.

I have run into students, sometime ago, who actually thought the E-Meter fell on the sound of their own voice. We've been curing this up. In other words, when the auditor spoke, the E-Meter reacted. I think that's marvelous, you know? Because it shows no comprehension of the auditing cycle. Because this immediately lends itself to some weird, old past track idea of some kind or another, whereby it is the practitioner who wears the case of the patient, and by speaking about it gets it to react on the meter, and now that the pc or the patient witnesses it, becomes well.

Now, I hate to burden your wits with that one, but I'm just showing you there's another cycle of action.

Now, you've seen characters laying on hands. Well, this is not a disgraceful activity. As a matter of fact a Touch Assist is always welcome. But how come this communication cycle of "We lay on the paw and draw the pain out of the wound, and experience the pain in the paw, and then shake it away like a dog coming out of the water." You've seen that, haven't you?

Well, it's an interesting cycle of action.
Now, we take somebody who of course is totally addicted to another cycle of action of some kind or another and never sees the auditing cycle of action, and what do we get out of this? After he reads the E-Meter, see – got the E-Meter there and he says "Have you sinned?" "Now he's better." Do you get that? It is totally – totally possible. This sounds utterly mad.

But I'm only calling this to your attention because the basic of auditing is an auditing cycle of command which operates as an attention director – call it a restimulator if you want, but it's an attention director – eliciting a response from the patient to as-is that area, and who knows he has done so when he receives from the practitioner an acknowledgment that it has occurred. Now, that is the auditing cycle and any departure from that auditing cycle will wind you up in the soup.

Now, that auditing cycle all by itself is sufficiently powerful to get gains no matter what button you direct. Let's be very, very, very puristic about this. Let's remove all significance from it as an action and see if anything happens to the pc! Let us tell him, from where he is to get the idea of looking at his left ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his right ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his left ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his right ear, and thank him. Well, what happens is he's not going to wind up without ears. But the mere fact of directed attention and the acknowledgment that he has directed his attention – just that fact all by itself – operates as a therapeutic action. See, there's no significance in the command. It just says, "Inspect your right ear; inspect your left ear," see, and that just run bang, bang, bang, bang.

Now, just doing it once might not be observably therapeutic. Doing it twice, probably not. But here is a new thing that enters into it: repetitive. The repetitive action. Duplication is added to the communication formula, which contains duplication anyway. So of course, you've taken the appearance of duplication – pardon me, you've taken the appearance of communication and increased it enormously by the fact of duplication. This fellow really knows he's being communicated to now, and he can direct his attention better and better and better. And he knows something is happening because somebody has told him so every time the acknowledgment occurs.

Now, what occurs this way? The person will become aware of some other being in existence, will become aware of mass, will become aware of the fact his attention is easy to shift or hard to shift. Various things will occur. His awareness of these things will increase and his attention becomes free. It becomes freer and freer and freer. Now, the thing is limited because he wots not of what he's looking at. Nobody has asked him for any sense to it. It takes longer.

Now, in essence, those are your CCHs. It's the nonsignificance of directed attention, and those of you who are still trying to read all kinds of significance into the CCHs should just tear that little chapter out of the book and go over in the corner quietly and read it, because the CCHs present different ways of directing the pc's attention with minimal significance. And of course, your worse-off pc does very well on them, because he finds out that there is matter, energy, space, time, and somebody else alive in the world. It's probably one of the greatest cognitions that an individual can have, if he doesn't know it. It's almost with horror that he realizes it for the first time.
How do you suppose the great criminal manages to live with himself? How does he manage to live with himself? It's just that nobody else exists, so therefore it doesn't matter what he does. And there he goes.

How are you going to get this fellow out of it? Well, you can't tell him, "Think of the significance of this or that and the other thing" most of the time, because the significance would never arrive. He – this he could not duplicate. He cannot duplicate the significance of looking at it – the significance of looking at a significance. He can't do that. But he can duplicate the relatively nonsignificant action of simply directed attention.

If you want to make some pc feel like he's being hypnotized when he isn't, set up two bottles in front of him and tell him to look at the left one, and then tell him to look at the right one, and then tell him to look at the left one, and tell him to look at the right one, and tell him to look at the left one, and tell him to look at the right one, and all of the sudden he'll get some weird feeling of becoming hypnotized. Of course, he isn't becoming hypnotized; hypnotism is running off. And if you do it for a little while after he first begins to feel that he's being hypnotized, he'll realize actually what is happening. He's waking up. Sleeping Beauty.

Now, there you see a new idea in the communication cycle. It's a communication without significance, beyond the significance of what the attention is directed to.

Now, many an activity has directed attention, but not duplicatively. And that is one of the secrets of Scientology processing and why it works. Duplicative. One of the reasons this was never discovered was because most people can't take it. It's the practitioner who can't take it, not the patient. Therefore at HCA level we like to have a lot of Op Pro by Dup, and somebody comes through and says, "Well, should Op Pro by Dup be run just during the auditing periods for three days in order to get in – or four days in order to get in eight hours of it, or should it be run all at once, or should it be so, and should it be so on?" You see, they're so starved for significance they won't just do Op Pro by Dup. I don't care how it's run; run it! See?

But of course, every time the fellow says that he cannot walk over to the book one more time, at that moment you assist him thither. It must be run. And where everybody is busy worrying about how it's run, they very often neglect that it must be run. If you ever wanted to see a Scientologist natter, find one that early in his career was run on Op Pro by Dup by consent of the pc on this basis: The pc says he's getting tired so the auditor says, "All right, sit down and take a rest." The pc says he can't tell just now, so the auditor lets it skid. And boy, what's happened there? The cycle of action is entirely and completely mishmashed. You don't get the intention of the practitioner expressed in the direction of attention of the person it is being run on. And therefore, then, you don't get the acknowledgment – and it's very weird.

But there's a very basic action, and you could do this in a single-action basis. But it doesn't make space and it tends to make the guy feel kind of stacked up when you say, "You see that black spot? All right, look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that..." You haven't got two points, so of course you've no space. And the odd part of
it is this black spot will start to look closer and closer and closer and closer, and the guy will begin to believe he's kind of being pulled out of his head toward the black spot. Because he can't make space, so therefore he doesn't know where he is.

So two is always better. And then of course, two adds to the element of duplication. We got a two-pole universe and we've got duplication going and here we go. Op Pro by Dup becomes a killer.

But recognize that you could direct attention repetitively, in a duplicative fashion, on and on and on – in almost any fashion – and achieve a renewed awareness on the part of another being, for yourself and for the world around him. See? It isn't – any other significance in it than just that. There is no further significance in that action than that. There is actually no further result in that action than that either. Somatics will turn on and off and you'll think he's getting rid of lots of somatics, and you'll run to them – run into them later on, to the place where he is going to. And there they'll be waiting on the track again. But that's beside the point. The person has become aware. He's become more aware and to that degree he has enormously improved.

Now, this does very interesting things in terms of improvement. It improves IQ, it improves alertness, it improves sogginess of one kind or another in life. It'll do all kinds of things. You could write up a bill of – a bill of health on the thing and put it on a slab board outside, that a lot of customers would be very, very happy to come in and get that to happen to them. But it's an elementary purity. Op Pro by Dup.

Other activities, as I was just about to say, have done repetitive commands. Various activities have done this. There is a one-command process which is used over in the heights of the Himalayas which deletes these things, and that is "Regard your navel." The command is given once and twenty years later the fellow is still sitting there. It's not optimum auditing. It's called an auditor comm lag. But recognize that as a cycle of action of sorts. Recognize that.

Somebody writes down in a book "What you want to do is regard your navel." All right. So the fellow says, "Fine. I'll regard my navel." He's got one auditing command and one navel. And he gets stuck! Because the acknowledgment is missing even for that one command. The author of the text never comes out afterwards, through the pages of the book, and – sort of breaking the fellow's attention off as it's staring downward – and says, "Thank you very much."

You go around to somebody – if you want to produce a shock of magnitude on some monk of Tibet, why, learn this in Tibetan. It'd probably get you past many monastery doors. They'd be so flat on their backs after you said it that nobody would stop you. And that would be "Thank you very much for regarding your navel." Guy has been waiting for it, you know?

Now, if you – you see that then the – there are different cycles than the auditing cycle, and it is very easy to fall into these other cycles because men have been in them for a long time. There's lots of them on the track. There's an enormous variety of ways to handle communication. There's, for instance, a cycle – there's a cycle that might go something like this: "Hello, dear." Bang! You see? The acknowledgment comes with the greeting. Well, we see this in less domestic ways on such a thing, "Halt or I'll shoot!" Bang! You see?
It's like the captain walking past the guardhouse one day and new sentry said to him, "Halt or I'll shoot. Halt or I'll shoot. Halt or I'll shoot."

And fortunately before he got the last syllable completely out the captain reached over and shook him and said, "Hey, what's going on? What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"Well, sergeant said to say that three times and then shoot." Well, that's another cycle of action.

Now, wherever you've got a – a communication line set up, you have some kind of a response system on this line and it'll go through some kind of a cycle. There are some marvelous cycles. I wouldn't spend any time studying them particularly. But if you know there are different cycles of communication or action, then you'll see that it is a unique cycle. The auditing cycle of action is unique. And frankly you could sit down and study it for quite a while with a considerable amount of benefit. You could say, "What is this thing all about?" You utter a command or ask a question, and this directs the pc's attention; and then you'd realize that the question or command (also unseen) directs the attention of the pc by pulling the reactive bank up around the pc's ears, which is operating independent of the intention of the pc, and is more responsive to the practitioner than it is to the person.

I can always make people's somatic strips go tearing around. It's very fascinating. Any outsider has more control of a person's reactive bank than the person himself. Of course it's on that additional point that auditing is to some degree based. This fellow sits inside of his skull and he says, "I'll restimulate it and then I'll as-is it, and I'll restimulate it, and I'll as-is it, and I'll restimulate and I'll as-is it, and I'll restimulate and I'll as-is it, and I'll restimulate it and I'll as-is." Odd part of it is it has some workability, but he gets stacked up after a while, you see, because he actually isn't as-ising some of it and never notices when he goes off of it. He isn't a good director of his reactive bank, because the common denominator of the reactive bank is other-determinism.

So auditing basically requires a practitioner. That is because an other-determinism handles the other-determinism of the reactive bank much more easily than the individual himself. Did you ever think of that?

So when the auditor isn't following through the cycle of action of auditing – the cycle of an auditing command – then nobody else is going to adjust the bank for him. And an auditor who won't help him out by adjusting the bank for him, of course, is leaving him in the soup; and the pc feels like he's getting no auditing.

If you go ahead and study the cycle I've been talking to you about in this lecture, you will see most of the mistakes of auditing. You will see how these things grow and come about: first by a habit pattern from other eras and scenes and activities, and second by not recognizing that it is a set pattern that you're following. There is a set pattern. It is very set. Auditing has a very precise cycle. And if that cycle isn't followed, auditing doesn't occur.

The next thing that you should recognize about this is that a pc whose attention cannot be controlled cannot be directed into areas of significance which don't (reactively) want to have any attention directed into. Let us say this pc has a goal "never to look." And you're busy trying to find a goal "never to look," only you don't know what the goal is. Oh, coo! I invite
you to try to find this on a pc whose attention you, the auditor, does not – do not control. You see what would happen? The bank has more authority over the pc than the auditor.

Now, this pc's attention can be directed so – and the auditor is skilled at directing his attention, not diverting it by dropping E-Meters or comments on the weather – and there is a point in the session when this ridge, or whatever the buildup is which sort of surrounds this goal, first appears over the reactive horizon. And it says, "never to look." And of course, the auditor has more control of the pc's attention than the pc's own bank. So therefore, the pc looks straight at it and tells the auditor exactly what it is. And you write down the goal "never to look" on the pc's list, and when it's tiger drilled you find it.

Now, a pc who is gloriously "out of session," we call it – that is, a pc whose attention is not being directed by the auditor – he hits this one and he obeys the bank and he doesn't look over there. Bank says, "never to look." That's it. Pc doesn't look over there. Do you see how it is?

Now, all goals lists contain goals of this character. This is not peculiar to one pc. For one pc to have this as a goal would be an individualism of one kind. That's the pc's goal. But all goals lists contain goals of this character. And you can almost – this is just a hazarded guess here – look over the list of the pc whose goal is not being easily found and you will find on it a complete absence of goals which command the attention to go the other way. There'll never be anything on it like "never to look," "not to talk," "to be silent." These things will not appear on that pc's goals list. And the pc whose attention can be directed by the auditor will have a great many of these on the list. That's just an educated guesstimate, not based on very much observation. But I'm just giving you just a look at it.

So you wonder why pc A's goal cannot be found and pc B's goal can be found. It again comes down to the auditor and to nobody else. There are no good pcs or bad pcs. There are only pcs. There are good auditors and there are bad auditors. And good auditors use a communication cycle and get it executed. And bad auditors monkey along and never direct the pc's attention. Therefore you have fast goal finding and slow goal finding. You have fast auditing and slow auditing. You have all the varieties of auditing which are presented to your eye by any group of pcs passing through an HGC or a private auditor's hands. That's the way it is.

Now, we say, "Well, some pcs' attention is harder to direct than others." And I say it's still the auditor. It's sometimes an auditor has to work harder than others. And that's about all that you can say about it. If you look over your own auditing on the basis of the cycle of auditing, and if you look over any pc that you are auditing on the basis of "Is his attention being directed by me and can I count upon the fact that it is?" you will learn a great deal about what is going on, both with your auditing and with that pc and the relationships in between. Okay?

Thank you.
Okay, second lecture, 18 September, AD 12. 3GA Dynamic Assessment.

Once upon a time there was a thetan.

Nobody happens to have that "Rule of Thumb"; do they? No, that's all right. Remember most of them.

3GA. The thing you should know about 3GA Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is that when it does not work, you haven't done it! There's several tips one could give on this, this is not particularly an expansive lecture that gives you all of the odd bits and all that sort of thing, but it's definitely of great interest to you that this has been working. And it has been working very well. It requires further working on, and I am working on it further.

But there are many things you can do with this Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. The idea is simply this: The rock slam is called a rock slam because it is a needle manifestation which is achieved when the auditor is approaching what we once called "the Rock." Now, there's something earlier than the Rock and it's called a goal. And if it were called a "Goal Slam," you would have it. Because it is the goal that is slamming. It's producing a great deal of random needle motion. And this random needle motion is occurring solely, entirely and completely because of the currents being set up amongst the items and identities the person has assumed or fought in the progress of executing his or her goal.

And it goes this way and it goes that way, and it goes someplace else, and the individual has no place to go, no place to go to, no place to retire from. In other words, he cannot get away from it, he cannot approach it, nothing else is happening, he is in a state of agitation. Now, this rock slam, or goal slam, which we will not call it, we will maintain the word rock slam, is a thetan convulsion. And in the absence of a slamming needle, you will very often find a convulsing body. The body will convulse, before the rock slam will turn on.

People who have convulsing bodies may sometimes not develop rock slams, and people who have rock slams may suddenly develop convulsing bodies. Was talking to somebody over in Washington on an innocent subject, and he looked like he was going to go into a convulsion. He's very, very afraid of going into a convulsion, this idea upset him very much. And that I was merely approaching the subject which he thought would send him into a convulsion, if I'd had him on the meter at that moment I would have found a slamming needle.

---

1 Editor's note: HCOB 19 Sep. 1962, "3GA, Tips on Dynamic Assessment, Rules of Thumb"
Do you see that? So, it – there it is in the bank, the reactive bank, and it's the crisscross of currents that are battering a thetan around. And, when this gets into a solidity, why, it of course has the power of throwing the body around.

Now, the degree that it can throw the body around probably approaches poltergeist. The thetan produces a rock slam on the needle. Well this – he's just feeling kind of ththththh! He's being – you know, his currents are going left, right and center, and so forth, and they're going through him and by him and up and down and side rrrrrllmm!

All right. The next thing that would happen is this submerged – this is all surmised, by the way, but it has some factual evidence behind it. I'm just trying to give you this illustratively. You might have somebody who was convulsing physically. You know, the head starts going like this, uhh-uhh-vuhhvuhh-rvuh-vuhh-vuhh-rvuhh, see? Like a slamming needle. But then you also might have somebody whose whole body started to go that way, and that is called an epileptic fit. It's also called other names. That type of convulsion is the type I'm speaking of.

Now, supposing it advanced further than the body, and – this is surmised, you see – advanced further than the body and entered the physical universe around the person. And you would get the physical universe at first responding sort of enturbulatedly. You get a psycho, walks up the front steps of an HGC, the Shipping Clerk starts cutting his fingers with the shears, you know? That's a fact! You want to produce turbulence, or something, why, just take some psycho and put him into the auditing lineup and you've got it. You yourself will catch yourself dropping commands, and so forth.

I had a session like this in Washington. I was quite amazed. I was handing out the wrong commands a time or two and so forth, ugh! It was a sort of a – of a theta poltergeist, you know, in the immediate atmosphere around me! Dzzzz-zzzz, you know, you could sort of feel it.

All right, now, if that went a little bit further, you would get real poltergeist, perhaps. You know, the rugs being thrown around, and so forth. But certainly you get enmest. Whatever else you get, you get enmest. You look at that person's possessions and they're starting to get chewed up, you know? You give this girl a brand-new handbag. And in the process of her grasping the handle it ages! [laughter] You get the idea?

Anyway, what it is, is obsessive and random motion. Or a postulate which is in a state of producing obsessive and random intentions and impulses when restimulated. Let's say this fellow has a goal "to swim the English Channel." And we know this but he doesn't. You see you never really get that as a pure test. We take him out to the cliff, over at Dover, and we say to him, we say, "Swim the English Channel!" see? And my God, he wouldn't know whether to jump off the cliff, or run to London, or hide under a clam shell, and he'd probably go into some kind of a convulsion.

He's being required to do something, the requirement is illogical, unreasonable, unexpected, you get all these conditions attached to it – would probably produce you some very interesting behavior. And yet very often a person's goal is said to them! Sometimes in a level of command. And a person starts going hzzz-hzzt-bzzz-bzzt-blzz-wzzzl-zzmm! You walk up to somebody who has a goal, "to eat cats." And you say to him, "I'm afraid you'll eat the cat!"
He'll totally occlude the statement, he'll go straight into the bank, and you'll get a rock-slammy mental condition.

And he's liable to remember this on the backtrack as a convulsion of some sort. He's been backed into his item, or he's – or he's been backed into his goal in some fashion, and he can't quite tell what it is. But he sure feels random about it.

I see somebody has had this experience with an item. Or, even a goal. And you remember times when this one suddenly was presented to you. A fellow has a – has a goal "to jump off high places" see. Such a goal, anybody had. Has a goal "to jump off high places." It is the goal, you understand. I'm not talking about a random, casual little subsidiary goal, you know. Finds himself on a high place. Man, that is enough! He doesn't jump off high places. But actually he doesn't not jump off high places. You get the idea? He goes around seeking high places to jump off of, and then never climbing up them.

Now, you should understand a rock slam for what it is, then. It is the goal track. There's many things you can say about it. The pc's interest, by the way, follows the track of the goal. And therefore follows the slam. Pc's interest follows the slam. Pc's getting interested, the needle's slamming, pc's interested, needle's slamming, pcs interested, needle's slamming, pc's not interested, needle's not slamming. In other words, the pc's interest follows the slam. Pc's cognitions follow the slam.

All of a sudden, the pc's been sitting there, as dead as some of this South African wood that won't even float in water. See, there he is. Total session response: "Uh-huh, hm-hmm." Been like this for hundreds of hours of auditing. "Hm-hmm." All of a sudden this pc says to you, "I'll bet all roof rafters are not really straight. You know, there is something about that. They're not really straight. Yes, yes, that item you just called out there, that's very interesting. Not-straight roof rafters. And – and – yes, and it goes down on the other side, too, and very often they're long. Yes, I've had this experience and so forth. So – funny thing, I've just realized that most roof rafters, they pretend they are straight!" See? Well, if you weren't watching your needle at the time, you'll find that it was – you look down on it, you'd find it was slaming.

You're looking for the cogniting pc. Pcs, any pc cognites, when the slam is being followed. You're going down the slam track. And the pc will cognite. If you just get on the edge of the slam someplace, the pc is liable to cognite. But a pc's cognitions actually go down the track of the rock slam.

That is very interesting, not that a pc is suddenly, inexplicably in-session, never having been before, but the pc in actual fact is being reached as a case. Well, this is all grist to the auditor's mill. It isn't the pc is not in-session when he is not rock slamming, but if you want to see an exaggeration of in-sessionness it is during one of these periods.

Now, it's as much as your life is worth to ARC break a pc who is in the middle of a rock slam. You won't be able to get away with the things you got away with when he wasn't rock slamming. In other words, it takes pretty careful auditing. Somebody the other day was busy teaching all the HCAs in the Central Organization to do Dynamic Assessments. And some of them were even up to running ARC Straightwire! What he didn't realize – well, we won't go into that. And it's all right, everything is all straightened out now, except they're
probably all mad at me, and realizing that I am preventing them from going Clear. I'm sure they realize this.

You really got to sit in there and audit. That auditing better be pretty smooth. If a flub on your part coincides with a cognition on the pc's part, well, I don't know, blow up the room with an atomic bomb, it'd be much calmer. Something's going to go wrong. And furthermore the case is going to hang, very badly at that point, and will have to be straightened out.

You can get into more trouble – anything you ever heard of, by putting the pc on the, on the track of a slam, and then all of a sudden making a horrible goof, bust, dropping the ball, laying an egg, in an auditing session. It just isn't done. Therefore, you should be a pretty good auditor before you start monkeying around with rock slams.

Now, the pc's interest is high, remember the old tone drop. Remember the curve, the down curve, remember? You've got the guy going from Tone 30, straight down to minus 8, with no gradient. Now, you're going to erase this. Well, you spend the next few sessions patching it up, see? But this can't patch up, because of course, your patching it up means no auditing, and he already is cogniting, but he's already cogniting on it, but you've got to get rid of the auditing that messed it up, so that in getting rid of the auditing that messed it up you're not then furthering his auditing or cognitions or case, but you can't further his auditing or cognitions or case until you have cleaned it up. This is a time an auditor wishes he just had never picked up that E-Meter on that pc. It was the wrong time of day, it must have had something to do with the stars in their conjunctions, if not their prepositions.

This is very intense. The whole subject of Dynamic Assessment is very intense. And it should not be regarded casually by an auditor, it is a very intense activity. All goals finding is an intense activity. The main intent and intenseness is on the part of the pc. His interest is so piqued, that he thinks things get in his road which don't. Because all the time he's going down that track he, of course, is running into the items which you eventually will list out, after you've found his goal. And they're all telling him he can't have it; that they oppose it; that he isn't. You see? And he knows not what of any of this.

So the first benefit of a Dynamic Assessment is that it takes off the lot of the edginess from a case, and gives the reward of some very large finds to the pc. You find his detested person. He's very happy. Oooh! Yes! That's why he's always hated Josibelle, see. Ho-ho! That's the person he hates the most in the whole universe! That means something to the pc.

Now, we move it on down, we find a dynamic. And we get this dynamic found. If it is the dynamic, and it is found, and it slammed, ah, my! He's really got his fingers on something that means a great deal to him. Now, we go ahead and find the item. And here is something which is enormously significant to him. He can explain things all over the place that have been happening to him for ages. Some people, if they never got any further than finding the item they'd be perfectly happy. The auditing had repaid them thousandfold over anything they'd expected it to be repaid, see.

And then, when you find their goal, why, all else pales. But, this is a gradient. The fellow isn't put on an enormously long wait before anything happens, so that you get a nervous charge building up over that tremendous long period of time of search. That is one of the
things wrong with 3GA done on its routine ordinary style of write out eight hundred and fifty goals and tiger drill them.

But you understand, that when we were eliminating goals by Assessment by Elimination, this tension was sufficiently great in building up in the pc over a period of time, to practically break the pc's heart, and the auditor's heart, too. That was tough. But the reason it was tough is not that it was tough to do. Not that it was impossible to find goals by Assessment by Elimination. Because God help us we're now running into more goals, now, after Dynamic Assessment, that were found in the old days, so we can audit them out the rest of the way.

Good heavens! It heads right back to the original goal. But the pc's original goal was so burdened by all of these other things, and rock slams, and so on, that the pc never really did get a full digest of the goal. No full reality on it.

An Assessment by Elimination brought about a nervous condition on the part of the pc, where he is so nervy and so ARC breaky, he was almost impossible to audit. Now that's – that should give you an idea or two of why we're – why we're very happy to have such things as Tiger Drills and so forth.

Now, if you tiger drill a list, the goal is never behind you – unless you're a complete knucklehead. And the pc is making gains most of the time. And by erasing goals by Tiger Drill, you are actually getting a very, very thorough, therapeutic result for the pc. And the pc is feeling better and better and better and better. There's something to occupy the pc's time. So an eight hundred and fifty goals list tiger drilled, properly of course, is highly therapeutic, and this is fine. And this is easier to do, but it's still not easy enough.

You need shorter jumps. Now, I've seen a Tiger Drill list go null on a pc, with more consequent splatter than anything I care to put a pc over. And many auditors doing old 3GA, even with a Tiger Drill, just say, well, I just never want to put a pc through that again.

And it's not that it hurts, it's not that it's arduous. But the fellow's right on a terrific attention line. And any little wiggle in the session, or any breath of wind in life, is magnified a thousandfold to the pc.

Well, now, on Dynamic Assessment you throw away most of these liabilities because you're going right in after it. The pc's attention isn't directly on the goal, it's on the goal line. In other words, you're following in to the goal line by interest. See, you got a gradient of interest. And the pc's interested all the way. He isn't sitting there like a dummy, the way he was in Assessment by Elimination. You're actually tearing on down the line and the pc is an active participant in this, because you're getting a result every few hours. Now, that's an advantage that shouldn't be discounted. You're following the interest line by following the rock slam. And the pc is turning up and handing you up data all the time. Very valuable to a pc just to list. List the rock slam out.

Now, aside from this, a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam being successfully done makes the pc feel absolutely marvelous. Just puts him on the top of the world. It's just great auditing. Don't kid yourself, it's great auditing.

The funny part of it is, the auditor doesn't give a damn. Those gains are just chaff in the wind. They are nothing. Three cheers, so the pc feels better. Good. We don't give a damn.
if he feels better. What we want is his goal! You understand? It's worth doing, just to make
the pc feel better. But this is not the end product of it.

Doing this over in Washington just in the last three weeks here, astounded by the fact
that the pcs began to apologize to me because I'd made this remark to them two or three times.
They come out, "Oh! I just feel glorious! Just top of the world! I never felt better! If I never
got any more out of this than audit... If I never got audited any more than this, everything
would seem wonderful to me! Wonderful!"

And I'd say, "Will you please shut up and sit down and pick up the cans! I'm trying to
find your goal!" And it finally got through their skulls that I didn't give a damn whether they
felt wonderful or not, I was after their goal. And they'd cooperate like crazy.

But they'd say, "I'm sorry, Ron. I'm sorry to have to tell you, but you know I feel
great!" You know? [laughs, laughter]

Well, one doesn't necessarily try to promote that apology in a pc. But don't lose sight
of it. Because actually in doing a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, properly and correctly,
with all coal on the fire, and with that old needle wagging on dwindling slams as you list, and
that sort of thing, you're liable to be totally misdirected on the subject of what you're after.

You know, a pc feels so good, and everything, and you pat yourself on the back, and
you say, "Well, I got the pc's item! Made him feel wonderful!" Don't you ever tell me that!
Don't you ever tell me how wonderful the pc felt after a Dynamic Rock Slam Assessment.
Because I'll ask you right away, "Did you find his goal? You got the pc's goal?"

"Oh, well, no. As a matter of fact we sort of knocked off on that. He's sort of feeling
pretty good these days and we've really entered into a Prepcheck area, and you know, kind of
capitalize the gains," something like that. Has nothing to do with it. Did you find the pc's
goal?

Now, a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is sufficiently spectacular to distract the
auditor from the basic reason he is auditing the pc, believe it or not. He's supposed to find the
goal. And therefore, if you do excursions or diversions or something, in some direction, that
do not enhance finding the pc's goal, you are wasting time. And enough time can be burned in
a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam as it is. You can burn lots of time up on one.

Now any of you that are ever going to make a Class IV Auditor, let me tell you this.
You've got to be able to do it fast. Do it fast. You understand, I think you're pretty wonderful,
right here, I think you're pretty wonderful, to have picked it up, in the short period of time,
and have produced as many dynamics, and as many items, and as many goals as you have in
this very short period of time. To learn it and to do that is a great tribute to you. And I don't
want you to sit back on your laurels and expect you to think that is how long it should take
you. Because let me tell you something, you should be able to find, by the reason of schedul-
ing, by reason of finance, by reason of routing of pcs, by reason of running groups, by reason
of program Clear Earth, you've got to be able to find the pc's goal in a week. And that in-
cludes a complete assessment with the goal in your paw. You've got to be able to do it in a
week.
Otherwise, nothing is going to tally. Now, I'm demanding something of you, which I can do. And which you can do. But you set yourself a nice zenith. Be effective! When you find that meter in your paws, you audit! You understand me? We don't care how good the pc feels or how bad the pc feels. We're not interested in the least, so long as it doesn't get in the road of our auditing. "You feel as good as you want to, just let me go ahead and get this list!" See, it's that frame of mind.

Now, why am I talking to you like this all of a sudden? Well, that's because I'm talking to you on the basis of an upgrade. Talking to you on the basis of an upgrade. I expect you to get out of here a Class III. Definitely expect you to get out of here a Class III. And if you really want to be up on top, a Class IV. Now I'm not kidding about Class IV. Because it'd take a Class IV to handle a group. You understand why? Let's say – let's say you've got fifty people in a group. And they're going to co-audit, and they're going to do this and they're going to do that, and every week you're going to reach into that bunch of people and you're going to pick up one human being, and you're going to completely alter, change their lives, and send them on the road. Put them back in the group again, to get the thing listed out.

All right, that's your program for world clearing. You'll find that that program is working right now – is being started on the Washington staff course. That program will be started here and there and the other place, and you're going to be very familiar with that program. Because there isn't any other way you can do it. You can't afford the time to do it any other way. Therefore it's up to me to make a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam or some other method of finding a pc's goals as rapid and effective and positive as possible! And therefore it's up to you, a Saint Hill graduate, to be able to do this.

The end of one year, you would have produced fifty Clears. Not to be sneezed at. All right. Now, that's pretty terrific. It's in your hands to do this. I'm not talking to you about pie in the sky and wouldn't it nice – be nice to be Clear. And all this sort of thing. I'm not talking to anything – about anything that is even vaguely out of your reach. This is right in your reach, right now.

Therefore, I want you to be a Class IV Auditor. And be able to find a goal in a week. And as soon as I am able to trim the edges around the technology a little bit more, to find a goal in twelve and a half hours. But let me tell you, the hotter it gets, the hotter you've got to be as an auditor. The faster you find a goal, the cleverer, quicker and more responsive you've got to be as an auditor, and there's some point where you reach diminishing returns. You find the goal so fast the pc doesn't find out about it! [laughter]

This idea of setting him up in a ray machine, you know, with one thing going in one side of his head and the impression on a screen on the other side of him, and we analyze the wave and say, "Your goal is to catch catfish! Ah-ha-ha!" No, I'm afraid that point is without the pc's interest or attention. He'd say, "It is?"

Now, the funny part of it is that a goal listed, I have found out now, without the goal being tiger drilled at the beginning of every session into a decent read, will not make Clears on all cases. And some cases will bog. So therefore you've got to be able to have a goal there that the pc's got some reality on, will follow down you've got to keep it cleaned up, and you...
will see a pc's interest in his goal, his reality on his goal, ebb and fade, as his listing continues. It is always brought back simply by tiger drilling the goal into the clear again.

But that has nothing to do with finding the goal. Finding the goal is a precision activity which is based first and foremost on terrifically positive, good, smooth auditing. This auditing can have nothing to do with the fact that "I don't understand TR 4." This auditing can have nothing to do with the fact "I'm having trouble reading a meter." This auditing has nothing to do with the fact that "I don't like to audit some pcs." You understand?

In your hands, at this time, exists technology which has not before existed. It is positive, it is definite, it has a definite end product. The same technology undoubtedly repeats over and over. The second goal found on the first second-goal-Clear made here, was found by the original method, but with Tiger Drilling. And it was number 400 and something on the second 850 list. That's interesting, isn't it? The second goal was found on that list, and it was that deep onto the list. Takes a long time. It takes one minute to clean up a goal, on an average, on Tiger Drilling. And you should be able to hit a goal a minute. That is the average for the long ones and the short ones, and the middle ones, and those that the pc wishes to God he'd never put on the list, you know. "To tie a knot around my Aunt Marandy's left ear." And the pc is saying all the time, "That isn't my goal," and the auditor's having to clean it up. So, there it goes, there it goes, there it goes.

That includes that one, but it's a goal a minute, that's about – that is the speed of Tiger Drilling. Now, at 460, you add 460 minutes plus your rudiments, over that period of time. Now, that's very fast goal finding, if you take a look at it. But with most pcs you will not find it is quite this fast or quite this easy. That's not slow goal finding. You divide 6 into 460, and you're going to get something that doesn't look like too much auditing. Because in the first place, you didn't sit there and list the pc's goals. The pc just wrote those goals out of session or elsewhere or somebody else listed them. Well, you see, that one, by indications, comes well within an ability to find a second goal, in a very short intensive, just by routine and ordinary methods.

But a great many pcs will never have their goal found in the absence of a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, and the first intensive, that is, the first time that you try to find a pc's goal, ah-ha, that's a rocky road, man. Most pcs, that's a rocky road. It is amazing that as many early goals as we found are in. That's amazing to me! Goal after goal, person after person that we found them on originally. But isn't it interesting that they faded away? Wouldn't show up or anything until we'd done a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam on them. And headed it right into inevitably just that goal. That was the only goal it could be! I'll tell you some funny stories about that – right now I won't, but it's very amusing.

Now what are we heading for? We're heading for an efficient positive method of finding goals. We're not heading for a method in which it takes us 3 hours on Josibelle and 196 hours on Pete. This method we want nothing to do with. Nothing to do with. Because it lends an uncertainty onto the line which drives an auditor halfway around the bend and sends the pc through the top of his skull-uncleared! Just try it sometime. Say, "Well, list 850 goals, and we'll tiger drill them down the line and find your goal. 850." They're all dead behind you and there are no goals in front of you. So you say to the pc, "Well, your goal wasn't on that list.
How about, well, how about writing me another couple of hundred goals tonight, and so forth." And you do the couple of hundred, and you say, "Heh-heh-heh, awfully sorry, but you – seems like we've erased the last goal here. How about writing me 5 or 600 goals tonight?"

On some cases this could go to 5 or 6,000 goals. That's 5 or 6,000 minutes man! 5 or 6,000 minutes of auditing, and that's an awful lot of auditing! See what that adds to?

Now, we found some goals on ACCs earlier, and some ACCs ran all 6 weeks without finding anybody's goal. Auditing and auditing and auditing and auditing; what a terrible lose! Very upsetting. No, we want a stabilized action.

Now, right now, Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is unstable to this element of luck. Just like you have luck as to whether or not the goal was early on the list, so you have luck as to whether or not the list you're assessing is complete. First thing you must recognize. A cardinal rule of thumb about a list is if no item assesses out unmistakably, unmistakably, no item assesses out, the list was incomplete. There is no other reason. I have added these all up, and subtracted them, and multiplied them, and subdivided them and turned them over to the rabbits and birds. There is no other reason. If you didn't find the item on that list, the item was not on that list, and that is the open and shut of it. Very simple.

Now, you'd be amazed how often you have luck, just by writing down the 8 dynamics, calling them off to the pc, and say, "Consider overts against…" and so forth. You'd be surprised how often this is lucky. You'll be surprised how often you have 250 (quote) "dynamics" (unquote) listed by the pc, and have no item on them. Do you see that? Some certainty needs to be attached to that, and the certainty that attaches to it is the rock slam during listing.

Now, new capers can be expected along this line. This is not a sterile line. This is under very hot development. But use what you've got. What I would use right now is exactly what you've got. What we know this. We know this. That if we can get a dynamic a pc has rock-slamming overts on, we can then list what represents that dynamic to the pc, on a dwindling rock slam. The rock slam dwindles, item by item, gets smaller and smaller and smaller, and we then have a list that we can assess, and we will find an item. And that the goal will be an overt against that item in one shaded meaning or another, as given on the list.

Now, those are your certainties. Now, the entrance point is the tough point. Trying to find the first slam. Now, we developed a new caper. I dreamed one up in Washington on this basis: The most detested person. "What opinionated person have you most detested?" was the original question. Well, it's not a bad question! But what if the fellow couldn't ever see any people at all? Or people were nowhere near anything he found to be wrong. Now, you're going to lay an egg. You're going to have to say, "Who or what have you detested?" And you're liable to wind yourself up with something that looks like an item.

Now, we're into the experimental field of Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. Do you see why? "Who or what have you detested?" This isn't too good. It isn't perfect. But it's better than nothing. How many ways can you enter this thing? Well, let me tell you a shortcut. A very short, shortcut. You say to the pc, "What do you wish was not part of existence?" And you take a list which you scrap. You don't pay much attention to that list. And then after you've done that list, which kind of oils him up and grooves him in, you say, "What isn't part
of existence?" And you've got the, "What isn't part of existence" list. This will serve you as an item, if it will develop a rock slam.

You assess it by, "Consider overts against..." You will find out the common denominator of all dynamics and items is that the person will not admit they are part of existence. It's a test. When the person first thought it over, he said, well, that wasn't real, wasn't part of existence, didn't belong on the dynamic scale, see. It's a – it's a thing from which they have individuated. It's a thing that they're against. It's a thing they don't want anything more to do with. And there'd probably be several ways you could groove somebody in.

But do you wind up with an item? You've actually really wound up with a person or a thing, which is the most detested person or thing, haven't you? Now, you could regard it as an item, and you could get someplace. But experimental action right at the present moment would be to use this question – highly experimental – you get this thing, "What isn't part of existence" list. Get that nice and long. Assess it by "Consider overts against..." You'll find one finally has a heavy slam on it. "Consider overts against..."

This last slamming item can be built, perhaps, back to a dynamic this way. You understand, this is a, "When-all-else-fails." You realize I'm giving you the, "When-all-else-fails." I probably haven't made it too clear. Your – you've tried to get a dynamic list and you failed. You tried to get a detested person from that and get a dynamic list that was meaningful. And it just didn't go anywhere. You got the idea? We couldn't get dwindling slams, we just couldn't get anything on. You've always got this one, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" Throw that list away and list, "What isn't part of existence?", assess that list and you've got an entrance point. Or, you've got an item!

Well, it's interesting, I'm not sure how you decide. And therefore I'm about to make the following test to see whether or not this works. We take an item so found, and we say, "What part of existence does (item found on 'What isn't part of existence?' list) belong to?" See? "What part of existence does ____ belong to?" And we're going to get a larger thing, which perhaps then... Well, we get a list, we assess that, "Consider overts against..." We pick out the rock slamming item out of that, and then we list this, "What part of existence does a (blank) represent?" See, represent again. See if we get our dwindling slam. You understand this excursion?

What I'm pointing out to you merely by giving you this experimental method is not whether or not this works, or doesn't work. But that this has several entrance points. And if I found as many entrance points as this, you can expect more. You can expect them to be very thorough entrance points.

Right now, you're in a somewhat hit-or-miss state. It's kind of by luck that it's on the first list. Detested person is a very, very fine way of finding it. You use the "detested" person this way: You say, "What opinionated person have you detested?" or something like that. Assess it by rock slam. You could say, "What part of existence does blank (the assessed person) represent to you?" Not, "What is (blank's)... ?" By the way this is a serious error to say, "What is (blank's) idea of the dynamics?" That doesn't work.

But we get "Joe," see. And we say, "All right. What part of existence does Joe represent to you?" see. And the person will give you a dynamic list. Sometimes it lists down at
once to an item and sometimes you've already found the item on the list. You get the liability here?

Well, your exact procedure – the way I would go about a Dynamic Assessment on raw meat – would be just this way. I'd say, "What part – what opinionated person have you detested?" They give me one person. Then they give me two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, twenty, twenty-two, twenty-three people and I'm not even bleeding the meter, don't you see? I say, "Are there any more?", and they add a couple as an afterthought, and then I'll assess that list by, "Think of doing bad things to… " Each person in turn, and assess it rock slam by elimination with that question, wind up with one of these people. You'd be surprised how often it's the first person they said. It's amazing how often it is just the first person. It's not good enough, however, to just take the first person.

All right, we take this person, we say, "What part of existence does (blank) represent?" As soon as we've got (blank) busily listed, we've got a dynamic list, and we will find that rock slams are appearing now. That list doesn't get listed however on a dwindling slam. We shouldn't expect such riches at this time, and we assess that new list by saying, "Think of doing bad things to… " the items on this list, and we will come out with an unmistakable rock slam, if we are lucky. If we've had a rock slam, why, before, on the person, and we've had a – some rock slams on the listing of the dynamics, and if we've had an unmistakable rock slam, and hammer and pound away on the dynamic we finally eliminated down to, let me tell you, that the list, then, of the item will be a dwindling slam. It'll start wide and item by item it'll get narrower and narrower, finally go down to a dirty needle and had to be bled off.

Then we assess that list, which is the item list, once more, "Consider committing overts against..." or "Think of doing bad things to..." Either command will serve, and bang, one of those things will fire. We finally get that firing very, very well, and we have the pc's goals line. And then we say, "What goal might you have that would be an overt against (the item found)." And that should be a dwindling slam and go right on down and finally disappear into a dirty needle and pass away.

And then you should list List Six\(^2\) right away. And then you should list some of the other lists, but List Six is a must, because in a high percentage of the cases, the goal will be number one, two, three, or four listed on List Six. So much so, of course, that you quite often ignore List One. And other lists. Hit that List Six.

Also do not, do not tiger drill selected goals by the auditor. Do not do that, just start at the top of List Six, and start going. Yeah, why think about it, see? Why even add that element of evaluation? These lists are rather brief, don't you see? It doesn't take you long to do these things anyhow. And who knows, the pc's goal might be, "to kiss a mermaid who hasn't eaten garlic." We're not sure what his goal will end up, see. But, in any event, the goal is the goal, and it will be the goal, and if it's there, it fires.

---

\(^2\) Editor's note: "What goal might you have that would be impossible to realise [or: to achieve] if you were (item or part of item)?" – see HCOB 22 Aug. 1962 and HCOB 1 Sep. 1962
Now, an action which must go before, must precede any Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is as follows: The pc lists 850 goals on his own, or he's listed it for them by another auditor in a co-audit and, don't forget this one before you do the Dynamic Assessment and go to all that trouble, you sit down and you take every goal ever found on the pc, and you make a list of those goals. I don't care whether they were good, bad, indifferent. He says they've been erased, we don't care. We write down that list of goals. And we tiger drill that list. It seldom goes more than 6 or 7.

And we tiger drill them with these magic words. The first Tiger Drill is done as follows – tiger drilling words, this is a brand-new idea to you. "On the word 'suppressed' has anything been suppressed?" Got that? You tiger drill the buttons. It's amazing what you can do. Somebody's sure they've had pain-drug-hypnosis, been proved to them, in upper Sullivan Island, and you can tiger drill pain, you can tiger drill drugs, you can tiger drill hypnotism. Tiger drill words. Quite amazing what it does.

If you think somebody's dramatizing her name because she's crying all the time and her name is Teary, you want to know? We used to do other things with this. Well, the answer to it is Tiger Drill. Just tiger drill the word Teary. And you can tiger drill to flatness or cognition.

Now, that is a must for somebody who has been audited a bit – for a lot or prep-checked and so forth. Let's clean up these words. We have had an experience, a horrifying experience, of a pc selected to have his goal found at the congress slamming with gorgeousity! Kicking the pin. You could see the needle bend, I'm sure. And the second the pc thus tested reported for session, was found to have no rock slam at all. And the rock slam just was off, and that was it. Pretty grim, huh? Well the suppression there was terrific. Because the consequences of all our clearing him were succinctly stated by that pc in letters of fire with exclamation points. He'd have to practically do everything include committing suicide, I think. It was pretty drastic what he'd have to do if we cleared him. Of course the overt word was Scientology. And that saved our bacons nicely.

But as soon as we got onto the line, the rock slam turned back on again. How could this have been turned on earlier? By tiger drilling words. Also, it could have been handled by tiger drilling a period of time. You've not heard of that one before, you heard of prepchecking a period of time, but Tiger Drilling it is just sitting right there on the meter and bingety-banging it.

That, however, was not too good on this case. What was happening on this case was the consequences of becoming Clear. Something that has to be gone into with every pc that you are working. You have to go into the consequences of being Clear. If I cleared you, what would be the consequences? You'll find out sometimes it's so catastrophic the pc never will give you his goal. He knows what clearing is. He's done it lots of times himself. You put the person in front of the Fac One machine and you start turning the handles. And he knows why you shouldn't clear people, because he gets a hole in his chest! You know, the old machine that had the – had the big blast that went out the front, and the little peekhole in the back that it came back and hit the operator. Somebody was telling me the other day they're going to make these for the US Army, and I – why, I didn't – I didn't think they ought to do it. They
could only be operated by Clears, and Clears wouldn't operate them. Interesting. So, why build the machine?

Anyway, here was a case of a sudden vanishment of a rock slam. Now, you're going to confront that many a time. And maybe there are many better solutions to it. But right now, you will find that tiger drilling words will serve an enormous number of purposes. That's one for you to put down. Because I think that will be with us for a long time.

The other thing is work the Suppress button hard, and the other thing is to work the Careful button. Careful is actually more likely to turn on a rock slam than Suppress. And the probability is that our pc's rock slam at the congress would have turned on if the Careful button had been well enough operated, or heavy enough operated. But I don't think it was used. Because it was put in a little bit later. I'm not sure about that but I think that's the case.

All right. Now, I've seen a lot of rock slams occurring underneath that Careful button. Rock slams which were off. So, now I told you that there were two things that you should do before you start in on a Dynamic Assessment on a pc. There were two things you should do. And one of them is to tiger drill the buttons into some kind of shape, and the other one is to take those early goals.

Any goal found on them to date, and tiger drill those goals with this command: "In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" etc. Do you get it? "In auditing on the goal so-and-so..." And you tiger drill with no other phraseology than that. You just tiger drill that one. And you will find out that a goal that has been buried and cannot be made to read again, can be made to read by prechecking the buttons. And then prechecking with this formula: "In auditing, on the goal," whatever it was, "has anything been..." the buttons. Got it?

Now, that has a varied – a varied form. Where it didn't succeed, you can go into "Since..." whatever date the goal was found, "... on the goal..." whatever the goal is, "... has anything been..." and tiger drill it in that fashion. Okay? So you've got an alternate method. You've got the period method, and you've got, "In auditing."

I've seen a goal tiger drilled, a goal already found and abused, I've seen a goal tiger drilled, with plain Tiger Drilling, ordinary Tiger Drilling, out of existence. It didn't read, it didn't fire, it didn't cough, it didn't sneeze, there was nothing. There was not a yeep left on it! Pcs satisfied with it, too. No somatics left on it. Everybody happy. The pc happy, and the auditor happy, and everybody cheerful that his goal being gone. Then opened up on again with tiger drilling the buttons of the Tiger Drill, and then swinging in on the goal and making it read.

And I have seen this happen: Taking an old goal, seeing it totally flattened with – utterly and completely erased as far as anybody could tell, not a quiver on a Mark V E-Meter. And here it goes, gone! Not a, not a mention. Couldn't get Suppress to read. Couldn't get anything to read. Couldn't get any part of anything to read. Gone! And then suddenly run, "In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" and all of a sudden seeing the goal come back to life with a crash. Okay? Seen them both.
So don't ever discard old goals as beneath your contempt. An early goal is found on this case. This goal is for the birds. Nobody could possibly make anything out of this goal, and it was run on the pc for some days with no success. And you say, "Well, I guess we can neglect that." Yes, you can neglect it, why not neglect the whole case? In fact, why audit the case at all? Because from that moment onward, that case makes no further forward progress. That's horrifying, you know? That says why we stopped them from letting HCAs find all the goals! Dzzzz! Must have been rough! See that? So your pc has had this ridiculous goal found, "to tie bowlines on a bight on the backs of catfish and ride with a pipe in my teeth across the seas of Arizona." And the auditor says, "This couldn't possibly be a goal, therefore I'll neglect this thing." And the case is parked from there on. Case is parked.

You got to handle that goal like I just told you. I may even think of better ways of handling it. But that's good enough for a few – three weeks of development. You'll get that goal firing and knock out any residual fire in it. And get it out and get it gone, get the protests off of it, and get that thing went. And now all of a sudden the pc a – runs like a baby carriage. Savvy? Get rid of them old goals before you wind up on a Dynamic Assessment and you will be a happy character. Because the pc has already experienced an improvement under your auditing and therefore has confidence in you as an auditor. And you can use every bit of that confidence while doing a Dynamic Assessment.

Course, if you insist on doing it and it's – already they've been thoroughly cleaned up, and you can't get a spark out of any of them, and the pc keeps telling you, "But they've been cleaned up!"

And you keep saying, "Well I know, but I've got to make sure, according to Ron's lecture of September 18, AD 12, I have to go over these things with a fine…"

"I know! But the auditor did last week!"

You'll eventually get the goals reading again. Of course all they'll respond to is the word "protest." They'll all be reading! That's outside the auditing formula. But there, in final analysis, is where we have arrived at with 3G Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam.

Good hunting!

Thank you!
TV DEMO: TIGER DRILL

An auditing demonstration given on 19 September 1962

LRH: Okay. Is it all right with you if we start this thing in motion?
PC: All right.
LRH: All right? You comfortable?
PC: Yes. Thank you.
LRH: Not too close?
PC: 'Tis a bit, yes.
LRH: All right. Pull you back.
PC: Thank you.
LRH: All right. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's fine. Okay. Give them another squeeze. Thank you. That's fine. All right. Now, I'll tell you what we're going to do here, is I've got a few goals to tiger drill, and that's all I'm going to do.
PC: Right.
LRH: And I'm just going to go on down the list of existing goals with some that you have added on here, and do all this in Model Session. Okay?
PC: That's fine.
LRH: Very good. I hope you won't mind that the room is still. [PC laughs] All right. Is it all right with you if I start this session now?
PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of session. All right. Has the session started for you?
PC: Yes.
LRH: Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?
PC: Well, to find the goal.
LRH: Good.
PC: To work well. To work well.
LRH: Good, got it. Good.
PC: And to feel even better at the end of it.
LRH: All right.
PC: That's the lot.
LRH: Okay. Are there any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?
PC: Oh, to be Clear.
LRH: Good.
PC: And um – goal for life or livingness – and as part – I'd like to get part in this session, that is to get my eyesight back as it used to be.
LRH: Eyesight better than it used to be?
PC: I'm sorry. As – as better – as it used to be in other words. To get – get my eyesight better, as it – as it used to be.
LRH: I got it. As it used to be.
PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Very good. You'd like to also set that as a session goal?

PC: Well, part of it, you see. I don't uh ...

LRH: All right. Very good. Any other goal you'd like set for life and livingness?

PC: No. That'll do.

LRH: That'll do.

PC: Well, there's the rest I've always given still stand.

LRH: The usual.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Well, your tone arm is sitting here at, oh, about 2.9, something like that.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Very nearly 3.

PC: Your work wasn't in vain on board.

LRH: Hmm?

PC: Your work wasn't in vain on board.

LRH: All right. Okay. Good enough. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. You might have something more to say about that. What was that right there?

PC: Well, that was that I'm quite willing to talk to you about my difficulties, and just after the — after the previous thing and even despite the fact that we're on TV.

LRH: All right. Very good. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Surely.

LRH: Very good. Check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: I've got a fall here I'll have to clear up.

PC: Um – well, this is um – nervous feeling I've got is in the stomach, and it's obviously something to do with the fact that uh – that we're in this room now. I shouldn't be nervous. I don't know why, but that's the difficulty I have right now, but I'm quite willing to talk to you about it.

LRH: All right. Very good. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?
PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, what difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about? There it is.

PC: Oh, well, that's the – yes. That's the difficulty of um – of – I did mention it to you briefly before we started the session, of getting the TV sets into the um – chapel because um – now that they're auditing there all day, it's rather difficult for – or almost impossible to get them in, do you see?

LRH: Mm.

PC: So I'm quite willing to talk to you about it but there ha- has been a reluctance really to worry you with it ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... and to get it down somehow or other. And so there we are.

LRH: Okay. Very good. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Well, on the same thing, now, the other difficulty in the same connection is getting the sound so that it suits you, which means that we got – we really need you down there to – whilst we're testing it to check it, but I'm willing to talk to you about that.

LRH: Very good.

PC: That's the only other thing I can think of.

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check that out on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? There's no reaction there.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: Thank you very much. Okay. Now you can sigh with relief. All right. When was the last time I audited you?

PC: On Monday night.

LRH: Very good. Now since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

PC: Well, I'd been away for a long while. I hadn't seen Jenny for a long while, so the inevitable happened last night.

LRH: Very good.

PC: As this always comes up in talking to you – it always seems to happen just before a session for some reason, even though I don't know it, that when I go to the toilet, I have a mishap somehow, do you see. And this happened again last night. Now that's something I was withholding from you and the public.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: And I think that's the lot.

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check that on the meter. All right. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? All right. I have a reaction here. What have you done? There.

PC: Well, um...

LRH: That's it.

PC: I made a phone call tonight – um – that I think you know about now anyway, but I went to some trouble and a lot of dashing around in the general office.
to find the right telephone number. I – see, to get onto this – this telephone number, I had to go ring up somebody to find somebody else's number who knew this number, but I never call him there. That's the only thing I thought of then.

**LRH:** All right. Thank you. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** All right. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? All right. I have a reaction here. What have you done? There it is.

**PC:** Well, I've got the area. Well, I suppose I am withholding it. I spoke to a student today about the – his future, and then I said, "Well, I'll pass this on to Ron, but you can write direct if you like," and he chose that way, so therefore I've withheld the information – not this big, I mean nothing serious in this – withheld it because he's going to do it direct.

**LRH:** Hmm. All right. Thank you. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** Well, I can't think of anything else.

**LRH:** Very good. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? I have a reaction here. What have you done? There is.

**PC:** Well, this is at...

**LRH:** There it is.

**PC:** ... this is on the quay side on Tuesday.

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

**PC:** Loading up – loading up the car...

**LRH:** There.

**PC:** I just remember we were getting your car out. Um...

**LRH:** What was that? There it is. There.

**PC:** Loaded the car up.

**LRH:** There. There. There.

**PC:** Oh, I lent somebody some money.

**LRH:** Oh, I see. All right. Very good. Thank you. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Very good. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? All right. I have a reaction here. What have you done? It's another one. There.

**PC:** Well, that is – well, this is only a thought, but um – the ... We came out of the hotel in – when we – where we stayed for lunch on Tuesday, and I took rather a dim view of the way you came out of there, because there was another car coming up, we came out rather... There was a lorry parked on the right which might have distracted your attention. This car came up from the other side. I think it was a – or a bit earlier. Anyway. And I thought well, you hadn't looked, and it was rather a disparaging – disparaging thought. That's all.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. All right. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** Interesting – but I can't –
really can't think — scanning over anything else.

**LRH:** Very good. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? I have a – another reaction here. What have you done?

**PC:** This is an omission. I noticed somebody was wearing a brooch and I didn't remark on it. I noticed – there's the done, but I didn't remark on it.

**LRH:** Very good.

**PC:** That was — that was — now there's the withhold. Yes. That I had noticed that they had — wearing a brooch.

**LRH:** Very good. All right. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** Well, yes. I wonder if this is what's holding it up. I have taken over the cottage which I'm withholding from a lot of people, not from you, but from a lot of people.

**LRH:** Hmm.

**PC:** There's one thing there, yes.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. How you doing now?

**PC:** I'm doing all right.

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** Rather a little um – surprised at all these petty little things that're sort of kicking on the meter. That's all.

**LRH:** All right. All right. Okay. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?

**PC:** Well, I think I withheld from you that I didn't sleep very well on Monday night. In fact, I lay awake quite a long while and so on, and I was – attention was taken sometimes by the tugs coming along-
thing else. I must be the world's silliest withholder. Well, I – I spoke disparagingly of somebody because they borrowed my car and they didn't fill it up with petrol.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

PC: Well, I found the missing photographs – the pictures – last night that I was supposed to take to America.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: And I withheld that up to now. I mean – they would have been ... Anyway I had withheld it up till now. Nothing else found there. No.

LRH: No? All right. Very good. All right. I'll check that on the meter now. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? All right. I have a reaction here. What have you done?

PC: Well, uh ...

LRH: There it is.

PC: Well, I – there's two things there. One is that I received today the parcel of – of parcel containing the equipment so that we can synchronize a tape with a film – with a slide show. Um, the other thing is I'm withholding, I think, getting very impatient because this rudiment doesn't clean up.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Is that it?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? All right. There is a reaction here.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Now let me see if I can't help you out here a little bit, hm?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. Let's just follow this reaction. There. What's that? Right there. There it is. It's been the same reaction straight through. What is it?

PC: Well, there's nothing I'm consciously avoiding.

LRH: There it is right there. There it is. There it is.

PC: Well, I announced to Jenny on the – over dinner tonight that I was going to be audited and um – told her what I'd have to admit, but uh – that's that.

LRH: Now, what's that? What's that one right there?

PC: Well, it's to do with the TV.

LRH: All right. What's that right there? What do you do when I give you a that?

PC: Well, I-I just see what I'm looking at, or what I – whereabouts I – when you give me – when I start to look, I just try to scan over the period to find something I had done. When you say that, I stop where I am and look around that area to see whether there is – what is there that I'm withholding.

LRH: All right. Very good. Perfectly proper.

PC: Um-hmm.

LRH: All right.

PC: Um.

LRH: There. What's that? What's that right there?

PC: Well, that's ...

LRH: Right there. There. There.
PC: Well, this is the training office. Um ...

LRH: That's it. That's it. That's it.

PC: Oh, this was sending you a note about some of the students who have left and so on. I can't see any withhold there.

LRH: Well, there's a tick-tick here.

PC: Is it pills? I-I-I took those pills up today. Um – withheld that from you, that I didn't think you wanted to be bothered with those things, you know. Those pills you received on board, I took them up to Peter so he could handle that. Um ...

LRH: ...There ... There ... There.

PC: I've moved around to ...

LRH: Hmm?

PC: Going to bed last night, but I've told you ...

LRH: Mm-mmm.

PC: Not withholding anything about that.

LRH: All right.

PC: I feel there's something wrong here because I-I'm sure there's nothing I've done that I'm withholding, and um ...

LRH: What are you looking at right there?

PC: Looking at the cottage.

LRH: Mm-mmm.

PC: Um ...

LRH: There. There.

PC: My coat hanging on the tier, lighter not working. Comb my hair and thought of you telling me it was all stuck up the other day. Um ...

LRH: What are you sitting on right there?

PC: Wish I knew.

LRH: Right there. There.

PC: Car.

LRH: ... There ... There. You're sitting right on it. It keeps going click-click, click-click, click-click. There it is. There it is.

PC: Well, I'm looking to see whether I've said something out of place about you, but I can't – I don't think I have anyway. Um – talking

LRH: What's that? What's that?

PC: I'm an absolute blank.

LRH: There.

PC: I was conscious of a ...

LRH: There.

PC: ... nervous tension in my stomach, but ...

LRH: There.

PC: Well, what I keep thinking of is when you said to me tonight – you said, you know, "Do you want a session?" I said, "Yes, that's fine," and then after that I just thought, what have I done since because I'm going through this. And the only things that came to mind are what I've already told you.

LRH: Well, was this a self-audit sort of thing?

PC: Possibly, yes. Well just – I just scanned over when um ...

LRH: Was there any effort here not – to have these things out of the road so they wouldn't register?

PC: Well, no, not to have them out of the road. Oh, there was some play at
this over dinner time, but uh...

**LRH:** Ah – what was that?

**PC:** Oh, well I said to Jenny – oh, I've told you this anyway – I said to Jenny going on TV tonight. So she – she said something about oh, um – well, if you'd known you were going on – if you'd known you were going on TV, you wouldn't, you see. So I – then Philip said, oh, you – he needs a good acknowledgment. So this is sort of the joking was to as-is it all, you see. So I said that won't do it. And so I just resigned myself it would have to come out. That was all.

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** That's all I've done. I mean...

**LRH:** There's a decision there.

**PC:** A decision? Yes.

**LRH:** You made a decision. Now what was it?

**PC:** That I'd have to come out with this withhold, give all my sex life away and so on.

**LRH:** All right. All right. Now, is that something you've done?

**PC:** Yes. And withheld it up to now. Yes.

**LRH:** Is that right?

**PC:** That's right, yes.

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Now, can I check this out on the meter?

**PC:** Yes, please.

**LRH:** All right. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? And that is as smooth as glass.

**PC:** Jesus.

**LRH:** Apparently we've been working away from this one point.

**PC:** Mmm. Mmm.

**LRH:** Ok?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Fascinating.

**LRH:** You feel all right about this?

**PC:** Oh, I feel quite all right about it.

**LRH:** All right. Any ARC break connected with this?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** All right. Thank you, there is none.

All right. Is it all right if we go on now?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** You feel all right about it?

**PC:** I feel quite happy about it. Cocky, as a matter of fact.

**LRH:** Okay. Now, do you have a present time problem?

**PC:** No. Not after that.

**LRH:** All right. I'll check this on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? I've got a reaction here. What problem do you have? There it is.

**PC:** Oh, that, yeah. Well, that's the problem on getting this – the problem that I was on the phone about before, which I feel is my problem as well. There's that. There's the problem of getting the TV in over the road and the sound working.

**LRH:** Mm-hmm.

**PC:** And problem of getting the, not a lot, but my in-basket cleared up since
I've been away. There's not much there. I don't think there are any other problems.

LRH: Very good. All right. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: Very good. I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? All right. I have a reaction here. What is your problem?

PC: To get off this rut and to get on with our goals.

LRH: Very good. All right. I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? All right. Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. Thank you. All right. Now, we've ... There's a blowdown here, came down to about 2.25, under all this hammering. All right. Now, we've been boxing around here with a goal line, haven't we?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yes.

LRH: When I asked you to write a certain number of goals and I actually got a certain number of goals to do, and I haven't had the chance to tiger drill many of these goals, so why don't I just start in here some place or another ...

PC: Mm-mmh.

LRH: ... and we just see what we can locate here. Okay?

PC: That's fine.

LRH: You just now gave me a new list ...

PC: It's on those short, small pieces of paper.

LRH: Yes. It's charted all by itself. It's here in these worksheets. I will find it in here. Many of these goals might be perfectly valid. Hidden under that sheet. All right. Why don't we just dispose of these?

PC: All right.

LRH: Hmm? I asked you to do some goals on "a murderer." Now, we're going to get "a murderer" to fire. Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. Here we go. Consider committing overt against a murderer. All right, there's a small stop on that and I'm going to settle for that small stop. Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: And here's our first goal. And what were these? These were goals that uh ...

PC: Condemn. Goals that would really condemn a murderer, I think.

LRH: Really condemn a murderer since it was condemn that we were – hey! that's still reacting. It was "to condemn" that we started out from on this. So here's the first one. Okay? All right with you if I go on with this now?

PC: It's fine, yes, yes.

LRH: Anything you care to say before I do?

PC: No, no.

LRH: Anything you have to say, why, just open up and tell me. Okay?

PC: Mm-mmh.

LRH: All right. Here's the first goal: "to know." On this goal, has anything been invalidated? All right. What is that? What's been invalidated?

PC: Well, I've invalidated "to
know" a bit because it comes below not-know on the Tone Scale, and so "to know" – it would be a higher goal than that, you see, to not-know.

**LRH:** Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. There's another one, what's that?

**PC:** Well, I've often been accused of being a know-all, which is "to know," so then – so to that extent it's been invalidated.

**LRH:** Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. There's another one. There it is. There.

**PC:** Well, it's invalidated as though you must know. I didn't know what it was, do you see, so I was invalidated on the goal to know.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Okay. To know. To know. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? There it is. What is that?

**PC:** Well, I've often – I've played this game quite a bit of being um – uh – ignorant. I've found this has often paid in business. You find out a lot that way, so sometimes when I've known quite a bit, I've pretended I didn't in order to draw the other chap out. So I invalidated the goal "to know" to that extent.

**LRH:** Mm. Very good.

**PC:** I'm sorry, failed to reveal that.

**LRH:** Very good. All right. On the goal to know, is there anything that you failed to reveal? All right. Probably okay. To know. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. What's the mistake? There it is. There.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** There.

**PC:** Something on the lines of – it's a mistake to know as I was telling you just now. Well, yes. When I wrote it out, I thought it was probably wrong. It's probably "to know something" and "to know" on its own wasn't quite right. Hence, the other goals that follow on that have got "to know," but there's another bit more added onto the goal. So that could've been a mistake.

**LRH:** Very good. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? Okay. There's another one. What is that? There. There.

**PC:** It – it's a mistake to know – um – I have a somatic under my – in my neck.

Well, I just – well, going on getting when I wrote them out, I hadn't my glasses on first of all, and I was wondering whether I had written it – couldn't quite see what I'd written afterwards. I wasn't sure whether it was right or not. I wondered whether there was a mistake. But there wasn't.

**LRH:** Mm-mmm. All right. That answer the question?

**PC:** I think so.

**LRH:** You satisfied?

**PC:** Mm-mmm.

**LRH:** You don't look so.

**PC:** Yes, I'm satisfied.

**LRH:** Really?

**PC:** I was wondering whether you would be satisfied.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. All right. Good
enough. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. That looks clean for the moment. To know. To know. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes. What's that?

PC:  Well, I'm invalidating it because I think somebody else has got this goal on the course, and I'm wondering whether I've just put it on because I've heard it from them.

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. That looks clean. All right. To know. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? There it is. What's that? What's the suppression?

PC:  Well, I actually, I thought of this goal on Monday night in bed and I suppose suppressed – I suppressed an urge to get up and write it down.

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay?

PC:  Yes.

LRH: Anything else?

PC:  No. Getting quite some somatics on this one, on the chest.

LRH: What?

PC:  Some somatics. Pain across the chest and the neck.

LRH: Well, good.

PC:  Just developed. Thank you.

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? On the goal to know, has there been anything you've been careful of? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. Just another invalidation. What's that? There it is.

PC:  Well, I'm invalidating it. I just can't ... Seemed quite real when I wrote it down. It doesn't seem so real now. Doesn't seem as if it was my goal. And yet – so I'm invalidating it to that extent.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes, what's that? There it is.

PC:  Well, I've invalidated the goal a lot because I won't know detail. I invalidate the necessity to know detail. That's the answer.

LRH: All right. Thank you. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. Did you think of a suggest?

PC:  Well, the only fear – the only suggest could have been somebody else having it on course.

LRH: All right. Thank you. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? There is another one. What's that?

PC:  It's been suggested that these go – this goal is probably too – one, you know, that is getting a bit too basic for – too basic, almost fundamentals of – fundamentals of Scientology and so on that probably – it's been suggested that, and therefore suggested it wouldn't be my goal.

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? Yes, there's another one. What is it? There.

PC:  Well, I'm getting quite a lot of discomfort and – and pain as you're doing this one. And I'm trying to ... There's a peculiar thing going on here because I'm suggesting it's nothing to do with it and it's accidental – the somatics that turned on with this.

LRH: All right. Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. On the goal to know, has a mistake
been made? There's a mistake. What is it?

PC: Well, when I first thought of this goal, I was really – really hit me, you know. I thought oh, this is it. This is it. This is what we've been looking for. This adds everything up. But now I feel there's a mistake been made that it wasn't so – you know, it wasn't so much my – I'm sorry uh...

LRH: What's the matter?

PC: Oh, I lost myself. I don't know what I was saying even.

LRH: All right. Mistake. Has a mistake been made?

PC: When I first thought of this girl – goal, girl! I was really sure it was mine.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And then I – I don't know. I feel so uncomfortable right now. Me arms are tightening – tightening into the side and I feel I'm try – I feel almost that I'm trying to sell it to you and it shouldn't be, and if it does check out, it will be a mistake. So that's a mistake ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... this attitude.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? Equivocal. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. To know. All right. To know. All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Has anything been suggested? What's the suggestion?

PC: Your sitting – your pausing on the read of this and the method of Tiger Drill suggests whether it's in or not.

LRH: All right. Very good. It's still clicking.

PC: Mm-mmh.

LRH: I'm just trying to get it to click more. Hence even when it clicks, I sometimes use a Suppress button.

PC: Um-hmm.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Yes. Thank you.

LRH: All right. On the goal – on the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Has anything been suggested? Is there anything you failed to reveal? Equivocal. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes. What's that? Failed to reveal. There it is.

PC: Well, this – this is not something I just thought of. I'm afraid I've – this sort of kicking a bit and so on. And I – then I sat here and I thought, "Oh, it'd be terrific if this checks out," and then I thought, "and the blighters down there think we found this goal first and you're going through the motions."

LRH: Uh-huh. Oh, all right.

PC: And well, there's a "failed to reveal."

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. To know. To know. To know. I got three agitations – two ticks and a long drop. Okay?

PC: Um-hmm, um-hmm.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Equivocal. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. Has anything been suggested? Okay. Any suggestion there?

PC: Yes. When I was looking this
over the other night when it was so real to me, I was looking over and thinking how often I say "I don't know."

LRH: Mmmm.

PC: And it – it's a pet phrase of mine. I don't know. I don't know. And this seems to me to tie up possibly to somebody who had the goal to know – he obviously wouldn't know. And, this has once or twice has been pointed out to me that I go around saying, "Well, I don't know," and so on. So there we are.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? There's another one. What is that?

PC: Oh, now I'm going right back to when I was having the assembly and there was little Bert there and somehow or other then I came out with this phrase "I don't know," and he suggested that that was quite – "I don't know" was quite a wise thing to do, you know.

LRH: Um-humm.

PC: That's it.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? Okay. There's another one. What is that?

PC: Well, that's again – you suggested it might be the goal by telling me the reads.

LRH: Okay. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? Another one. What's that?

PC: Well, I've suggested it's too highfalutin a goal to have.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. Probably there's another one there. Just a guess that there may be one. If you don't think of one, that's all right.

PC: I haven't got one readily available ...
things — I often suppress them. God, yes, so as not to hurt somebody else. This has been very good, but uh ... This reflects on me so that I won't be thought bad of, but sometimes I know something and I will let people talk and go on and pretend I don't know.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Suppress it then.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? There's another one. What's that?

**PC:** My life's been suppressed from many quarters from knowing. Um ...

**LRH:** Your life?

**PC:** Mmm.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** In uh – Christ, this pain is something terrible – It's an exaggeration, really...

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Don't know why I said that, but it's not — it's not pleasant.

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** But in my life I've — I've wanted to go out and know things or find out things and people have been too flip-pant about things, you see, so to that degree they've suppressed what I'm doing.

**LRH:** Mm-mmh.

**PC:** That's all I see on this.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Okay. There's another one. What's that?

**PC:** Now I'm getting sen because of — my hands feel like a — ooh, this is so heavy that they're really pressing — they seem to be pressing right through my thighs where the are on my ... Seems solid down there.

**LRH:** Mm-hmm. All right.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** What's been suppressed?

**PC:** Um...

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

**PC:** Well, sex has been suppressed. This may amuse — amaze — not so — but — in that connection I got — suddenly got the Biblical phrase "She knew him," which I believe means she had sex with him or something.

**LRH:** Oh, yes. All right.

**PC:** Sorry for that, I don't know where that came from, but ...

**LRH:** Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Yes. What's that? That's it.

**PC:** Efforts to know ...

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** ... have been suppressed.

**LRH:** On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Equivocal. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? There is another one. What's that? There it is. Yep. Walking into a slam here. What's that suppression?

**PC:** Well, I've suppressed people knowing about me. I've kept my life very often very much to myself so I've suppressed their knowing what I'm doing.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. Do you have another answer there?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** All right. There probably is one. See if you can look around and find it.
There it is.

PC: *I'm suppressing at this moment any attempt to do anything until you direct me.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been sup– has anything been suppressed? There's another one. What's that?

PC: *I suppressed your hesitation.*

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. Equivocal. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. It's clean for the moment. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? Can you think of an answer there? There. There.

PC: *I'm careful to find out things and to know.*

LRH: Mm-mmm.

PC: *Oh ...*

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? Think of another answer?

PC: *Careful to just sit here.*

LRH: Okay. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? There's another one, probably.

PC: *Well, that's a maybe, is the best I can do for you. It's maybe I've been careful of knowing ...*

LRH: Mm-mmm.

PC: ...on the goal to know, because it's sometimes dangerous to know. Yes, that's better. It's um – you don't want bad news so you don't know. You don't go make any effort to know, so you're careful not to find out and know.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. Maybe another one. There, what's that?

PC: *So is it careful?*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *Um...*

LRH: What have you been careful of? There. What's that?

PC: *Well, I'm sorry. Just – I was aware of your pencil that you dropped just now ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... because I got aware of it.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Careful not to try – careful not to take any notice of what you – that you had dropped.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. There's one. What's that?

PC: *I've been careful to listen to all your lectures. Gone to great care to do that, which is on the way to knowing.*

LRH: Very good. All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. Looks clean for the moment.

On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. Don't find much on that. Have you got any answer? All right. To know. To know. To know. Firing a bit latent, but that's all right. Differently. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes? What's that?

PC: *Well, I was invalidating your read then because I noticed that I was*
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breathing, and not deliberately, but seemed to come – my breath seemed to come as you said. I think I'd invalidate almost anything with that.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes. What's that?

PC: Oh, that was – I suppose I did a bit of invalidation as well, but I had a letter from some strange guy today who – oh, I don't know what he was, but he'd written about my book and I think he finished up by being a bit sarcastic and saying he admired my courage. He was trying to prove some point about energy and mass. He was saying there was no – to take – not mass, solids – to take a solid thing as a stable datum was wrong or something, so there was his invalidation of my knowledge, my "to know," my method of knowing. So I promptly slapped him one back and suggested to him that he hadn't understood my book right and perhaps he'd better read it again.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: There's a postscript to that and I must tell you this, otherwise it'll be a withhold. Um – to better still, that you read the works of L. Ron Hubbard.

LRH: Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. There's probably one. Find that there?

PC: Mmh.

LRH: What's that?

PC: Mmh.

LRH: I'll repeat the question. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes. There is one there.

PC: Yeah. Well, I suppose I've invalidated some of the students sometimes when I've flunked them or told them they weren't right and so on.

LRH: Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. Has anything been suggested? All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. There may be a revealed here. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes, definitely. What's the failed to reveal?

PC: Well, I fail to reveal very often that I haven't understood things. In other words, known what was going on, and um – there's a sort of a – uh, yes, a pretended knowingness sometimes.

LRH: Um-hmm.

PC: But what is perhaps worse here is that I'll get a – you – you will say something either in a lecture or to me or to a group, that is – I can wholeheartedly understand and agree with, and then it goes, afterwards, you know. I – seems almost as if I just duplicate the data so completely that it's no longer with me.

LRH: Umm.

PC: Um – so there's a failed to reveal, do you see? There's some – there's something I failed to reveal on a – on a goal "to know" that this happens to me. It – it's not quite true because then I find that – provided I'm not asked what did you say on such and such a date, if somebody will come up and ask – ask me a question on that, I can very often just come out with the answer. I know I did it today to somebody, came to ask me a question. I didn't have to think at all. I just gave him the answer.

LRH: All right. Thank you. How are these somatics?

PC: Well, they're easing off a bit, but I've still got this one right across
the chest, and I've gone a bit throaty, and the heavy – my hands still feel heavy, but that terrific pressure that was nearly breaking my - was sort of pressing down my arms - that's gone.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** I still seem to be gripping hold of these cans fairly tightly.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. What was that?

**PC:** Well, I just suggested that - how this tied up with the other goals you been checking out. And there was this one about truth – not being truthful or honest and so on, do you see?

**LRH:** Mmh.

**PC:** They all – they all tie up somehow or other.

**LRH:** Hmm.

**PC:** And I was also suggesting to meself that this one's dying hard.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. There's probably another one here. Suggest. Suggest.

**PC:** Well, I'm sorry, but I just suggested to meself it's rather a surprising goal for me to have or something or – it's a goal you might be proud of.

**LRH:** All right. Oh, I see. I see. Okay. On the goal – on the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Yeah, there's probably suppression there.

**PC:** Well, that's – was a – a desire just to wipe my nose. It's not necessary, but just a sort of desire then.

**LRH:** Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. This seems clean. To know. To know. To know. All right. How is this – how is this somatic and so forth?

**PC:** Well, it's still across the chest. It's easing off a bit, and I've still got it across the chest.

**LRH:** Now, do you mind if we leave that goal partially checked out and check the next goal?

**PC:** Mm-hmm.

**LRH:** All right. Just – just for fun.

**PC:** That's all right. Enjoy yourself.

**LRH:** It's almost the same goal and I'm trying to explain the latent read here.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** All right. Because the goal is still hidden.

**PC:** Okay.

**LRH:** To know all. To know all. Okay. To know all. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Yes. What's that?

**PC:** Well, that it – I've just suppressed it because it sounded to me like an impossible goal.

**LRH:** All right. On that goal has anything been suppressed? All right. Another one. What's that?

**PC:** I'm – uh – I like the other goal best, and I'm trying to suppress this one.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. On the goal to know all, has anything been sup-
pressed? Okay. To know all. Very good. That is no longer amongst us. I'm going to get the next two in a hurry here ...

PC:  All right.

LRH:  ... because they're both the same type of goal.

PC:  Mmh.

LRH:  All right. To know about people. On this goal, has anything been suppressed? All right. That's probably out. All right. To know all about people. All right. On that goal, has anything been invalidated? All right. Has anything been suppressed? All right. We're not going to pay any more attention to that. Now let's go back and look at this goal some more, huh?

PC:  Mmh-hmm.

LRH:  Good. Sometimes you can loosen them up by knocking the others like them.

PC:  Can I just wipe my nose? It's just taking my attention a bit.

LRH:  You surely wipe your nose. Go ahead and wipe your nose.

PC:  Thank you.

LRH:  All right. Now, we're going to get in the middle rudiments here for the session, very rapidly by fast check. Okay?

PC:  Okay.

LRH:  All right. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? Invalidated? What's that? In this session what have you invalidated? That.

PC:  Well, I invalidated some of those goals just then.

LRH:  Yeah. All right. Okay. In this session, is there anything you have invalidated? There's another one. What's that?

PC:  Mm.

LRH:  There. What's that?

PC:  You um – somehow. Oh, I think I was — uh — what was I doing? I was invalidating you a bit in the rudiments by thinking you were cleaning cleans.

LRH:  Oh, all right. Thank you. In this session, is there anything you have invalidated? Equivocal. In this session, is there anything you have invalidated? All right. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. In this session, has anything been suggested? Yes. What? What's been suggested?

PC:  Well, I just suggested — and was horrified afterward when I heard what I'd said — that you were cleaning cleans and I thought well, that leaves that one down.

LRH:  All right. Very good. Very good.

PC:  Oh, there is an addition to that because then there was a silence after it and I thought you were suggesting by your silence I was in for a dig.

LRH:  No, I think I was trying to keep from laughing. I wouldn't have a withhold from you. Needle falling off the pin the whole way. And I said to myself, "Well, I've got witnesses." [PC and LRH laugh]

PC:  Okay.

LRH:  All right. In this session, is there anything you have suggested? All right. That appears okay. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. You think of anything? There? What's that?

PC:  Well, I failed to reveal — but I did.

LRH:  Hm? You failed what?
PC: I failed to reveal the withhold for a long while in the rudiments.

LRH: Hmm.

PC: I did eventually. But there was a fail for a while there.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? Equivocal. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? I don't find a failed to reveal, but the word "session" is banging here. I won't bother to investigate it. But in this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? Well, there possibly would be another one if you could dream one up. If you can't, it's all right with me.

PC: Oh ...

LRH: What's that? What's that?

PC: I ... it – it was a failed to reveal and another failed to reveal that I had a little while ago. I gave you one, and I thought there's another one, and then – then you had an equivocal read, and I was going to mention it then ...

LRH: Mm-mmm.

PC: ... and then when you gave it to me, I was going – I'd forgotten it and it's gone now, I'm afraid, but anyway I failed to reveal that.

LRH: All right. Very good. Excellent. All right. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. There is one. You could accuse me almost of cleaning cleans here.

PC: [laughs] Mm... Mm.

LRH: There, what's that?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: What's that? What's that?

PC: That's the beginning of the session, just before the session started. Ah! I failed to reveal to you the exact trouble they were having with the TV set downstairs. I know you looked a bit mystified and I was and – I was chasing around a bit getting all this. I was late back from dinner, do you see, and they kept ringing up saying this wasn't right. Well, there's nothing I could do from it up here. They'd just have to put it right downstairs. But I failed to reveal this to you. I left you in a bit of a mystery.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. We're going to call that clean. In this session, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. I don't get anything on that unless you want to give me an answer.

PC: No.

LRH: All right. In this session, has anything been suppressed? There's what – there's one. What's that?

PC: Well, it was details of what happened last night. The details.

LRH: Very good. All right. Very good. In this session – in this session, has anything been suppressed? All right. There's another one.

PC: Well, that was the comment – last night's your own these days, is it?

LRH: All right. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? All right. There's another one. Thought of something there?

PC: I-I've suppressed too much hope that this goal will check out.

LRH: Very good. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? All right. Another one. What's that?

PC: That's the thought that this is the sort of goal where you could get your teeth around.
LRH: I beg your pardon?

PC: *It's the sort of goal you get your teeth around when you come to list it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? All right. Looks clean to me. Got any more answers on it?

PC: No.

LRH: Very good. All right. Seem to you middle rudiments are in?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, let's go back to this goal to know. Okay?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Sorry to distract you from that. Did that bother you any?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. To know. Slowed. To know. No reaction. To know. A sort of a trip. To know. A stop. All right. On this goal, has anything been suggested? Yes. What's that?

PC: *Well, I just suggested it would be a nice goal to list.*

LRH: Very good. On this goal, has anything been suggested? All right. Probably some more.

PC: *Well, this – this – this pain across my chest suggests it might be bloody near it if it isn't it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. Seems clean at the moment. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. What might that be? There. There.

PC: When I was looking this over I um – had a cognition about it. Because when I first thought that this would fit into on this particular question, and this was on Monday night on the ship in brin – in bed.

LRH: Um-hmm.

PC: That's – you could – basic – uh – wearing your hat – somebody saying that this goal was pretty high on the Know to Mystery Scale, and I've lost the full cognition now, but it was something on those lines that it was – you could probably – that's right – you could probably get the classification of where a guy's goal came by this scale, you see...

LRH: Mm-hmm.

PC: ... and classify goals in that, yes.

LRH: Mm.

PC: That's it.

LRH: Mm.

PC: That's it.

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right. Let's see what this goal does now. To know. Reacted. To know. No reaction. To know. No reaction.

PC: Yes. I-I'm sorry.

LRH: Go ahead. What were you going to say?

PC: I seem to – it reacts – you tell me it reacts, and then I think, oh, no, it won't. I'll do this right immediately after you say it.

LRH: Mm-hmm.

PC: This is – this is a too good to be true thing I've got.

LRH: Mm-hmm.

PC: Thought I'd better tell you that.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been – has anything been suppressed? All right. On the goal to know, has there been anything
you've been careful of? All right. Got an answer there?

PC: Careful to tell you that thought just then.

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has there been anything you've been careful of? Yes. What's that?

PC: I've been careful to know what is necessary and to know ... Oh, yes! Christ! I've never passed an examination or any ... I have no academic qualifications, yet I am fairly successful in my line of business, modestly. Very successful. And it's — but I've always said I know where I can find out rather than have to know the data, do you see, and this has been something I've relied on.

LRH: All right. Okay. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. There's another one there.

PC: Careful to be modest about knowing, as is just evident.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. There's another one.

PC: Careful not to give the impression that I know more than I do.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. To know. On this goal, has anything been invalidated? Yes. What's that?

PC: I've invalidated myself by suggesting that I know less than I do.

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. There's a suggestion. What's that?

PC: Well, I failed to reveal knowledge on many occasion. I mean it's an advantage in many spheres to — not to play all your cards and to keep knowledge one has to oneself.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes. Another one. There.

PC: I failed to reveal my whereabouts to my — my mother as a child. Now, um — she would want to know where I was and I would keep it quiet.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. Seems clean. To know. To know. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Yes. Got the invalidation. There it is.

PC: This is people — I seem to get invalidated myself. I very often know the right way to do something and then people will ... No, that's not right. I know how to find something out; how to know, in other words, do you see, and people will follow another — another course. I — this
comes up – this is why the teaching goal stayed in for so long, or whatever it was, instructing.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: That was on the list. That I know how to let people know, but then they won't – they won't follow that, so they invalidate it.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. What's the suppression?

PC: Well just then. Oh, how did it go?...

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

PC: Suppressed the suppression even. Sorry, I'm absolutely – gone blank on everything.

LRH: All right. We're looking for a suppressed on the goal to know. There it is.

PC: Umm.

LRH: There.

PC: Yes, it's to do with what I was ... Well, it's almost the same answer as I gave before, that it's the suppression of my – a suppression of my – of auditing somehow, not by me. Well, people have suggested and so ... Oh, I suppressed auditing somehow. It made nothing of auditing to me, saying it's not worthwhile, so their goal to know is being suppressed as a result.

LRH: I see, all right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? All right. To know. Slow. To know. Ah – reaction. To know. No reaction – a latent reaction. All right. How's these somatics?

PC: Well, they're easier. I've still got it across my chest slightly there. Otherwise they've eased off. Um – slight bit of a headache or a pain behind the eyes. Nothing serious.

LRH: Mmm. All right. You're doing all right in general?

PC: Mm, yes, yes.

LRH: All right. Well, let's bang away at this thing a bit more and see what we can get out of it here.

PC: Mm. That's fine.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Yes. What's the suppression?

PC: Well, I was tending to suppress the somatics then, you know, to say, "Oh, they've – they've gone," and so on, and that's to do with the goal. After all, they've come in on this one.

LRH: Mm-mmh.

PC: Mm-mmh.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Okay. To know. To know. To know. To know. To know. All right. This thing has got less than an agitation now. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right, no reaction. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? Okay. And on the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? Has anything been suppressed? Yes. What's the suppression?

PC: Well, I didn't hear a lot of those rudiment questions then. Um – and, um – oh, God. Well, I suppressed hearing
the questions.

LRH: Hmm?

PC: I suppressed hearing the questions just then.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suppressed? On the goal to know, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. Do you think of an answer to that? Okay. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. What's the invalidation?

PC: Well, you just saying it is just ticking and it led me to suggest that it was going out.

LRH: Very good. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? Another one.

PC: Oh, more or less confirmed on myself then that I suppose it is out, you know.

LRH: Oh, all right. On the goal to know, has anything been invalidated? All right. On the goal to know, has anything been suggested? All right. Maybe there's a suggestion.

PC: Well, there was a slight suggestion to you that it was going out or that I had got from you that it is going out.

LRH: Very good. You might be interested in the last couple of times I used it in a sentence, it's fired both times.

PC: Mm-hmm.

LRH: All right. On – on the goal to know, has anything been suggested? Any answer to that?

PC: Well, I could give you an answer that, by telling me it's firing, then you were suggesting something or other – I wasn't particularly interested what – I just thought I could dig up a suggestion there.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes. What's the failure to reveal?

PC: Well, I failed to reveal that I've now got different somatics down the – down the – my arms.

LRH: Hmm. All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes, what's that?

PC: Well, I failed to reveal I've also got the somatic across my chest.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes. Another one... There. There. There.

PC: Oh, I failed to re– failed to reveal just then that I heard the lift move or a sound like the lift moving.

LRH: The what?

PC: The lift moved.

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: And I failed to reveal that.

LRH: All right. On the goal to know, is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. It seems clean. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? Yes. What's the mistake?

PC: Well, I think you made a mistake there. I'm sorry about – to suggest this, but it – you didn't – perhaps didn't quite see how the last answer tied in. It was that I knew the lift had moved and therefore I hadn't revealed it and it was to do with the goal "to know," do you see?

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. On the goal to know, has a mistake been made? All right. Any more answers there? The needle's flying very fast. It might be, it might not be. Okay?
PC: *Mmh.*

LRH: All right. To know. To know. To know. This roughs the needle up, is what you could say about that if you're wondering whether it's in or not. All right. To know. To know. That gives you several fast rises, speeded rises.

PC: *Mmh.*

LRH: To know. To know. To know. This thing is not reacting very satisfactorily.

PC: *Mmh.*

LRH: You see, it went the reverse way. I thought, well, all right, if it's out I'll clean it up.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: If it's in – it went the reverse way.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: See, it got worse. You got a new set of somatics turned on.

PC: *Mm. Yes.*

LRH: Huh? You see the position?

PC: *Hm. Oh, don't worry. I'm all right.*

LRH: Are you all right?

PC: *Yes. Yes.*

LRH: Will you forgive me if I leave you with those somatics?

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: Not necessarily suggesting they won't go off at once.

PC: *I don't mind. They'll be going off.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Is it all right with you? Say so if it isn't.

PC: *No. I'd say – no, it's quite all right with me.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Quite all right with me. I'm quite happy.*

LRH: All right. Then is it all right with you if we conclude the body of session?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: A little disagreement here. What might it be?

PC: *Um, I wasn't quite sure of the time. That was the only thing.*

LRH: Oh, it's twenty minutes of ten.

PC: *Okay. That's all I wanted to say – wasn't anything I was careful of.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Is it all right with you, then, if I end the body of session?

PC: *Yes.*


PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: Noting that pc's left with somatics on this goal. All right?

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: Okay. 2.5, your TA. So here we go with the end rudiments.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Here we are. In this session, have you told me any half-truth, untruth, done something only to impress me? And what have you done only to impress me?

PC: *Opened me eyes sometimes.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I've opened my eyes sometimes.*
LRH: Okay. Very good. In this session, have you done something only to impress me? All right. There's another reaction.

PC: I was leaning forward on the table...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ...at one stage and then I sat back to impress you that I was all right.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. In this session, have you done something only to impress me? All right. I have another reaction here, what is that? There it is. Okay, what's that? What's that?

PC: Umm.

LRH: There it is.

PC: Well, I think I’ve kept my eye – my hand in my lap once when I had an itch on my forehead. And I thought it'd look bad if I'd put it up and scratched it, you see.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, have you done something only to impress me? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Very good. In this session, have you tried to damage anyone? All right. I have a reaction here. What is that? There it is.

PC: Um, I thought I might be damaging Jenny at one time.

LRH: All right. In this session, have you tried to damage anyone? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Very good. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Okay. In this session, have you decided anything? All right. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. In this session, have I failed to find out anything you have thought, said or done? All right. There is a thought there.

PC: Oh I thought that you'd probably find out that I'd noticed you'd altered the rudiment around.

LRH: Very good.

PC: That's funny, I pointed it out once. Yes.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, have I failed to find out anything you have thought? Very good. Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: In this session, has anything been misunderstood? And what is that?

PC: Well, you misunderstood me when I said it was all right. It was all right and you asked me – kept asking me, as much as to say you didn't understand that it was all right.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, was anything misunderstood? All right. I have another reaction there.

PC: It was the thing with the lift. I think you misunderstood at first.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this session, was anything misunderstood? All
right. Do you agree that's clean?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** Very good. In this session, was the room all right?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** All right. Do you agree that that's clean?

**PC:** Yep.

**LRH:** All right. Any comments to make on the room?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Very good. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans down. Okay. We're going to run just a few commands of Havingness.

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** Okay. Feel that cloth. Thank you. Feel the back of your left hand. Thank you. Feel the back of your right hand. Thank you. Feel your wristwatch. Thank you. Feel the top of that telephone. Thank you. Feel the dial. Thank you. Feel the top of that telephone. Thank you. Feel the clock. Thank you. Feel that lapel of your jacket. Thank you. Feel the inside of that can. Thank you. Feel the outside of that can. Thank you. Pick up the cans. Okay. Oh, that's much better. Squeeze the cans. Fine. Fine. Fine. That's good. All right. It came right back up toward 3.0.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** Okay. Now, have you made any part of your goals for this session?

**PC:** Well, I think we've done very well.

**LRH:** To find the goal is the first one.

**PC:** Well, we're on it or something. I don't know but we've certainly done a lot of work on something there.

**LRH:** All right. To work well.

**PC:** Well, I think I worked very well.

**LRH:** Uh-huh. All right. To feel even better at the end of it.

**PC:** [laughs] Well, I do really. I'm not - the pain's gone in my chest. Hasn't gone completely but it's eased off quite a bit. Me arms are quite okay now since we did the rudiments.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. What will we say about that, to feel even better?

**PC:** Well, yes. We're feeling

**LRH:** All right. Very good. And this was part of it: to get my eyes a bit better.

**PC:** Well, I can't tell you about those at the moment. They're a bit moist. Uh, yes, I can read that a bit better than I could. Yes, I think there's an improvement there. Because me eyes have been - very conscious of me eyes sometimes in session.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Now, are there any other gains you'd care to mention?

**PC:** Um, yes. I- uh - despite the slow haul getting away in the beginning rudiments - uh - it really got me into session because - uh - it's only about once or twice did I really think of the people downstairs. And I think that's - really getting in-session is quite a gain.

**LRH:** Mm.

**PC:** And I had a number of cognitions throughout.

**LRH:** Okay.

**PC:** I think that's the lot.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Now,
is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC:   Well, I want to thank you very much for the session. And, it's a pity we didn't make it on that one. It would have been quite a...

LRH:  All right.

PC:   ...quite something. But there we are.

LRH:  Okay. All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session?

PC:   Yes.

LRH:  All right. Here it is: End of session.

PC:   Thank you.

LRH:  All right. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC:   You're no longer auditing me.

LRH:  All right.

PC:   Thank you.
LISTING LINES

A lecture given on 20 September 1962

Thank you.

Well, here we are on the what?

Audience: Twentieth.

Where did the 19th go? Oh, I was auditing that night. That's right. So this is the 20th of September, AD 12.

I'm going to talk to you right now about lines and listing.

It's only four days deep into this week and six goals have been found. We're running at a rate of one and a half goals per day. Those of you who have had the half-goal found… [laughter, laughs] Six goals – just like that. They're rolling off now at a highly rapid rate.

All you've got to do is learn how to do it so that it happens with everybody you address in under twenty-five hours. That's what I want to have you do. And that way you can run a co-audit and that way you can do a terrific amount of this and that. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. Now, I want to talk to you about goals and listing. Listing is a problem you have not yet wrapped your wits about. None of you were listing on the right lines. I doubt there's anybody listing on the right lines. Your lines are probably wrong. I have tried to develop a formula for lines without much success, which could be rattled off boppity-boppity-bop.

The formula is probably: create, curious, desire, enforce, inhibit, you know? The CDEI Scale with a create on top of it. That's probably the formula. And that goes positive and negative and oppose and not-oppose. And then it goes cause and effect on the goal line. Well that, if added up, give you forty lines. Look it over; that's a forty line listing rig.

Now, I haven't listed one out totally on those lines because I've just – you're as usual, trodding upon my heels very tightly. And I have to fix – I have to get the backs of my shoes fixed more often than any other person, anyplace.

But the essence of this is that if you had: one, create, do you see, causative, then of course, there is a create effect. You'll understand more about that in a minute, see. So that's a group of four. Create causative immediately becomes a group of four. I'll give you an idea:

"Who or what would make catfish?" See? Now, that's fine. Who or what would make catfish? All right. Now, that, of course, goes into "not make catfish," "would oppose making
catfish" and "not oppose making catfish." Instantly and immediately we have a group of four. It's always on a group of four.

You always have the plus and the minus and the plus-oppose and the minus-oppose – always. There will be some version of that and it must be in a multiple of four.

Now, if you have a causative end of the line – you know, "Who or what would make catfish," then you've got… This is a very crude example and I should tell you right here that the problem is not as critical as you're making it out. With four lines it was terribly critical. You had to get these things to fire; you had to get everything all set and whooo!, it was really sharp and so forth. Well, we're handling it quantitatively now. Who cares? See? You don't have to get these lines – you don't have to prepcheck these lines, you don't have to get these lines to fire, you don't have to do anything. You just take the goal, put it to it and list and the weird part of it is you're operating on a plus margin. You're way over what it takes to make him Clear. You understand? And I'll go into that more.

But let's take a look at this now. You've got the effect end, which gives you another four. Now, if you've got a cause four, you must have an effect four. You got the idea?

"Who or what would make catfish?" See? You've got to have "What would catfish make?" Do you see that? And "What would catfish not make?" and "What would catfish oppose making?" and "What would they not oppose making?" You understand that?

Just because you've got an object in the goal is no reason that the effect end is settled. You got the idea?

We had somebody once who had a goal that had the word "empire" in it. Well, this saddled everybody. An empire was an empire and that was all there was to it. You know, the object end of the goal; the effect end of the goal is all taken care of in the goal. That's obvious, isn't it? It's got an empire on the end of the goal, so therefore, "Who'd want to run an empire?" You see? Ah! We'll have to get over to the other side of this thing, "What empire would want to be run?" Don't you see that?

Don't take it for granted that because the goal has an object in the sentence that that is a fait accompli and that is never alterable or anything or you'll leave your pc there with stacks of extra answers.

Now, how did all this come about?

It came about this way: PCs listing on four lines were having to alter-is the command to squeeze the answers in sideways. You got it?

Audience: Mm-hm.

And they were always left with extra items and these sometimes would pile up to a point where the tone arm would start rising and would go up and stick. And those were just piled-up suppressed items that there was no line for them to go on, alterations of line, alterations of the auditing command. You see these were all disobediences of the basics of auditing: must be a clear auditing question and it must be a clean auditing answer to that question. Don't you see?
All right. Now, the answer to that is, of course, give them more lines than they ever heard of. They always got someplace to put the extra item.

Now, furthermore, even though you have somebody's goals already all fixed up, see, and it's already grooved in and you've got this all taped and everything, and he all of a sudden comes up with a rabbit. And he tells you after you've gone through sixteen consecutive lines of listing – which is all you had for his goal – that he's still got a rabbit. Well, you don't throw this rabbit away. But let me tell you, the rabbit – the rabbit is what he would make. Do you see? And there just is no place to put this rabbit. And here's this poor old bunny sitting out there on the side and it drives your pc halfway around the bend.

Well, you can't put in an extra line which accommodates the rabbit. If you put in an extra line to accommodate the rabbit you of course have to put in eight lines. So, actually, the minimal number of lines that you can add to anybody's list is eight. Not four, but eight. It must be subject and it must be object. You see? The cause and the effect. You see that?

So anyway, if your pc can't accommodate a rabbit then you'd better give this thing a good study. Not evaluate for him and tell him where it belongs but tell him what he thinks this rabbit would have to do with what he is doing.

And he says, "Well," he says, "the rabbit of course – the rabbit would – would – the rabbit – I guess the rabbit would – well, he'd be impossible to make."

And maybe the goal was "to make things." A rabbit would just be impossible to make. Well, you're off to the races. Just put the word "impossible" into eight lines. You see how you'd do that? And you'll accommodate the rabbit and you'll find out there's a whole bunch more that will come in on top of it and I don't care how many sets of lines you use.

But if you do that, don't try to catch the lines up to the other lines, just add them in the normal course of events. You understand? You'll always find extra items.

Now, there's an oddity here as any pc that has been run on it and is jostling around can tell you. "Who or what would want the goal to catch catfish? Who or what would not want the goal to catch catfish? Who or what would oppose the goal to catch catfish? And who or what would not oppose the goal to catch catfish?" All of those get different answers than anything else. "Who or what would catch catfish?" and all of that bracket, actually you get different answers when you say "the goal". That's an interesting ramification, see. If you say, "Who or what would want the goal to catch catfish?" Don't you see? Well, that gives you four lines that sort of stand out.

Now, what would be the object of this? Is what catfish? You got the idea? You'd have to add the other four in some haphazard fashion to make it a balanced eight. Do you understand? But it'd all be the goal – the goal, the goal, the goal. That would be eight lines all devoted to the goal. You understand? If you were going to run it that way.

Actually, you're now riding in clover. You're way out on the wide-open sands and you've got such abundance of places to put things that you're riding on a quantitative cushion, you might say. The pc can put anything – anything he's got anyplace without that one, the goal. But I'm just giving you an idea, see?
This, by the way, I've seen boggle a pc. I'm not advocating that you use this one. See? The pc would be saying, "Who wants this goal?" and, "Who wants this goal?" and so forth. Well, just gratuitously add eight more lines. Got the idea? Each one with the goal in front of the thing. And you'll get a whole bunch more answers. You understand? You're always at liberty to do this.

Now, I don't care how many lines you list. You can list 128 lines if you want to. But they're all listed in the same way; they must be answerable and each line is put down at the top of a sheet of paper and you add 4 items to that list and put a check mark and go to the next page. Not five, not three: four. That is what you want, just exactly four.

And what if he gets an extra item?

He says, "But-but-but-but I've got this item here. I got this rabbit. I-Here's this rabbit. I-I-I got this rabbit. I got this rabbit."

You say, "Good. I'll write the rabbit down in the margin. You can have him the next time around." Got the idea?

And this disciplines and puts the pc at cause over these wild automaticities that you so far have been accommodating – too accommodating about. Got the idea? Four. Not three, not five: four. And that leaves the auditor at cause over the session. See? Because listing sessions tend to become too uncaused. They go wild. The guy writes three sessions on, "Who or what would not want to have made catfish?" See? And it goes on and on and on and on and on. Actually jams himself up by doing this, too.

Now, why do I say "four"?

Well, four appears to be a fairly optimum number. But I would not be surprised to have you come down sometime or another with a real jammed-up case to one.

Now, why would you drop?

You wouldn't drop on the case after you'd started. If you started with four, you'd continue with four. If you started with one, you'd continue with one. But one, that isn't very quantitative. But you might get it so jammed up that the guy can't do anything about it.

Now, what happens exactly if you overlist?

First you get a comm lag. And then you get a "fishing for the right item." These occupy a lot of session time of which – there's no value in occupying that session time, see? Has no value at all. And then the next phenomenon is, "Oh, that isn't it!" You got it?

All right. It's first comm lags. "There's – there's a waterbuck and a tiger and a ahh-ahhm-ahh-ahh-aahh-ahhm-ahh-ahh-ahh..." At twenty-five dollars an hour. That's crazy. You don't want that. You get the idea? See, he's listed sixteen items and then he goes on to ahh-ahh-ahh, and the next thing you give him, you say, "All right, give me another one on that line." If you did that – you ought to make this as an experiment some day just to see how it works because it always works out this way.

He'll say, "Well, it's a big – no a small, a large – an enormous, a huge – uh-uh-a big – m m-mm – it's a certain type of waterbuck. It's a large – who, a who – big, small, no, no – it
isn't big, small – no, no – couldn't be – so on and so on, so on. Oh, I finally got it! The item is a certain type of waterbuck. Yeah, that's great."

Now, if you said, "Give me some more items," he would be saying, "A waterbuck – no that isn't it. A tiger – no that isn't it. A giraffe – no that isn't it. No, don't put that down. Uh, that wouldn't be it. A tiger. No, that isn't it," and so on.

You've got to run them all out in invalidations on a Prepcheck. To hell with that racket. See, that's no good.

What's happening? What's happening?

On the ahh-ahh-ahh-ahh-ahh, what you've got is the line has flowed in one direction. You see, these flows – you're listing flows – and you've run one of these flows to a point where it's idling at the end, you see. It's idling and it isn't reaching anything and it's kind of trying to come back. So he's kind of saying, "Uhh-uhh-uhh." It can't strike anything because he can't reach in that direction anymore. The flow is now stuck.

And the next phenomenon is: he does manage to reach something but he knows kind of that it's undescribable. You're asking him to reach too far, don't you see? And it's too far in that direction. It's undescribable and therefore the right thing and all of that and so forth. Now, if you – if he goes past that and manages to describe it, he's already overreached himself considerably.

The next phenomenon is that the backflow on that same line starts to hit. And so he no more than announces something than he is invalidated. You see? The backflow has started. You're trying to reach out and it's trying to come in. Or you're trying to reach in and he's trying to flow out. You get the idea? It's self-invalidative. And if you run a line too long in one direction, you will get this, "Isn't it, isn't it, isn't it. Catfish, isn't it. Waterbuck, isn't it. Tiger, isn't it." You get the idea? And all you're running into there is bank phenomena.

The comm lag, the indescribable, the invalidated; and that is the cycle that those listings go.

So, you want to stop short of that and keep the pc fluid. Now, the way you can keep him running properly in these lines is to get a large number of lines and let him put a definite number on each line. The – a good average number is four. But if you start in with four then he damn well give you four. And that's all there is to it. And you'll find very shortly he gets totally educated on the thing. He'll give you four – one, two, three, four. Next line, one, two, three, four. Next line, one, two, three, four. Next line, one, two, three, four. Next line, one, two, three, four. And then he'll say, "Ahh-ahh-ahh," on the next line. And then, one, two, three, four. And one, two, three, four. And one, two, three, four. And one, two, three, four. And, man, you're getting items, man. And that guy's going Clear in a hurry. Savvy?

None of this ahh-ahh-ahh-ahh-ahh, you know? Auditing is not an exercise in gargling. [laughter]

Now, that's how to get fast listing done.

Now, the funny part of it is, the more lines you've got the shorter your listing will be. The more lines you list, the less listing you're going to do. Let me give you an idea. This is –
this is suppositional. That on four lines you would have had to have listed twenty thousand items to free needle. So we list eight items and you would only have to list on all – that is, this is a total number of items – maybe eighteen thousand. See? We list sixteen lines and we only list twelve thousand items. You get the idea? You see, it isn't per line. That's just the gross number.

Now, perhaps you could go too far out on this. And the only way you could go too far out on this is by failing to sandwich the causative and the effective properly. Now, you can have eight causative and eight effective without getting into trouble. But if you start up from that number you had better have four causative, four effect. You understand? Four cause, four effect.

Now, you understand what I mean by cause and effect. "Who would want to be a goddess?" and "Who the hell would want a goddess?" You get the idea? See? Get that as cause and effect, see? Who'd want to be one? Who'd want to have one? That's your four lines in sequence, one to the next. You savvy?

Now, oddly enough, you can do this rather badly and still win. Lucky – lucky that it's that way. On the four lines you had to be very precise, you had to keep your mid rudiments in, you had to do this, you had to do that, you had to check – precheck everything, you had to precheck it every time you turned around, you had to do this.

Why?

Well, in looking into this to find out why, I found out that the items were being stacked up in alter-is. So if the items are being stacked in alter-is, why then of course, you had to precheck often.

Now, why did the items [lines] themselves have to fire?

Well, they had to fire because you did – you didn't have any abundance of lines: you were running on an economy of lines, which gave you, of course you had to get those lines which fired most and then you had a chance. But by listing a large number of lines, why, you're all set.

Now, I don't know what the proper number of lines is. I know very easily that sixteen you could undoubtedly get by with. You could get by with sixteen lines. Twenty-four lines – that's your next number up. That's dandy; they're fine; that's fine. Thirty-two – okay; okay. Forty – fine. See, it's almost a matter of, who cares?

But you get those together and you determine the number of lines you're going to have unless the pc had – starts having leftover rabbits, a case of leftover rabbits, why you wouldn't have to form up any more lines.

But now here's the precise way in which you list one of these things. I'm going to go worse, then I'm going to go over this again with you – formation of lines – because this is a headache. But let me tell you – let me get it in so I won't forget it. Here is an exact, proper listing session. I want to tell you what an exact listing session is. Exactly what it is.

You sit yourself down. You sits the pc down. You adjust his chair and you get the can squeeze and you put him into Model Session. You got that now? All right.
And then the firsttest thing you do is you super-tiger drill the goal till it reads. See? You get that goal reading.

Now, the magic phrase, "In auditing on the goal," or "Since (blank)" (whenever the goal was found or since the last time he was prepchecked up to) are also usable in that Tiger Drill. "In auditing on the goal to catch catfish has anything been suppressed? In auditing on the goal to catch catfish is there anything you've been careful of?" You understand? And you drill that thing back into a read before you start a thing in that session. And after that you don't do a darn thing with it. You don't do anything with lines. You don't do anything with anything. You just list. You got it to read, that's it.

Now, of course, if your session goes to hell you get your mid rudiments in. But you don't do anything else with the goal. If your session goes to pieces, why, you get your middle rudiments in. That's when you use middle rudiments.

Now, middle rudiments are best put in with this line, not "In this session" but "Since the last time I audited you." Got that? They're always put in best that way. "Since the last time I audited you." I know it's right in the middle of the session and the guy's all out of session and everything else and so forth, well you figure this must have gone wrong between sessions.

Why? Why is this?

Well, I discovered a new phenomenon. There's a new phenomenon. You miss a withhold on the pc in a session, it'll key in a withhold that happened before the session. Now, that's a hell of a thing. This had to happen to us, see. I'll give you an idea. You say – the pc says to you, one of his items is a buttercake, see, and he says to you, "Buttercake."

And you say, "A blossom." You're muttering to yourself.
And he says, "No, no, no. No, no. A – a buttercake."
And you say, "A splutterbath."
And, he says, "No, no, no, no, a buttercake. A buttercake. A buttercake. That – that's what I want on there, a buttercake."
And you say, "All right. Waterbuck."
Now, then you finally wake up, see – this was a warm day – and you say, "Oh, a buttercake." And you put down a buttercake.

And you say everything is all right but now the middle rudiments are a little bit out. So you say, "In this session yip-yap, yup-yup, whoop-whop..." And you straighten it all out and the pc is still out of session.

Well, what's taken place here?

Something very interesting has taken place. Because you missed, see, that's a withhold – you made him have a withhold called a buttercake – you will key in a missed withhold that wasn't registering in the beginning rudiments. Heehhh! This would happen to us! Now, the liability of it – you must understand this – because the liability of it is this: that it didn't happen between sessions but is a missed withhold from eighteen years ago. Ooooh!
Well, if you just know that one can happen, you can also get it from eighteen years ago. But that's why a pc appears to stay ARC broke, even though you get in the middle ruds. You got it?

In other words, when you missed a withhold in the session it keyed in a missed withhold. Weird business, you see. You hadn't missed it up to then; you had missed no part of it because it had never come up. Well, because you missed one in the session you key in one and miss it. You got that?

_Audience: Mm-hm. Yes._

So a good prevention of this – but not the perfect prevention of this – is of course, "Since the last time I audited you." Now, that will catch most of them. But sometimes you just got up and drunk the wrong brand of coffee; it must be, because it's just unlucky. You keyed in one when he was five years old and it doesn't even get included into the Problems Intensive run on him, you know? And there's a missed withhold sitting there staring everybody in the face and the pc's all ARC broke and nobody can make anything out of it.

Now also, you could have gone past something or other about his goal or missed an item or he's suppressed one. And that will operate as a missed withhold and key in an earlier missed withhold. You get the idea? In other words, he gets in a snarl, but it's still under the heading of missed withholds.

The only thing you've got to solve when a pc continues to be ARC breaky is the whenness of the missed withhold. See? It's the whenness of the missed withhold that will louse you up in a listing session or a goals finding session.

You missed something so you keyed in an earlier one that you hadn't missed. You know? He stole a piece of cake off of you two months ago and it's never come up. You've been auditing right across this thing; you've been just doing fine in the session and everything's been going along dandy and session after session, never come up, never disturbed him, he's in good ARC with you, never been critical. And then one fine day he says, "Buttercup."

And you say, "All right. Waterbuck."

And here we go. You've missed a withhold in session, he keys it in – all of a sudden the pc's all chopped up, very ARC breaky and you finally get very, very clever and finally find the stolen cake two months ago.

And you say, "How in the name of common sense could I have been auditing this character for two months?" Well, it wasn't keyed in. It just stayed there. You know? There it was.

You know an engram never becomes anything unless it's keyed in. Well, that's the same thing with a missed withhold. See? A withhold – a potential withhold does not do anything to anybody until he withholds it and you or somebody else misses it. You got the idea? It takes the action, then the pc's withholderness and then somebody missing the withhold for this thing to really go up in a cloud of blue smoke. You see that?

It's sort of the way you fire a depth charge: you can put a 16-inch shell through a depth charge without exploding the thing. But a tack hammer hammered against one end of it, ignit-
ing a primer, igniting ground-up TNT then ignites solid TNT and you get an explosion. And you'd never get an explosion unless it went exactly on that route. And that's the way a missed withhold goes together. It's been sitting there ready to be withheld and ready to be missed. See?

So getting in your middle rudiments on a pc in a listing session, particularly, or a goals finding session, it's very important that when you've had an ARC break or it's a big chop-up or you don't understand what's going on with the pc and he's still ARC broke, that you get your middle rudiments in in such a fashion as to get any withhold which might have been keyed in outside the area of the session. See? Because the boob probably keyed in something earlier. Got that? That's quite important.

So all right. You just go right on to the end of the session. You list, list, list, list, list – just carrying on with what I was telling you how to run a listing session. You go right on to the end of the session right up to the – to the clock and give him the business with the end rudiments and bring him right on out of session. In other words, you check nothing else, you prepcheck nothing else, you do nothing, nothing, nothing, except list. Got it?

All right. Now, that's all listing sessions consist of.

Now, what happens if you go to free needle on a line? You go to free needle on a line? Well, you ask him the question and it doesn't disturb it. Well, now this is why four: four are never going to jam nothing. See, just four items. It isn't going to jam anything. But you might be careful toward the end of the thing and only get one item if you were starting to run into lots of free needles. Got the idea? You could do your four straight on through without ruining the pc.

See, you would just go – the way – a listing session has very little to do with the meter. See, you can watch your meter and watch your TA action. Make sure your TA action is continuing because your TA action isn't continuing, your pc's out of session. Middle rudiments are out, see. And – or you didn't tiger drill the goal to read, see. It's mostly tiger drilling the goal to read – that's the important thing in beginning the session. You get TA action if you get to keep that goal tiger drilled.

All right. Now, it has got that – you've got the goal to read and then you list it. And you've got written across the top of the sheet of paper (you can usually double column these), you write the title of the line, you see – the whole line wording across the top of the sheet – and then you come down here over on the left and you write four items and then you put a tick and that tick goes just below and to the left of the fourth word. It's just a little strike of the pencil. Why?. That's because you then never have to add up the lines to find out if you've got four or not, see? It's always apparent that the unit is four. And that's counting the next four because you can very easily see if you have four without doing any numbering.

And then you write those four and then you flip the sheet, see, to the next page and you write the four and you flip the sheet to the next page and you write the four and so forth. And you can have a whole mass of things and you can put – if you can make it – two columns to the sheet. And then, of course, each sheet has a back with two columns on it. And you have
as many sheets as you have lines. And this makes very neat listing and the pc gets monotonously used to having a piece of paper flipped over in front of his face. You got it?

All right. Now, it becomes embarrassing when you start running out of captioned things in the middle. And nobody's had a solution to this yet. I've – we might have a mirror clip or something that reads the line on the back of the sheet while you're writing on the front of it or something. You get what I mean? I mean, you haven't got any lines prepared and you've got no sheets prepared, and where are we going now? You see. Well, you solve that the best you can. Right now the technology concerned with that is summataable in a four letter word: cope.

Now, you'll find out that one listing session isn't going to knock the goal badly out of read, and in fact will improve its read. And ordinarily, unless you've run a very lousy session, indeed, why – you know, run it with the rudiments all out and you never got them in in the first place and you missed all the reads and all this sort of thing – you'll find out ordinarily that if you read your goal at the end (and you ought to do this a time or two just to see the facts of the case) "To catch catfish," pow! "To catch catfish," pow! you know? I mean that thing is really reading then. And you'll find out at the beginning of the next session it isn't reading at all.

Well, what happened?

Well, pcs think. It's unfortunate, but they do. Some pcs are awful busy. I almost say this to pcs sometimes and I think I've been known to, is: "My God, you've been busy," you know? "What a busy, busy pc."

You know: "Think, think, think, think, figure, figure, figure, figure – invalidate, invalidate – suggest, suggest, suggest, suggest – fail to reveal, fail to reveal, fail to reveal, fail to reveal – mistake, mistake. Could it be a mistake?" [laughter] "Mistake, mistake, mistake-mistake, mistake. Well, I'd better suppress the whole thing!" [laughter] "Now, if I'm very careful until the next session, nothing will happen to the goal." You see? Pretty wild. Busy.

Anyhow, it's very strange what listing a goal will do for a goal. But, remember this about goals; remember this about goals: that listing – this is by actual test – listing will not polish up a goal all by itself.

In other words, you can't take a goal which is totally out of read and then list on it for a while and make it read. Now, I've already seen that tested and I have finally come to that conclusion. That conclusion might be based on firmer evidence, I might have examined it longer but I've just examined three pcs whose goal had been found a long time ago, who'd had the goal listed but nobody had ever polished up the goal for a period of months and months – in one case, a whole year – nobody had ever polished up that goal, it had only been listed, it was totally submerged, the pc's tone arm was way up and stuck, the pc looked like hell and nobody could make the goal read. You understand?

So that was good enough evidence for me. Because when I went in and rolled up my sleeves and tiger drilled the thing I got it to a total flat. Then I did a Dynamic Assessment and came right back to the same goal and got it firing like crazy. But it took that much to get that goal firing again, see? It took that much. And it also took a whole lot of, "In auditing, on the
goal blankety-blank, has anything been suppressed?" You know, a whole lot of that type of Tiger Drill and I finally got that goal firing again. But remember that goal had been listed in the interim. That's interesting, isn't it?

So listing in absence of Tiger Drilling at the beginning of every session is liable to find your pc getting lumpy. In other words, they're liable not to go Clear unless you do this. That's the secret back of it: you've got to keep the goal firing and keep the listing constant and regular and routine.

Now, let's get into self-auditing on listing. Can it be done? Yes, if somebody's around to tiger drill the goal. And if somebody holds the club over the pc and says, "You list these lines and that is it. You don't list any other lines but these."

You could do this. This is not necessarily optimum. It's probably a long way from optimum, but I can tell you already it can be done.

Now, how far this can be done is determinable by somebody sitting down and tiger drilling the goal into action at routine and regular intervals, see? But that's sort of on the emergency basis. You understand? That's getting out there to an emergency. It can be done. It isn't done well. And one of the reasons it isn't done well — one of the reasons it isn't done well is because the pain and sen will appear on the wrong lines. You got that?

Sounds funny, but the guy auditing himself is going into different valences and there's no auditor to give him the commands so he skips over into other valences to give himself the command and he gives the command to another valence. You got the idea? And therefore you louse up where the pain and sen belong. You got that figured out? You know, he goes into the oppose line to list the want. You understand? He goes into the want line to list the oppose. So he gets the sen and the pain in the wrong places. And this gets him awfully confused. You see, there's a liability to that. So self-auditing is different than being listed on it. But there's a possibility of doing so. Okay? Emergency situation.

All right. Now, there's a great deal to know about goals and goals listing and so forth. And I'd better give you what I can think of right here in an awful hurry because it isn't down anyplace else.

Now, when you are proving out a goal, you will find that sen occurs, sensation, by which we mean motion, sensations of pressure and misemotion and by the way, sexual sensation, all of those things occur on the Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal buttons. And on Invalidate, Suggest and Mistake you get pain.

Now, you're somewhere close to the guy's right goal or somewhere close to his goals channel when it behaves that way. But on a checkout of an actual goal you get pain. The only place you'll get sen is when you're hitting Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal. You're liable to get some sen when you're running those, but otherwise you're going to get pain, and pain is dominant in a checkout. If you're checking out the right goal, the pc's got pain; that's dominant. There's more pain there than there is sen and when you finally got it all the way checked out there is no sen — no sen at all and only pain. Got that? Because just to some degree you haven't tiger drilled it enough if he's still got sen. You got — you see how this is?
Now, don't worry about this too much if your imperfections of auditing and pc's out-of-sessionness and another thing leaves some sen on his right ear while his throat is being cut with a very sharp knife repeatedly. See? Don't worry about this. Just make sure, for the rule of thumb, that it's lots of pn, see? He's got to have pn. The pc who has no pain while the goal is being checked out is not being checked out on his goal. That's one very fast way of knowing about it. But that, by the way, isn't enough to stop checking out a goal. You are honor-bound to check a goal until it neither has pain nor sen. And that will keep you from erring anyway.

As long as he's got pain or sensation that began at the time you started checking the goal – that began during the course of your checking – you've got to continue until there ain't none. In other words, that doesn't mean you've got to continue the session till there isn't any, but you've got to keep on that course of events, session after session, until there isn't any. You understand? Because some goals might possibly go as long as six and a half hours to a fade. That's horrible, isn't it?

I did a goal in Washington – was marvelous, made a horrible liar out of me. I checked it for about an hour. It wasn't firing beautifully, but it sure looked like a goal. Man, it sure looked like a goal. It was "to be totally aware." Man, did that look like a goal! Well, I said, "That's good enough for me! Ha! Nothing to it." Turns out that it was the principal ending on the pc's old goal. It was a modifier. The pc's old goal went just before it. It sounded just like a goal, you understand. So, of course, it checked out hard. And it moved back into the pc's old goal and of course, it dropped out and the old goal stayed in. But that was only because it was a consecutive goal. You got the idea? It followed all the rules – my God, it had rocket reads and everything else.

That – don't make that shiver you to death on this because it only took another – about another half an hour or so. Took about an hour and a half of fooling before that thing did a fade. And then this was all being done in the face of a found goal. See? This wasn't very – would never be true of new goals. This is patching it up. You're running across all sorts of oddities in patching things up.

But you could hammer and pound away at a goal and pound away and hammer at a goal and have the thing fade; have it go. Oh dear, and you're about ready to pass in the checks and hand in your thetan and so forth, when you all of a sudden remember I told you in a lecture, "In auditing on the goal 'to catch catfish'..." And you brighten up and start tiger drilling it on that and it comes back and reads again and it is the goal after all. And goals are heart-breakers to this degree: they go in and they go out.

Now. Pain – this is the absolute rule, if we can get as close to an absolute, but it is an absolute to that degree just within this framework – must be present. Pain must be present during a checkout. Whatever else is happening, some pain's got to be there.

And in listing, pain must be present. When the goal has not been adequately tiger drilled, listing occurs without pain even on the right goal and isn't running out anything. You understand that? You just set off and you don't tiger drill this goal and you just go on and list – mm-mm. Pc gets sen, sen, sen, sen, sen, sen, sen. There's no pain anyplace.

Now, that's also true of a wrong goal, don't you see? A right goal, with the goal made to read at the beginning of the session on listing will give the pc pain. There will be some pain
and there will be some sensation. But it must have pain. Whatever else happens, there must be pain during the listing. You understand? You got to be alert to this. So that's something else you have to look for while you're listing. Is the pc occasionally letting out feeble little yips? If he isn't, he's not all right, oddly enough. Sounds -- sounds funny, you know. But it's true.

You say, "Always before in this universe we have carefully avoided pain. Now, we carefully avoid those things which don't give people pain." Probably you'll have a hard time raveling... I think it's about time, though, for the whole flow to reverse, so you'll probably do this very comfortably.

Now, there's -- there are some musts. There are some musts. You start worrying during a listing session when the pc is getting no pain. Now, understand we don't care what line the pain occurs on. You understand? Just wipe out the old rule that it's got to occur on one and three. We don't care what line it occurs on as long as it occurs. Pain can occur on one and three. Pain can clear -- can occur on two and four of any series.

Why? Because pcs get in wrong valences. They can be totally switched around on this and have pain gorgeously occurring on two and four and sensation roaring on one and three. That is not meaningful; it's just the pc is stuck in another part of the bank at the moment and probably feeding the auditing command through to an old friendly valence that he had, you know, some old witch. There's some circuitry going on; some other things are occurring.

But these are the things to know about listing. Tiger drill it in. Run a good, smooth session. Rat-a-tat-tat, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And you'll find out it's very easy to do.

But the four per line -- four items per line -- and sixteen or more lines solve any problem you're having with listing. It just goes off dead easy. There's no fumble; there's no sitting there waiting for the pc to think of another answer and ARC breaking him because he went to sleep and you woke him up -- there isn't any of this nonsense occurs in the session. And of going on and on and on and running out of paper on one line and then having to go back and find some paper on another line and how many did you list where and -- pooey. See? This is all for the birds. You'll find listing is as easy as you keep it pocketa-pocketa-pocketa at an even groove, see.

You say, "Who or what...?" And he gives you one and he doesn't seem to be in the mood to give you anymore. You want to watch a pc. Don't give him the command as he's saying one or you'll get him all suppressed. See? And, he gives you one and you give him the command and he gives you one, you give him the command and he gives you one, you give him the command and you give him one -- that's all. And of course, you acknowledge him each time he occurred.

And you'll find the pc very rapidly gets up into this frame of mind: you give him the command once, he gives you four answers and you acknowledge. See?

Remember the answer doesn't -- the question never asks him for one, see? So it's not a disobedience of the auditing. It doesn't ask him for one. It says "who or what" and both of those are plural.
So normally he gets into a groove like this: You say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" He gives you four. "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?" He gives you four. "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" He gives you four. "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" He gives you four. You got it?

And you just acknowledge and write them down, your pencil flying, "Cheerio, cheerio, cheerio, cheerio."

Now, some auditors won't like this. They haven't any -- any boil-off periods in which to catch up their notes.

But you can really keep it flying. And that's very fast clearing.

Now, what happens toward the end of this listing -- whole series of sessions? What happens? What happens on the meter?

Well, it starts to go free.

What is a free needle? You'll know it when you see it.

Is a free needle a quarter of an inch wide? No.

Is a free needle a half an inch wide? No.

Is a free needle a dial wide? No.

Does a free needle have a pattern to the left and right? No.

Does a free needle have a pattern to the right and left? No.

Well, then, what is a free needle?

Well, a free needle is a free needle. You've never seen anything like it till you've seen a free needle. There's no describing it. It looks like it's floating on air or something. It's disconnected.

The auditor's -- one of the auditor's first responses when he first sees a free needle is to get a hold of the cable, see, and check the cable and plug it in and out.

And then his worst mistake is to say, "Hey, hey, hey look, I got a free needle on you!" When he turns it back again, it isn't free. It just floats, that's all. It doesn't float in any pattern. That is what is peculiar about it, see, it doesn't have any pattern.

Once in a blue moon a free needle appears to hit heart beats or it appears to hit breathing or it appears to hit something else. But a tight needle can also hit these things. We don't care what it hits; it's free.

You -- this would not happen, but you could say the pc has just murdered his grandmother. You ask him the question, "have you murdered your grandmother?" And the needle won't register, see. It's a non-registering needle. That's all it is and it floats.

Now, should the pc always be at his Clear read as you come toward the end of listing sessions?

Nope. The thing will fly around as much as one and a half divisions on the tone arm dial just before he goes Clear totally.
The last two days – now, let's take up the grimness of listing sessions – the last two days or three days of listing sessions are the worst. The pc gets better and better and better and then stays along and is doing all right and is doing all right and is doing all right and then gets better and better and then is doing all right and is doing all right and then gets a bit worse and then gets a little more worse and then is doing better and he's doing fine and he's getting along all right and he's doing better and he's doing better and then he gets a little bit worse and then he gets a little bit worse and then he gets a little bit worse and then he gets a little bit worse – and then he gets very worried and he gets very invalidated and he's not sure that you're the right auditor or those are the right lines or this is the right universe.

You've brought him down to a point of stand and deliver. You're within just probably dozens of items of the goal springing. And he's thinking of this goal as really something. This goal is real valuable. All kinds of wild ideas are going through his head. Why did he ever start this clearing in the first place? Because, look, he obviously will never be able to catch catfish again if he gives this thing up. And it's a terrible situation that he's run into. And, furthermore, he won't have any game. That's what's worrying him. If he gives this goal up now then he won't have any game anymore. And there's no game to play except catching catfish and if he gives up the goal – this is his logic, if you want to call it such, idiot's logic, see – if you stopped cat – if you gave up the goal "to catch catfish" then you would stop catching catfish, then you'd no longer be interested in catching catfish so, therefore, there's only one game in the world which is catching catfish. So this means therefore, that you would only have one game and that would be gone, which would leave you as gameless. And this is not tolerable and this is something that's too horrible to contemplate. And the pc giving up just the last, last struggling line – a few lines, see, a few items, so forth, get – really gets in a terrible state. And you really have to persuade him through this. Then all of a sudden, why, he says, "Oh, well, there it goes. There's – there's-za-za-za-za – there's nothing there."

I guess he expected to meet somebody, George Washington. [laughter] Because it's just nothing and it just all went pfff, see, there's nothing left. And he says, "Well, gee-whiz, you know, I feel good, I feel wonderful; this is terrific."

If you'd ask him at that time, "Would you like to go out and catch some catfish?" he'd say, "Sure, I'll go out and catch catfish; it's as good as doing anything else. However, I want to try whistling at blondes." Because he's already thinking about putting in the next postulate. [laughter, laughs]

But there – it'd take him a long time to get it stacked up like that again. And he's really not in good enough shape to put it in the way he did the first time.

Anyway – fortunately – the situation is – this, I want to impress this on you – is the listing out of a goal is not a smooth snore. It has its rough spots. The pc will start to get somatics – sharp, impersistent, that feel exactly like the original accident. You know, being stabbed in the back with a knife feels like being stabbed in the back with a knife. And they get flinchy sometimes on somatics. And then this passes away and then they don't care about it. And they have to run out. But they get flinch – they get so they flinch on these things and so forth. And they do various things.
Now, the course of action of a somatic is, early on, they tend to be rather dull and persistent; dull and persistent. Fellow's got a head somatic and he'll tell you day after day after day after day after day after week after week after week after week about – this all depends on how long he's being audited or whether he is being audited at the time – about how this pain in his head or this pain in his foot or this pain in his stomach is pretty bad. You know, it's persistent.

And then you get to about the middle part of listing and they come on and they go off. You know, it's they come on like turning up a light by rheostat, you know? And they go off by shutting it down by rheostat. You know, it just gets dimmer and dimmer and there it goes. All right.

Now, you get down to the end of the thing and, man, they're on and they're off with a click of the switch. See? Bang! You know? It's gone; it was here and it left. That is a symptom of winding up. You're getting on down toward the end of listing when this is occurring. And they're getting sharper and they're getting swifter. And the pc's actually much more able to brace up to them and, you know, he doesn't care a bit about them as much in spite of the fact it hurts like hell. They occasionally will say, "Yipe!" You know? And this, of course, is why they resist getting Clear: it's those last residual somatics.

Now they actually are not resisting going Clear at all. They just don't quite like to face up to that. That's why it's a good idea to have an auditor on listing. Somebody's going to list by himself off in northern Saskatchewan or someplace, and all that's very fine. But he'll hit one of these bogs or he'll hit a wonderful spot, you know, "I feel wonderful." There's no – the guy isn't Clear yet but he feels wonderful. Be suspicious, because it's probably like inhaling the air and throwing out the arms on the upper edge of the Grand Canyon without watching where you're going. That expansive outfling of the arms and that gorgeous inhalation of the ozone is very often accompanied by a pale scream as he goes southward. [laughter] He hits the manic and he hits the depressive. Don't you see? And he'll be up feeling good again.

But halfway through with the lines not even vaguely listed out, a pc who begins to feel wonderful, he just feels wonderful, watch it, man. He's going to drag himself into session in the next day or so saying, "I feel terrible!"

He's gone over these manic ridges and that sort of thing. But he goes all the way through those things.

Now, of course, when it's all-out clear you know when it's clear because it's blown.

He'll tell you it's blown many times, too. I-I forgot to tell you that one. "It's blown! Yeah." Comes in in the morning, "Well, we needn't list on that anymore; I haven't any more items for these lines because it's blown." You know?

You put him on the needle, you know and there he is with a good old stuck, sticky needle, you know. You say, "Well, good; just list enough to get – let me check this out." You see?

And about the first two items he'll give you, it'll be, "Yipe, ouch, yrrrp!" and he won't mention anymore its having blown. Yeah.
Anyway, anyway, the beauty of it is, it all comes to pass. And when he – when he's through that – when he's through that series of jumps, he's through it.

When the goal is actually clear the needle will stay free and continue to be free if you've listed all the lines all the way out, it will continue to be free up till the time you find the next goal.

Now, in view of the fact that he knows you're going to find the next goal, don't be too upset if he starts to look for it before you start to look for it and find the needle all going gummy. It's not going gummy on what you did; it's going gummy on what you're going to do. And that's – that's the way that goes.

How many goals it takes to go to OT, I don't know – can't tell you at this time but it's probably some finite number.

Anyway, there is the whole course of listing. There's items. There's the lot. And that's a listing session. And that's how you do it.

Listing can be done by HCAs. Listing is not necessarily a Class IV Auditor activity. But it takes smooth auditing. It takes very nice auditing. It takes very good TR 2 to carry it through. And, of course, the guy has to be kind of a sharpie to keep the thing tiger drilled.

Now, if listing is being done on an HCA level, why, there must be somewhere around a supervising auditor that can occasionally take a look at it because, God knows, what stream they will go aground on or how – what shape those lines will get into. And with bursts of enthusiasm they've all of a sudden added two extra lines onto the end of it.

And the goal "to catch catfish" – the pc also had an idea that he might have a goal, "to be soulful," see? And, they've got Dover sole and other things written down on this other line. They're liable to go astray. You understand? So you have to keep your eye on it and just keep them on the groove I gave you and the fellow will go Clear.

And of course, you know that free needles to date have been going Clear on the four lines. And just give you one idea of this they also have stacked up a bit. Those people who have been four-line listed to free needle be – on being given an indifferently patched up sixteen-line list, whistled a sigh of relief and were very happy because parked someplace over on the northeast sector of the bank, they had all these rabbits they hadn't been able to dispose of. And they were very, very happy to write those rabbits down on the list. So that tells you that we were right in going in this particular way.

Okay?

Thank you.
GERIATRICS
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Audience: Yeah. Got it.

It's a trick way of saying gerontology. But actually, gerontology never solved geriatrics. But we have.

Geriatrics is of some interest to you and has been floating around you all the time, and you yourself have noticed it, and you've kept your eye peeled on it, and you've been curious about it, and you've actually used it as a method of measuring whether a case was progressing or not, but never really given it any further significance. Well, it does have further significance.

You should understand that one of the longest searches man has ever indulged in has been that of longevity itself. And the study of living longer is geriatrics. I, by the way, was one time a leading light in the American Society of Gerontology. What do you feed men to make them live longer? Well, there are many such preparations. Women: there's equinprimine, stilbestrol – the female hormones. Somebody gets beyond forty or something like that, why, they ought to start shooting them with a bit of equinprimine, something like that, that makes them look younger and feel friskier and make passes at the iceman.

Anyway, I had a very astonishing experience one time. I saw a lady and… This was right after the war. I had just studied quite a bit of endocrinology and found it a very fascinating study, but I was only studying it for one particular peculiar reason. I wanted to find out if the mind monitored the body or the body monitored the mind. And obviously the switchboard system between the body and the mind is the endocrine system or the glands. All right. Could you feed somebody these marvelous preparations which had been biochemically developed and effect a better frame of mind? And I found out that you could do so, occasionally, on lots of people. That's not good enough, is it? What was introducing the variable?

Traumatic second dynamic occlusions and one thing or another prevented the hormones and other shots from operating. I did this work at Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland, California. All right. A line officer wears his badges of rank on both collars and a staff officer wears them only on one collar, see. So I first got into their medical library simply by taking off one of my rank badges off one collar and hired a Marine to come by and say, "Good afternoon, Doctor." And that was very simple.

So anyway, we entered the field of endocrinology for only that reason and I ruined a great many cases. I ruined them abundantly. I – there was a doctor there by the name of –
think his name – one of the doctors on the thing was named Yankewitz, improbably. And this
guy was keeping records on this sort of thing. And they – the government at vast expense was
importing carload lots of pills and shots and monkey glands, and they had the problem of all
the fellows who had been incarcerated in the Japanese prison camps. And these fellows were
in a very bad state. They were too fat, and they were too thin, and they were too this, and they
were too that, and they were trying to put them back to rights with hormones.

And this is a very valid proposition. You can do far more for somebody's ulcers by
giving him shots of testosterone than any other known method. The doctors, of course, are
unable to operate, so they don't favor it. It's out of favor entirely.

Anyway, they were bringing these pills in and capsules in carload lots and they were
administering them to people. And having a bit of access to their records, I knew what cases
were being successfully affected and which weren't. And so I have done a little bit of work in
trying to ascertain whether or not the people who were being successfully affected were or
were not aberrated. And decided they were not very badly aberrated. And the people on
whom they were not being effective, I found to have psychic traumas by the bucketload; and à
la Freud, with a few frills from Ron, flipped a few psychic traumas out of the road and made
these endocrines operate on them very successfully, and came to the conclusion that an endo-
ctrine… The United States Navy should be given a rising vote of thanks for this, because I'm
sure the program cost them millions and millions and millions of dollars. And they derived
absolutely no benefit from it of any kind whatsoever. But we did. I didn't ruin their whole
program, but I sure sent their figures a little bit awry occasionally, you see. It's how many –
what the dosage should be. And on a case or two it became "none."

Now, this simply monitored this – this was not very conclusive, it was not very defi-
nite, and I could have done far more along this line of course, but I was only trying to estab-
ish one thing: By using physical substances, could you change a person's mind? You under-
stand? Or, by changing a person's mind, could you change the character of physical sub-
stances? I found the latter to be the case and thereafter have spent no time monkeying with
physical substances. Do you follow this line of reasoning?

In other words, the mind can change the body, but the body only slightly alters the
mind. In other words, function monitors structure, structure does not monitor function, see.
Now, of course, structure can monitor function sufficiently and observably enough that some-
body's liable to take this as a keynote. The obvious broad fact that you cut off somebody's
legs – he can't walk. Now, structure certainly monitored function. And a medico, being
somewhat of this crude reasoning level of course, takes that as the fait accompli and says,
"That's it. That's it. Therefore – therefore, no function monitors structure." I don't know how
he ever got there, you know? It's something like departing for the moon and finding yourself
on Wrigley Field and saying, "Well, that proves it. But we're not quite sure what," you know?

Now, here's – here's the point. They are wrong. They are wrong. Because if – the uni-
formity is that you can always get function or thought to monitor structure. You can get
thought to monitor structure, but you can't always get structure to monitor thought.

And that's how I came to that basic conclusion. Why you never find me paying any
real attention to structure. Because if you don't flip out the psychic traumas, you're not going
to monitor anybody's thinking. And if you do flip out the psychic traumas, why, you're going
to monitor structure. You follow that? See?

This guy can't perform in some direction. Well, you could feed him all the hormones
and give him all the Turkish baths and all the exercise, and all the dumbbells in the world and
he still wouldn't be able to do this, don't you see? But you change the psychic condition and
he'll make some progress in that direction.

Now, his structure might be inadequate to performing what he wants to perform, but
that again, by extrapolation, is an error in not enough thought, do you see – on it.

Now, these conclusions – these conclusions are very valid in the field of geriatrics.
Some girl, when she gets to be forty or so, and so forth, would do very well – I say so, would
do very well, since I've seen a lot of evidence in this line – to go down and get herself a fist
full of stilbestrol or equinprivine, or something... You don't get a fistful of equinprivine; you
get the gluteus maximus full of it. That – it's a shot. Anyway – anyway, a man hitting around
that age – that'd be a very good thing for him to do, get ahold of some methyltestosterone and
throw it down his gullet.

Frankly though, if either one has any slightest second dynamic aberration, it'll do a
minimal amount of good. And if their second dynamic aberration is terrific, it won't do any
good whatsoever. You might as well pour it down the drain. Do you see that? All right. This
has a lot to do with geriatrics. Not the second dynamic.

Metchnikoff, I think his name was – I've forgotten my books on this to a large degree,
and didn't bother to look them up because it wouldn't do you any good. Once – I just remem-
bered this as an anecdote. He said sour milk would make somebody have a greater longevity.
Make them live forever and that was fine. And he, by the way, was quite a boy. He added
quite some number of medical substances to man's category – amongst them compound calo-
mel in the prevention of syphilis and other things of this character. This guy was quite a
sharpie. And he was getting on in years, so he studied geriatrics. They all come to studying
geriatrics sooner or later. And they feel those years creeping up on them, you know, and they
start cracking the textbook on gerontology.

So, he collected sour cream and more sour cream and sour milk and sour skimmed
milk and sour watered milk, and – I almost said sour British milk – and he collected all varie-
ties. All varieties. And he had his basement full of them, and his neighbors' basement's full of
them, you know, and so forth. And he'd led his experiments and he had it made. He just had it
made. He and his partner both had it made, as a matter of fact. And they could extend life
with these magic compounds based on sour milk indefinitely. And they both died on the
sunny side of seventy. Just like any other man.

Usually, this is the fate of gerontological hopes. In the Middle Ages, why, people were
always slipping a bag of gold across to the aged witch to receive in return the amulet which
would cause them to live forever, don't you see? And those fellows, they'd still die in bed at
the age of seventy. And the soldiers were always getting amulets for not being shot in battle,
you know, and that sort of thing. And occasionally these things worked. The bullet hits them
and can't penetrate, you know, something like that. There's all kinds of amulets and potions to
save life, continue life, to make life longer and that sort of thing. All of which is very odd
because you can't kill a thetan. That's very peculiar when you come down to think about it, that there'd be all this tremendous interest in geriatrics.

What they're interested in, actually, is the preservation of a body. And they are not interested actually in the prolongation of individual life, because that does not need prolonging. It may need better remembering, but it prolongs itself. You don't drop out of the race. But the point is, here, that a body, being a possession, starts aging and caving in, and limiting a thetan's activities and he or she gets upset about this. And they want to look younger, and they want to feel younger, they want to act younger. And so they would rather go in the direction of gerontology. And almost anybody who comes along with a magic amulet or a potion or a shot of pills of some kind or another, is going to get a considerable amount of interest on this exact line.

Now you, as an auditor, have very often seen a pc doing well and looking younger, and doing badly and looking older. Have you ever noticed this? Do you have a good reality on this? Have you ever seen people look younger and look older through processing? Have you ever seen this? Now, some people look very much older and some people look very much younger. And it's quite mad how this thing will go.

Now, in the process of finding a goal in a Dynamic Assessment, you see this roller-coaster rather rapidly. This person is all exhausted over lots of goals they've been over, and lots of this and that, and they feel bad about it, and they've had a bad goal found or something, and you give them a Dynamic — they look terrible, you know, they look like they're about 180, and they're just all caved in. And then you do a Dynamic Assessment on them, and you get the dynamic. And right away, they look a bit younger, you know. They look nice and younger. And then you find an item, you know, and they look lots younger, and you find a goal, and boy do they look young and spry! Everything is getting along fine. They haven't hit any ultimate yet, but that's dandy. And then the auditor ARC breaks them, and they look much older. And then they will look younger, and they'll look older. And as the lines are listed out you can normally tell if the pc is having good progress by just this one point alone. Do they look younger?

For instance, I'm looking at somebody that last June had a line listed off to Clear, and I came in and thought we had a new teenage student. And a couple of weeks later, the goal had flubbed, there weren't enough lines, nothing had been tiger drilled on the thing and so forth and she looked about ninety-five. You get — this is this wild. But you've seen this. You've seen this with your own eyesight. So I'm not telling you anything you haven't observed. You've seen this.

This is definitely allied to the science of aging. You say, "Well, Ron, why are you mentioning this? We've all seen this. We know this." Well, one thing is we don't know all there is to know about this, see. We don't know how long a body will live in a five-goal Clear. You know, a five-goal Clear, how long can that person make the body live? We don't know.

We haven't any data on what the longevity could be stacked up to, but we can hazard a few good, solid guesses. That — let's say, somebody who was about thirty-five, or something like this, as raw meat, would look what would be average thirty-five, and if cleared would undoubtedly drop a few years in appearance. This we've got some reality on. Somebody who
was about forty-five or fifty, something like this – well, you'd probably get a much steeper drop. Don't you see, they'd probably drop back to a much younger appearance proportionately.

Somebody who's around seventy, of course, is kicking the point of no return or has already passed it, but you'd still expect them to look younger. Now, also, how much longer would you expect this person to live? Well, that's almost in the lap of the gods, you know. But you could make some ragged guess at this thing that maybe you'd put five, ten, fifteen, twenty years onto their life.

Now naturally, if you clear somebody at the age of thirty, you're probably going to stack thirty or forty years onto the end of their line, you see, at least. And if you clear somebody at seventy-five, why, maybe you'd stack another five or six, don't you see? So the older they are, probably the less years you stack on, or there's some rule of that character might apply.

Now, studying geriatrics, you're in a very, very interesting field. You're in a field of no data because none can happen for the next seventy years, you see. So, never do you get geriatrics being studied in any one lifetime. And nobody, of course, is ever able to keep any records on this, because they get bored. And there's no series, you see. The guy who was interested in keeping records has kicked the bucket and nobody else has picked it up and so on. So you're always challenged along this line in the field of gerontology on just this one fact: "Well, nobody has lived long enough to prove it."

Well, that is your usual blunt argument that is offered. But that is not what you're trying to prove. You're not trying to prove by the actual livingness. But age is normally determinable – relative physiological age is determinable – by the condition and character of certain parts of the body, certain functions of the body, and cellular structures.

You see, we are the first that could do this, see. There's been nobody else before us that could do anything about this, you see. But you would take and make a physiological examination of the person, their cellular structure, you see, and this and that and the other thing about them – the springiness of their joints or something – and you'd take this person and then clear this person, and then get an independent examination of the springiness of the joints and the cellular structure and that sort of thing. All of these various things.

Now, that's going at it rather painfully. But you would determine, then, that the person was physiologically younger, which of course predetermines the fact that they will live longer. You see how that works out? In other words, this is susceptible to proof now, in Scientology, in a period of less than six months, whether you have added to longevity or not, don't you see.

Now, that's the first time anybody's ever been able to do any conclusions on the subject of geriatrics, and we probably should go ahead and do something with this. Because this is – this is something that people are interested in. People are interested in care of the body, care of the body, preservation of the body, all that sort of thing, and they would find that this is very, very much to the good. Before a person can carry out any of his personal ambitions, he should have enough physical energy, and enough resilience of body to be able to accomplish this. And therefore, it is important to people.
Now, you try to tell people about the mind, the mind, the mind, the mind, the mind, and they very often don't know what you're talking about. Or they think you're apologizing or something, and they say, "Well, I had a brother once who was crazy," you see. I mean, this sort of thing – this sort of thing is completely beyond them. But you start talking to them about geriatrics and longevity and this fellow says, "What is this thing, Scientology?"

"Well," you'd say – you'd say, "Well, what do you suppose your life expectancy is?" This puts it where he lives, see. He might even collect some of these insurance tables. They're the lyingest things you ever had anything to do with. But insurance men believe in them implicitly, and people who do actuarial work – that's the phony mathematics that determine how much you pay for your policy – this kind of stuff gives you all kinds of tables.

And there's one over in Rockefeller Center that's the most alarming thing I ever had anything to do with. And you go up to it and you set on a dial – and – how old you are. And then you go around the corner and look at this other thing, and that tells you when you're going to die. Sort of blunt. And not at all accurate.

But they figure it out this way: A baby who lives to the age of six months has got a chance of living to one year. Because most babies who are going to kick the bucket, of course, do so within the first six months, don't you see? But the baby who lives to the age of one year has a life expectancy, you see, of maybe two-and-a-half years or something like that. But if somebody has lived to the good old age of fifteen, then he's got a good chance of living, according to the averages, to the age of thirty-eight. And somebody who has lived to the age of thirty-eight has a good chance of living until he's eighty-nine or something, you know. This is a totally mad series of scales, but everybody believes in them. It's sort of "the magic charm." "What's your life expectancy?" It's quite a game.

And one time I went up there – many years ago – Rockefeller Center. It was before the war. It didn't say any war was coming up on the thing, so it was not a very good swami, it didn't predict that. And I remember, I think I was something like twenty-seven or I was twenty-six. And I turned up twenty-six on the dial, you see. Went around the corner and took a look. And my God, you know, I'd been dead for years, according to what it said. [laughs]

So anyway, regardless of what these expectancies are, the insurance policy situation is very easily overridden by changing somebody's life expectancy. Now, you'd think insurance companies were interested in this, but actually they're not. You can't sell these things to an insurance company for the good reason that they don't deal in anything but figures. And their figures are based upon expectancies of claim payments. And it's all mathematics.

Actually, an automobile insurance company doesn't care how many wrecks you have – doesn't care for a minute how many wrecks you have, because it's all going to be figured out actuarially and averaged, don't you see. It's – some of the fellows up at Lloyd's worry because one or two of the syndicates may have the Queen Elizabeth or something, you see, under total insurance. Huh-huh! You know, and that's just one ship, you know. And it's worth skillions. And if it ever went thud, why, that would be the end of that syndicate. Don't you see, all their – all their eggs are in one funnel, you know?

And anyway, where we have a spread out risk, though, like in life insurance, and that sort of thing, or automobile accidents or something, it's just a matter of "who cares?" They
just charge as much for the policy as they're going to pay out in claims. I mean, that's the blunt thing. They're not in the business of making people live longer. As a matter of fact, most insurance companies would scream with terror if you proposed to them that you could make every one of their retirement policy holders live an additional hundred years.

Also, a socialist state is liable to get rather queasy on this subject. You finally break it down to the fact that there's one three-months old baby left in the entire place who is able to work and isn't on a pension, don't you see? It's just too ghastly to contemplate.

So you get a reverse philosophy going, that you will occasionally run into in geriatrics, which goes as follows: "If people weren't kicking the bucket all the time, we would be in a terrible state. And it's a very good thing everybody is dying off the way they are," see.

And you get all kinds of reasons why death is a marvelous thing and so forth. And they're actually thinking about their Aunt Tilda, who, if she lived forever, would never let them come into their inheritance or something of the sort. But now with inheritance tax they don't even think that anymore.

The upshot of this condition in geriatrics is you've got people who want people to live longer, and you've got people who hope to hell they don't, see, and would do anything they could to shorten it down just a little bit. But insurance companies have an open mind, and others don't care. I'm just telling you this so that you won't bother to approach these people with this subject. And – but I'm also telling you what arguments you will get into in this, and they're quite funny.

But when you say to somebody that you could increase his longevity, he's liable to be much more interested than if you said you could make him healthy. He – well, I'm only talking about a small section of people – would be far more interested... Guy's gimping along on crutches, you know, and he's all caved in, both ears are bent, and he says – you say, "Well, I could make you healthy. I could cure you." Well, he's not sure. He's not sure about that. He's got his service facsimile right there in his pocket and he knows its various uses. And if you cured him up he wouldn't get his pension anymore from the railroad. And you've threatened his survival.

But if you told him you could make him live longer – Oh, now we have another entrance point on the same Joe, see. Ho-ho. You're not only taking his pension – not taking his pension away from him, see, you are actually... [laughter]

So therefore, in actual fact, a Scientologist needs this other string to his bow, in the case of an argument along these lines. And you see somebody gimping on crutches, you say, "I could take you off the crutches," and you've made an enemy. And you say, "I could make you live longer," and you've made a friend.

People, of course, really don't believe that they can live longer, they just wish they could. And you have Greek plays, for instance, which convince you utterly of the folly of immortality. There's one of them there who at the end of a thousand years of age, why, he's just begging the gods to kill him off, because he's lost all his friends and everything else like that. I think he was a dope. But anyhow, that's beside the point. If he had that much influence
with the gods in the first place, why didn't he get his friends living longer, too? The guy was merely selfish.

So the point here is that you have a reverse argument, and there is use for this argument and this action. Now, how much longer you can make the person live, by the process of just doing a Problems Intensive, I don't know, but it must be considerable. You can make a haphazard guess at it, and your guess would be as good as anybody else's.

This person is, let us say, thirty-five years old, and they feel like they're going to die any minute, and you give them a Problems Intensive; well, you've increased their life expectancy – that is, how long they expect to live – regardless of how long you have increased their actual livingness. Do you see? And most people are fighting living any longer.

Now, let's go into this a little more searchingly. What exactly leads one off into any conclusions on this subject, at all, that have any validity?

Well, right there in that pavilion you're using these days, I conducted a bunch of plant experiments. Just vegetable matter, true, but it had something binging in it, and theta-bopping. And I conducted a series of experiments. And in the far end of that, that's furthest from the chapel here, there were a bunch of tomato plants which were championship tomato plants. Nobody has ever heard their like. I've got photographs of them and records of them to this day. But they were growing as far – as many as forty-seven tomatoes to the truss. This is unheard of, it's absolutely impossible, see. And they were growing up in height, higher than sixteen feet. And nothing was killing them off. They hadn't heard of seasons. Their temperature was being held constant, their moisture was being held constant, and I developed quite a little bit of stuff in order to get something to do this. Everybody thought I was interested in horticulture. I really wasn't. I was interested in several other things – namely disease and things of that character. But very carefully, none of these tomato plants were given any injuries.

Now, the normal way of raising tomatoes is you punish them until they yield tomatoes. You snip them. Every time they try to put out a new little branch or something like that, that you don't want, you snip them. And you top them and you do this to them and you do that to them. You do other things to them. And you're always at them, you know. Always at them, at them, at them, at them, at them, you know. And they finally will grow a lot of tomatoes for you. Yeah, they'll grow some big tomatoes and so forth. But oddly enough they are very fragile.

And hothouse tomatoes, growing, is an adventurous activity. You have the banker on one hand and on the other side, why, you have every disease known to tomatoes – all manner of blights and fungus and this and that and the other thing. You never saw anything as sick as a tomato plant when it's been got at, at, at, at, more, snip, snip, snip, snip. See, it all comes under the heading of, "Care for it, care for it, you know. Look after your tomatoes, care for it. Torture them. And when you finally get this going real good, why, they'll bear you a few tomatoes," but it actually establishes a short cycle of life.

In other words, the life term of a tomato and the amount of punishment that a tomato plant is given have something in common. That's something to remember there. They're both the same – a similar curve.
Now, a tomato plant which is abused will become ill. A tomato plant standing right next to it, wide open for infection, that hasn't become abused – hasn't been abused, doesn't become ill readily. Or if it does, it can be cured. In other words, abuse has something to do with incidence of illness and has a great deal to do with longevity. How long's this plant going to live?

So I raised half of that pavilion over there full of tomato plants that you had – we finally had to shoot them down, that's all – I don’t know where they would have gone. But they were filling up the whole house, and they were the most cheerful tomatoes that anybody ever had anything to do with. And they were just getting bigger and producing more tomatoes. And they'd already gone through two seasons. And they were preparing happily to go into a third season. I said, "The devil with it. We have concluded all I want to conclude. Cut them down." And we did. And that's the only reason that house isn't well, that's the only reason the whole pleasure garden out there isn't full of tomatoes to this day.

Now, stationed around these tomatoes, and amongst this, under exactly the same climatic conditions, were tomatoes which were abused, and which did not follow this curve of action. They were the same tomatoes, under the same environmental action, and they became (quote) "sick" (unquote), and their longevity was very short. Now, they were not badly abused, they were simply brushed against rather regularly, and they were snipped the way tomatoes are supposed to be snipped, you know, and so forth. But they never even managed to pass their diseases over onto these other tomatoes.

Now, I'm telling you as much as one could observe within the crude limits of experimentation which can be accomplished on this planet in any case. These were as well done as you can do such experiments. But no experiment is perfectly done, ever. The fellow who perfectly does an experiment – he hasn't been found yet.

So, within those limits, these facts are very factual. But certainly, I can show you the photographs of these tomatoes, and my God, you never saw tomatoes grow and grow and grow. And trusses would come out, and tomatoes would grow on the trusses, and so on. I think the record one for England is something rather low like thirty-four tomatoes to the truss, something like that. And these were going – we didn't even bother to count all of them, because you couldn't reach them all, you know. But many of these were forty-seven tomatoes to the truss, see.

Here you had longevity; you also had reproductiveness and creativity. You had these various things. So some of the fondest theories were upset in handling those tomatoes. All of which has to do – had a lot to do with the human being, if you consider a human being mainly body. Because a body follows apparently these same physiological lines. And I've seen nothing to disprove this fact: that a body and plant life and so forth, these things are all cousins. What laws apply to one tend to apply to another.

And I learned enough out of this to learn that abuse determines longevity. And that was the datum that came out of that. And once I had stared this in the face, I looked around in amongst human beings to see if this continued, and to a marked degree it did. And all of our experience in Dianetics and so forth, tended to conclude that anyway, even long before these experiments.
Now, the other thing was that abuse determined incidence of illness. A thing was as sick as it was abused and its life was as short as it was abused. See, these two things emerged as parallel conclusions as a result of these plant experiments. Now, that means that there are two levels or two lines of approach here, as far as dissemination of Scientology is concerned. You can talk about incidence of illness, or illness, or you can talk about longevity.

Now, these of course are quite inferior to talking about a thetan and clearing and beingness of a person, his individuality and that sort of thing. But remember, when you're talking about individuality or an individual or an individual being, you're not talking about a body. See? And so therefore, these things are true when you mean a body.

And on a planet which is terribly fixated on bodies and so forth, these two things are very strong and powerful dissemination media. If everybody's interested in the body and their minds are all busy being interested in the body, you can give them a couple of data about the body which is quite interesting. And one of those is the longevity of a body can be increased or decreased in livingness, and the other, that incidence to illness and being well can also be monitored, you see. These two things can occur. A person can be made "weller," or a person can be made sicker, or a person can be made to live longer, or look less old, or can be made to live less long and look older, you see. These things can all be concluded from these things. And they are not such foreign statements that people – people can misunderstand them. And they're all quite factual and so forth.

Now, the abuse of the tomato plant, and the deletion of abuse from the life of a human being have a parallel. In other words, if you delete the abuse, you have done something like not abuse. And that was how I cross-translated the experiment, rightly or wrongly. In other words, if you could pick up the abuses out of a person's lifetime or pick up those factors which made the person believe he was abused, you then picked up, of course, the characteristics of not having been abused. Do you follow that? And sure enough, that's how longevity follows.

So these tomato experiments were important to that degree, but you couldn't very easily process a tomato, at least I haven't been able to yet. Turn on theta bops on them, and rock slams and things like that, but I never got into good communication with them. I'm sure they were ready to go into session, but I didn't know the language.

Anyway, the point I'm talking about here is, when you're talking to a world that is terribly fixated on bodies, that world will listen on the subject of bodies.

And there are two things which utterly bypass the laws against healing and the laws against helping people, and so forth. And those things are longevity – geriatrics. I mean, that's wide open, man. Make them live longer. It's wide open. It has no medical connotations connected with it whatsoever. You're not giving them drugs to live longer. And the other one, on the other side of the fence, of course, is, "Maybe you're not sick, maybe you're just suppressed," see.

Now, let's look at this other one for a moment, which is aside from geriatrics. This dissemination mechanism is of great interest to us. Because you can say this – particularly in England you can say this, "If you've been depressed..." We use that word instead of suppressed, and it's not too good to continue to use this button "suppress," because you have to
tiger drill it hard because people have kidded about it, you know, and done other things with it. But "If you've been depressed, you can develop symptoms which look exactly like illness."

Then you go up to somebody and you say to them like this, you say, "Hello Joe. Joe, have you ever – you ever been sick?"

And he says, "You kidding?"

And you say, "Well, you ever go to the doctor?"

And he says, "Sure."

"Oh, did he cure you?"

And he says, "No, of course not."

Well, you follow your line in, "Well, maybe you weren't sick. Maybe you're just depressed."

And he says, "Huh?" His interest will be caught at that point.

"Maybe you weren't sick, maybe you're just depressed."

"What do you mean?"

"Well, a lot of people – you know, they feel depressed and they are depressed for a long time and life depresses them. You know, it, pushes in on them, depresses them one way or the other. And they will eventually develop a feeling or a belief that they are sick. And they'll actually develop symptoms of sickness when they're not sick."

And this guy'll say, "Maybe I'm not sick! Hm! Hm! What are you talking about? Yeah, maybe I'm not sick. All right, what do I do about it?"

Well, you say, "Get processed."

And that's all, see. You give that person a Problems Intensive. And let me guarantee, the data which has come rolling in on me here in the last, I don't know how many – well, I guess the last two or three months – have been demonstrating some of the wildest recoveries you ever wanted to hear. Perfectly illegal diseases, they must not be treated. I think there are twenty-five diseases that you better not have in California, because it's illegal to treat them. By law, it's illegal to treat them. Cancer, arthritis – there's a whole bunch of them. You mustn't treat them; you can go to jail for it. I think that even applies to medical doctors. But of course it safely applies to them.

Anyhow – oh, and you talk about – you talk about fancy treatments – I don't know how much a treatment for arthritis costs, on gold shots. They're called gold shots with reason. Man, you'd have to be one of the biggest directors in the Bank of England able to sign those five pound notes in your own fair hand in order to get enough gold shots to make you well. And furthermore, cortisone and other such things are only relief as long as they're administered. They cure nothing, they just relieve. So you've got tremendous numbers of relieving medicines for this vast number of diseases.

Now, if you came up and said – correctly, it so happens – "Well, I don't care whether the fellow has cancer or arthritis or hangnails! Nothing to do with me. He's depressed. He's
not sick. I'm not practicing medicine. Sure I've cured him – of being depressed! And very often when people are depressed they exhibit symptoms of illness. All right, he's well. So he recovered from his hangnails. Who cares? I haven't told him I'd…" And you must do this, you, "I've never treated him for hangnails. I never had anything to do with hangnails. I never recommended it. Never even diagnosed he had them. He said he had them, but that's nothing to do with me! All I did was treat his depressed or suppressed condition," whichever word you want to use. "I treated his suppression. Life had suppressed him very badly, and he'd answered by telling people he was sick."

"Oh, you're treating hypochondria."

"No, no, no, no. He didn't even believe he was sick. He just felt sick."

This is the peculiarity that you can drive home. You could get into one of the most circuitous – and people could run it out on you in sessions on the half-truth rudiment – get into one of the most circuitous arguments you ever wanted to get into in your life. Either one of these – geriatrics or "not sick, suppressed," see. Either one of those things gives you an absolute wealth of material that you can embroider back and forth, and work one way or the other and talk about. You can generate tons of ideas. It just starts an automaticity of generating ideas.

You're talking to some bird and he says, "Well, I don't know. I'll never be the same again. I know that. Ever since my first marriage, I've been pretty well caved in, and I'll never be the same again. I know I'll just go on being ill like this," and so forth. And you say – well, you know you're on the wrong button. You see, that's the wrong button to play on that case. So you just go into geriatrics, see. And you say, "Well, actually – actually I realize that some people are practically incurable. I realize that. There are some things that are practically incurable." And somebody can run it out of you in a session, you see. Because what you mean of course is his fixed idea on the subject of he has to be sick. He thinks it's a sickness you're talking about and you just simply tell him, "Well, there's another thing Scientology can make you do, and that's live longer. That has an apparency. There are some indications that processing makes one live longer." Well, you're not being dishonest there! You're not being dishonest there at all.

You can certainly tell him, "It makes you look younger." You can tell him that with some truth. They'll go consulting the mirror every time they turn around to see if they live younger. This is in a world, of course, which is totally fixated on a body and you're trying to disseminate to people who haven't heard of anything, who don't know anything about clearing, don't know anything about releasing, don't know anything about anything. And there you go. It opens up a door.

You can certainly tell him, "It makes you look younger." You can tell him that with some truth. They'll go consulting the mirror every time they turn around to see if they live younger. This is in a world, of course, which is totally fixated on a body and you're trying to disseminate to people who haven't heard of anything, who don't know anything about clearing, don't know anything about releasing, don't know anything about anything. And there you go. It opens up a door.

Now, the reason why I'm addressing this has nothing to do with whether or not I want to sell people an idea. We've got to have a bridge. We've got to have a bridge from raw meat to clearing. Well, that bridge has got to contain reality for the person it's happening to. And unless we have a bridge, we'll simply clear up all those people who are already interested in Scientology and that'll be the end of the line. There's got to be some bridge that brings the person into contact with a reality on the mind and life. I know nothing better than a Problems Intensive or a series of Problems Intensives.
Now, let us suppose you are running a clinic. It was – you were talking about making people live longer or you were talking about making people feel better. We don't care what you're doing, as long as it's either one of another or these particular activities. You have a – well, let's say it's a clinical type co-audit. You're using interns or anything you can lay your hands on, you know, and you're giving people Problems Intensives. And they're walking in and the Problems Intensives are given at two hours a week or nine hours a week or thirty-eight hours a week. We don't care how these things are given. And they're getting processed and they're walking in and all you're doing is running just a straight Problems Intensive, that's all. And you're just getting the buttons repetitively, and it's all right, because you're running a Prepcheck repetitive style. Doesn't matter whether the button is clean or not. If the fellow can't think of any more answers, why, you just say, "Well, all right," and shift to another button.

All of this is perfectly fine. And that fellow's going to come out the other end, if any kind of a job of auditing was done at all, looking and feeling younger – geriatrics – and well of something he has been sick of. Both are going to happen to him, if anything was run at all. I'm getting some amazing reports on what a Problems Intensive is doing.

You know, it's sort of like you climb this arduous mountain to find a nugget, you see, and you get up to the top of this mountain and somebody down in the valley, down below – there you are mopping the sweat off your brow, and he says, "Hey!" he says, "There's one here that's two feet in diameter." He says, "Would that do?" Well, we just bypassed it because the whole top of the mountain is gold, don't you see?

There still is that nugget in the valley. We've evidently bypassed the Problems Intensive. We've bypassed the potentialities of "suppressed, not sick," see. We've bypassed geriatrics completely. Haven't paid any attention to it until tonight; you probably haven't even heard the name. All of these things, you see, we've just thrown them away. We aren't paying any attention to them at all.

Now, I dare say we have people right here – their hidden standard is whether they look younger. You know, they go to the mirror every morning, and see if they look – and some of them, who want to look older. You see, it's – they're using age, or appearance of age, as a hidden standard to find out how they're doing. Are they looking younger? Are they looking older? You know? Well, this is a very, very standard hidden standard. This runs all through the human race. And if it's that general, well, you'd certainly better have a use for the generality of the button. And the generality of the button is this.

I'm not trying to teach you how to be con men or something like that. I'm just trying to teach you how to talk to people within their sphere of interest. Now, in Book Three of Book One – that is the third book of that first volume, Book One, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health – it says that if you can parallel – that's right at the beginning of it, if you can parallel what the mind is doing, you see, you can reach it and do something for it. Well, I'm trying to teach you a trick here to take raw meat and get their – to parallel, and for you to be able to parallel what their mind is doing. You see? That starts a session before the session happens. And I've all been – always been looking for these little buttons one way or the other and have accumulated a lot of information about it – information which I'm sure you can use.
So, you've got these two buttons, and with a superfixation on the body, the fellow is thinking, "How well am I?" and "How young or old am I?" See? "How well or sick am I?" "How young or old am I?" He's asking these questions all the time.

And on a superfixation on the body you can always get him into a communication on this subject, because his attention is fixed on it. How do people greet each other on this planet? They say, "How are you?" meaning "How sick are you today?" [laughter] And the other fellow brags up and says, "Well, I've had a cold lately, but uh..." so forth. Just read a letter that emanates from one farm district to another farm district, just catch the mail on censorship, and it all has to do with health and Aunt Lizzie's kidney stones, you know. These are the milestones of time, you see, and this sort of thing. Well, those minds are definitely stuck on state of the body. And of course, state of the body is young or old, sick or well.

Now, the reason I've called this lecture "Geriatrics" is because it's a brand-new—brand-new sphere. It's a brand-new look. It's a brand-new communication line, and it's a very old hidden standard. I imagine, trillions of years ago, when you wanted to know if you were getting along all right, you stuck your doll body up in front of a mirror to see how its dents were, you know? And you'd say, "Well, I'm getting on now, I'm getting pretty dented." You know, "Paint's getting kind of worn off. Face is no longer shiny."

Now, you've come on down the track trillennia, you have a meat body, and you go up to the mirror and you say, "Well, I'm doing very badly because my nose is shiny," you know. There's all kinds of changed considerations on this thing. But thetans have always been going on these two views. "How young or old do I look? How sick or well am I?"

Therefore, these are very, very good dissemination media. They're a good media for conversation. And I give them to you simply because you have a pat solution in the Problems Intensive.

Now, what clearing does for this is fantastic. We haven't even talked about what clearing would do for this, to any degree at all. I haven't a clue, because it is just too much. It's beyond a ready embrace of the mind. Age is hooked on to the body, normally, by the thetan himself as self-expression. And it is held in place in terms of engrams and secondaries. It's held right there, man. Anything that is wrong with a body is held into it and on it by the thetan who has that body. That's it. As long as he believes he can't grow a new leg, he won't have one, either. And this is very observably the place. There is frankly no limitation on what thought can do to structure. There is no limitation on that. There is a fantastic short look on what structure can do for function or thought.

But nevertheless, this is a ready tool. This is something that you need. You're sitting there, somebody says to you, "What is Scientology?" You look them over. You can tell them it's something that makes you well, or something that makes you younger. You can tell them, not in a dictionary definition of this or that which they won't understand anyhow because they won't have any comparable datum. The reason you have trouble defining Scientology to people is because there is no datum of comparable magnitude in this universe.

So they always put up a datum of comparable magnitude and hang you right away into a suppression and disagreement. So you have a hard time. Because they say, "Oh, it's like Christian Science."
"No," you say. You're hung right away with a suppression. You say, "No, it is not like Christian Science." And that puts you into a disagreement, and you haven't got the thing in session, don't you see. There it – it isn't flying now.

But they say, "Well, what is Scientology?"

And you say, "Well, Scientology is a study of livingness. A study of livingness. Now, do you often wish you were younger?"

The fellow says, "Oh, yeah, yeah, I do that."

And you say, "Well, good. Scientology processing and so forth would possibly permit you to achieve that desire."

Now, they've got a datum of comparable magnitude – themselves. So never let them find a datum of comparable magnitude; you give them one. Now, your datum of comparable magnitude may be, to a baseball manager, his baseball team. You see, but always give them the datum of comparable magnitude. It's themselves or it's what they own or it's their family or it's their aging or sick mother or their ailing wife. It is something like that, don't you see? It's a datum of comparable magnitude. And you can say – it's almost a short circuit on the thing. They say, "What is Scientology?"

Take a look at them: "Do you feel – do you often wish you were younger? Have you been sick lately?"

The fellow says, "Well no, I've never been sick a day in my life."

"Well, do you wish you felt younger?"

"Uh – No, I – I never did. I – I don't – don't ever wish I felt any younger."

"Do you have any ailing members of your family?"

"Oh, yes, there's my dear old mother."

"Well good. Scientology would be something that would make her well."

"Oh, uh – it's medicine?"

"No. No," it's – you're off on the wrong line, so you'd better amplify completely your statement. You'd say, "Well, Scientology is a system of processing which does certain things for the individual and straightens them out. And some people are not sick; they're just suppressed," and so forth, now.

And he says, "Your mother – uh – my mother," he says, "My mother, she always was kind of suppressed by my father. Oh God, I hated him! You know, he was no good at all!"

And you say, "Well, there you are. She's pretty suppressed, huh? Well, you could take something like Scientology to pick up that suppression and straighten her out."

And he says, "Well, now, that's a good thing."

See, that's his immediate conclusion. See how you'd do it?

But he's going to reach for a datum of comparable magnitude. You're not going to be able to stop him from doing that. Because understanding comes by comparison, don't you
see? And he's going to reach for a datum of comparable magnitude, so you better reach for him first.

Now, naturally, we take this society lady, and she has powder on her face a quarter of an inch thick. We're left in no illusions about it, but we also have to be very tactful. We're going to use geriatrics on this case, but we have to be very tactful about it. Like, "Some people, even when they look young, can be made to look even younger." [laughter]

You'll find many people cannot confront illness, have nothing to do with illness and illness is a very forbidden field to them, illness is a zone and area for specialists, illness is a place where you must not tread. This prejudice and superstition is fantastic, and yet to get an entrance in the case you've got to talk about something about the body. Because they'll never envision the mind.

All right, then you have geriatrics. You can get into the most endless discussions on people about whether people are older or younger, or as old as they feel or younger than they feel. And what if you just kept processing somebody and processing them, and they went down and became a baby and… ? You know? And could you process a person the wrong way and make them look older and older? And all kinds of things like this, but you'd find interest would quicken. You see?

Well, you've got, "Maybe you're not sick, maybe you're just suppressed," as a dissemination medium. I thought I'd better tell you about geriatrics, because there's a large section of the society that can't confront illness and won't even talk about it. Now, you've got geriatrics. An interesting, very interesting field. And one which we have incidentally wrapped up en passant and haven't even noticed. So I thought I'd better call it to our attention before we passed by it utterly. But you would be amazed how many billions of dollars are spent every year trying to discover the route to eternal youth. We are the only ones who have that map at the present time and naturally we've got maps to so many more worthwhile goals and actions that we've paid no attention to it at all.

So I thought I'd better call it to your attention.

Thank you very much.

Female voice: Thank you.
Thank you.

Well, this is the what?

Audience: 25th of September.

This is the 25th of September. Oh, you're a day behind me. All right, you can listen across that time gap. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. All right.

We haven't got very much to tell you. You know it all now. You know everything there is to know. But your basic Dynamic Assessment, or looking for a goal, has many things on which it depends, and first and foremost amongst these is the auditor knowing how to audit.

Somebody can look over the directions for a Dynamic Assessment and think he can do it because it's very easy, and all you do is fall on your head, and – and it's very simple. You just ask for a list, and that's all there is to that. Remember that lying underneath all this is the ability to audit.

I hope it doesn't happen to you, but all you've got to have is one wrong goal listed on you – one wrong, wrong goal listed on you – see somebody stumbling around that's had a wrong goal listed on him or her, and you'll never do it again. Let me tell you, you'll never do it again, man.

And you let a bunch of HPAs start finding goals, you'll get wrong goals found. Right now the main difficulty is not clearing people; we can do that. That's a fait accompli. Well-trained auditor, doing his stuff well, and so forth, and you can get somebody Clear. We have the technology with which to do this fact.

Twenty-five hundred years after the facts of somebody dreaming it could happen on this planet, ten thousand years after somebody hinted it might occur, why, we can do it. Not because they regard their navel meditatively or think right thoughts or realize that it's all thought after all, and not think bad thoughts about things and think right thoughts about things and read the book, held in a proper position on the knee and tie the cat properly to the bedpost, without all that line of – why, we can clear people. And that is a triumph of great magnitude.

Because it takes it out of the sphere, out of the sphere of "a gift because you are so holy"; something you deserve because you have believed right. And of course, that is the most
fantastic trap of all. Your freedom depends upon your absolute slavery. "Big Brother is watching you." 1984, here we come, see? Inquisitions – all these various mechanisms.

And the only inclination we have in the direction of discipline in this particular lineup is getting it done. That's the interest. Just let's get it done, and that's all. Let's just get it done.

Now, the odd part of it is, is there are certain things which occur, which prevent it from getting done. And amongst those things is not doing it. Saying you are, but not doing it.

Now, we can see a medico – he's hard up, cobwebs growing across his door, poor fellow. Bill collectors coming around. "Internal Ravening" screaming over the Telephone for his income for the year 1915. And he finally has an enormous cognition – almost blows his head apart. "It's those cotton-pickin' Scientologists that have done this to me! I am no longer permitted by the public – because they don't want me anymore to rip open people's bellies and take out odd organs on the belief that there's a possibility that if I take out enough odd organs something odd will occur." [laughter]

And "Well, I-I-I-I can clear people, too! Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho! I can clear people, ha-ha! What you do? You get an E-Meter. What's an E-Meter? Well, we had one; it's a um-hm-hm it's a galvanometer, it developed the skin pore count, I think. We'll put him on that. Yeah, that's good. Now we'll say their basic purpose – all men are evil – so the basic purpose of any of these people, it'd be to kill everybody or something like that. And I'll tell them that's the goal, and of course, do like the Scientologists do, ha-ha, and there it be, you know."

All of a sudden everybody around the place says, "Well, he's doing Scientology, and he's killing people." You see the danger?

So actually, a certain amount of safeguard must exist in the vicinity of any such technology. Now, the – not the most optimum way to do it, or the most practical way to do it, but sometimes the most desirable way to do it is just shoot people dead who don't do it right, see? Not optimum, or practical, but it's so satisfactory! [laughs]

Now, all of a sudden the other day in – oh, where else could it be – Los Angeles. All of a sudden, why, all HPA students and all HCAs in class and everybody else, all of a sudden started finding goals on everybody, and ran out all the dynamic rock slams and now the Saint Hill auditors around there can't find any rock slams or find any items. Nobody bothered to mention it or anything. Now, I think it'll take them a while to pull that one apart. An air letter is just now aflight. I think it has just now passed, Des Moines, Iowa; it is en route. And it is saying it takes two Saint Hill graduates to check out any goal found in the state of California and a cable to me before it can be listed.

Now, you say that's ridiculous. I mean, my God! Two Saint Hill graduates, and so forth. Well, I don't know why not, see? As far as cables, they're expensive. Human beings come cheap, but cables, they cost money. Now, you'll see somebody skirting around the edges of that one. And they all of a sudden will be stacking it up.

We have a responsibility. One is to make it very, very clear to people that clearing is a subject of very expert auditing, and is not a casual piece of nonsense that simply can occur anywhere on any crossroads. And go to some lengths to make sure that people who have the
pensant for trying to, get trained before they do. Now, that's our biggest danger right now. That's our biggest danger.

Now, one of the ways you can always tell when we're successful is the number of protests that come and the amount of attacks that develop. You can always tell when we're very successful. I have various uses for hostile thought and activity. I use this. I use it very, very good. If I engage on a certain plan and announce it in advance and there are a great many protests against the plan, I look up the people who are protesting against this plan, and if they belong to the "Rock Slammer's Club"... You know, they're old, well-known squirrels, we haven't heard from them for years, but all of a sudden this plan is announced and they've written in to condemn it utterly, I know, man, we're on the right road and put it into effect at once. It's a sure test. It's a sure test.

Now, the other use, the other use you put this to is I know we're successful if we're being counterfeited. And these sad efforts to duplicate and that sort of thing – very pale they are – start springing up around and about a certain something, why, I know we're being very successful.

Did you know that the one of these copycat outfits, by the way, is still in existence down in "Taxas?" Taxas – that's a part of the United States. It's Concept Therapy. It's run by a bunch of chiropractors down around – I don't know, oh, some bayou. And – that's Mud Flats. It's run by them. And they're still "conceiving." They're still going on. They picked up old Concept Therapy from 19... I think it was 1953 or 52 or 54. I don't know, way back, anyhow! Whenever it was – 52, if I remember rightly. Summer, isn't it – 52. Concept Therapy. They're still doing it. Well, that's fine! That's fine! Please let them keep on doing Concept Therapy. Don't let them get suddenly ambitious. But unfortunately they're liable to get ambitious, because who appeared at the last Washington congress but the chief movers in that movement. They were all there, and they heard all about clearing, and are going to go home, and they're going to spin some people in.

We ought to make it a law that they test it out on each other before they do this.

Now, the ethics of the situation, then, simply involve the effectiveness. The ethics of clearing are the effectiveness of clearing. In other words, he who can clear can clear. And he who hath not been trained into clearing had better keep his paws off. And that's ethics. Now, in any – when – any time you get ethics matched up totally with effectiveness, and so forth, well, you've got a win on your hands, because it's not superstition, because it'll actually defend itself. If we let it be known very broadly that this is what we stand for, is effective clearing, we don't care if somebody had a fluke. You know, one fluke can kill somebody, you know? It's horrible. For instance, even you, even you can make a fluke. It'll ruin you for a while. Do you realize that? You know, you have a lucky break. No, I'm talking about a bad one; I'm talking about a good one, see?

And you're sitting there, minding your own business, and you accidentally ask the pc if he has any string in his pocket. This is just sort of out of the clear, you see? And the pc says to you, "My God, I know what my goal is – my goal is to string people along!" and so forth. And there you are. You've had it. You've had it.
You haven't got a technology which expands beyond one pc. Now, the fight has been
to get a technology which covered everybody. And the assessments which you're doing now,
the Dynamic Assessments, are very embracive. You don't have exceptions to these things,
you see. But you can derail yourselves on them by having a lucky break. I don't know, there
are a couple of auditors around that have had lucky breaks and have been regretting them ever
since because – why? Because they keep waiting for it to happen again, and of course it doesn't
happen again. The pc does not have any string in his pocket, you know? Pc after pc is
stringless.

Well, now, a broad general technology, then, is a desirable thing. But it can get hacked
up to where it particularly fits just a few, or fits a very few cases, or something of that sort.
Therefore, broken down, then, in its broad general application, it ceases to be effective. So
you might say it becomes unethical to clear somebody "unstandardly." You g – you get the
idea, see? This now can get up toward an idiocy. A Simple Simonness about the whole thing,
you see. You have to clear somebody according to the rules. You can't clear them any other
way. Well, of course that too outlaws the occasional lucky break. So that'd be bad, too,
wouldn't it?

Here's the way you do it: You clear somebody according to the rules and take advan-
tage of every lucky break you get. And then realize that the break will probably never again
occur, of that particular type. You understand? If you can realize that, you're protected then,
very largely, from stumbling around and making a bunch of fruitless this and that about it.

So broad clearing technology of necessity must be preserved as it is. And released, and
to a marked degree safeguarded. There is some responsibility for the know-how. See. Well,
because there's a responsibility for the know-how, you do get some responsibility, then, for
the communication lines of the know-how. And the communication lines of Scientology are
simply just that. They're the communication lines of the know-how.

In that wise, you keep a broad breakdown, you keep broad technology going, and a
breakdown of broad technology from taking place. Now, how are we able to suddenly inter-
rupt all this in Los Angeles at such a – such a rate of speed? Well, it's just excellent commu-
nication lines, good positioning, communication centers operating, people alert and so forth,
and it can all be put back together again, zing, zing, zing! you see? In absence of these com-
munication lines, well, you just either have to let it go, just let it happen and go to pieces, or
wait until some far distant date when you can finally put it back together again, you hope, see.

Well, actually the way we're operating right now is something goes wrong – it's pretty
much – it's pretty much this way: Something goes wrong anyplace in the world, on the subject
of clearing technology, something like that, and so forth, why, it's just a matter of zing, zing,
zing! We hear about it; we do something about it. Bang, bang! You see? And it's within a
forty-eight-hour, sixty-hour proposition quite normally. Well, that's how we can operate right
now. And we can put things back to rights before they can fall apart. Now, it's very important.

Now, it's very important, these data to you, for this reason, is you're going out and
you're going to get stuck in some corner of a Central Organization or into a clearing co-audit,
or something of the sort. And you're going to have everything up against your chest, and your
world is going to be the immediate zone of influence, and you're going to have some tendency
to say, "That is happening in the next block and is none of my business." And that I don't approve of.

Nobody on this planet could hold my post at this present time. That I know would be completely impossible, because I can't hold it. It's backing me up, man. I've held on to it for years and kept it wheeling for years, and so forth, against all manner of this and that, and it's just getting too rough right now to – to cope with. Frankly, it is. Somehow or another it'll get coped with.

But let me point out something to you. Those things which I am handling at the present moment, which are giving me trouble, are out of routine. They're off-line. You understand? They're difficulties which have not been predicted and cared for long since, they're offbeat things that are occurring here. And that's what's giving me trouble. I can keep up with routine actions, with the administration lines, with all of these things, I can keep up with these things. But you start giving me a fistful of oddities – one corner and the other way, and it's this and it's that, and it's the other thing, and my God, I feel like a boxer backed up in the corner of the ring, you know, being hit by about four fighters. I start getting punch-drunk.

Now, if I'm going to handle everything that goes wrong in Port Darwin, everything that goes wrong in Mexico City, everything that goes wrong in Tierra del Fuego and Paris and Rome and a few other points, all on nonroutine basis, let me tell you, I can't do it. It's just not possible. And who's going to do these? And what goes wrong anyhow? Well, I'll give you a little rundown on what goes wrong and maybe you can understand why I'm talking to you about this.

"Somebody doesn't act," is the inscription on the tombstone of more graves than you can count. Somebody didn't act, that's all. Something didn't happen, you understand? And it drops a ball. A big one or a little one, ball gets dropped. And an area of confusion occurs. Now, prediction of what is going to happen is normally the common method of taking care of these emergencies. And a communication system or an administrative system is simply something which is already planned to handle traffic so that nothing becomes an emergency, you see. But if somebody doesn't act along those lines, or if somebody doesn't use his noggin along these lines somewhere, then the next thing you know, why, zip-zap-boom! And you've got confusion going at a mad rate all over the place. Confusion is occurring madly.

Now, who is this somebody who should have acted in the first place? Well, today, I got the most confoundingly confusing despatch you ever heard of. An HCO – I hate to use the name in this derogatory regard, but it's only a temporary secretary on post there – actually wrote and said, "Because the HCO was not collecting any of the monies which were due and owing to it, that it was out of funds, and therefore couldn't continue very long that way." What an incredible statement! But the person actually wrote this statement and sent it through the lines, and is feeling quite upset at this very minute, and is quite resigned and feeling apathetic about it, you know.

All this person has to do, you see, is just collect the monies owing to it. They are not unreasonable pieces of money from unreasonable quarters, don't you see? This perfectly ordinary action has to be taken, but is asking for an extraordinary solution, because the ordinary solution has never been taken. See, all the sources of income are right there, they're perfectly
able and competent to pay this HCO its money, but the HCO can't ask for that money, and somehow or another now an extraordinary solution has got to be dreamed up for this particular area, and so on. Do you see the setup?

So actually what the despatch was doing was demanding that I take some extraordinary step with regard to this area. It already isn't doing its job, it already has dropped the ball. Now, of course, an unusual solution must be entered into the situation.

Now, let's see how fundamental this combination of events can become. Whenever you have an extraordinary solution demanded of you – in supervising auditing or pcs or something – whenever you have an extraordinary solution demanded of you, it will only be because the ordinary solution was never in action in the first place. You have the unusual demanded of you because the usual has not been followed.

You've got a pc suddenly appearing on your doorstep, 3:00 A.M., they're shaking, they're sweating. Oh! They're just about ready to blow out their brains. Where did this pc come from? How come? What's the enturbation in this immediate person's area? Well – now, look at this. You're there. There's the pc. Well, it's up to you to do something about it, that's for sure. You've got to do something about it, you can't just recriminate and make everybody guilty for not having taken the usual steps. But let me call to your attention that you actually have two actions you are being asked for. Let me please teach you this one thing. There's the pc on your doorstep at 3:00 A.M., shaking, you know, loaded revolver in hand, "I've just come by to say goodbye," you know. Now, you naturally would take a hold of the pc or put him on the meter, talk to him, or give him some Phenobarbital, or anything you could think of I don't care what solution you use, see.

You get this pc calmed down, and you'll get the pc picked up in auditing or straightened out one way or the other. I know you'll handle that much of it. You always have. So you'll handle that much of it. Well, please, can I point out to you, there's another step you must always take. Is find out who dropped the ball that brought that pc into that condition! And straighten that area out! Got it? Always take that second action. Please, I'd be less than doing my job if I – if I didn't tell you about this, you see.

Always take the second action. I know it takes a few minutes longer; I know you feel hard-driven; I know that there's two pcs upstairs and one in the basement that are waiting for your time; I know there's three telephone calls in the – coming through the switchboard for you personally and nobody else can handle it, you see? I know all this.

Just as I say that I remember a telephone message I didn't deliver this evening, see? But the point is simply this: You've got to find time between those two pcs. You see, you've already found out that this person who appeared on your doorstep was audited and a goal was found last month by George Snikwick. And between the phone calls and so forth, ask, telephone, do something. "Who is George Snikwick?"

"Why, that's easy. He's the person who took the PE Course. And I think he went halfway through HCA Course, but dropped out – dropped out in the middle of the second week, because he knew more than the Instructors."
Well, your indicated action, see, is to do this second thing. Let's straighten out that zone. Otherwise, that zone is going to multiply more pcs on the doorstep and you're not going to be able to breathe, ever. This way I'm giving it to you, someday you can look forward to being able to breathe, see. Now, there's two or three things which are indicated there. What Instructor let him out of what class? What D of T didn't take this person in and put him on the meter and pull his missed withholds and send him back to class? Who didn't do this? Who doesn't know the May 3rd, 1962 bulletin? You understand?

What HCO Area Sec has not bent his ears over the top of his skull and tied a knot in them? You understand? And just take enough time to call up and say at least, "What the hell are you going to do about George Snikwick? Right now? Not next week, but right now!" See? That's actually about all you have to do, because it belongs to somebody else, you see?

And then that second step is not complete unless you've done the following: "What have you done about George Snikwick?" Understand? And that way perhaps we can keep calm reigning someplace or another. Now of course, there's things going to occur that the devil himself couldn't do anything about. But then the devil isn't OT. He got withholds, so he couldn't be. [laughter]

You got a problem here of keeping the plate level on the table and keeping the soup in the plate, not all over the room. And if you always take this second step, we can manage it. And if you don't always take the second step, why, zzz! You'll have areas sometimes – you say, "Oh, my God, nothing can be done about it!" True.

The United States Air Force Signal Corps, or something, has just decided to clear all of its pilots with auditors certified by the American Medical Association. *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*. What can you do about something like that? Well, I don't know. It must have gotten pretty bad, there must have been a lot of balls dropped up to a time when something like this could occur, you know.

You say, "What can I do about something like that?" Well, you can scream. You can always scream. And because you can always scream, scream! You understand?

And remember that there's this interesting mechanism which exists in this particular universe. You can always make a force turn around and serve you. I've taught a few people this; it can come absolutely deadly afterwards. No matter what force comes their way, they use it. It's a trick that is taught championship tennis players.

The force of the ball hitting the racket is employed to drive the ball back. Now, there's a little trick of rolling a racket. You know, the ball hits the racket just a little bit off slant and the racket is rolled, and actually will go straight back to where it came from, or it can be positioned almost anyplace. Did you ever hear of this tennis trick? It's a terrific trick. Try it sometime. Try it with a tennis racket. You'll find out that it isn't enough just to stand there and resist the impact of the ball. You can actually, by hitting the ball just right, roll your racket just right and it'll turn, and a lot of the force of incoming rolls outgoing. Do you get this trick?

It's something like dropping something into a cup. Instead of hitting the bottom of the cup it comes up the other side. This is merely illustrative, not a lesson in tennis.
All right. Use the force to serve you, and you often can. And it's a trick that's peculiarly adapted to this universe.

Now, you know that if auditors certified by the American Medical Association are going to clean up and clear the US Army Signal Force Air Corps, man, that's going to be disaster. That's going to be terrible. That's going to be pretty grim. So, unable to prevent the emergency, take advantage of it. You know very well what's going to occur. So you just publicize the fact and get everything all ready to take care of the catastrophe. Set yourself up as a small civil defense unit.

All right, we're talking to somebody who went halfway through an HCA class and he's read all the bulletins, and he knows how to clear somebody and he's going to clear them. That's fine. He's got an E-Meter that was manufactured for the American Medical Association, something like that. And he's going to clear this person, and he's going to work on his wife, and you're talking to this fellow.

Oh, he's going to do it, and you say, "But look, you haven't any right to do this, see. In the first place, you haven't been properly trained, it's a very touchy operation," and so forth. "And you haven't any right to do it, and you're actually putting your pc in considerable danger. Why don't you run a nice Problems Intensive? You can undoubtedly get away with that. You can make your pc feel better. Why try to kill your pc off?" you know. You – all these arguments now, they're good arguments and most of the time they'd serve you, but this time they fail.

Well, don't go off and hide your head. Do the secondary operation to that, which is he finally says, "Well, I'm going to do it, I don't care what you say!"

This is the time to say, "Well, now, here's my telephone number. Have you got it there? You got a pencil there? Here's your telephone. Now, I'm going to put it right here, under 'emergency' and 'ambulance.' Now, here's my telephone number and here's the time I can usually be reached," and so forth. "And – now, I'll tell you something, that sometimes if the person gets shaky, or something like that, if you cover them up and keep them warm. And you got any B1? Got any B1, anything like that; give them some B1, and cover them up and keep them warm and call this number." In other words, set it up to take care of the emergency. Cut the other trick.

The fact that you have set it up to take care of the emergency may very well give somebody enough pause that you get your own way in the first place. Guy says, "Uh, well, I don't know, you c–." Rolling up his sleeves; he's going to go on into session with his scalpel, you know, and do a goal-ectomy. [laughter] And he passes by the telephone, and sneers at it, you know. Collects an overt on the way by it. And goes in and starts, "What is the detested person?" He's read that in a bulletin someplace that you ask this and you don't much bother to put the data down, but you must have the pc answering this question, is: "What is the detested person?" Wrong question, but he knows you're supposed to do something like that. And of course, his wife says, "Well, let's see, you, and then there's you and, uh – you. You. You, yes. That's – that's you."

And he says, "Well, it couldn't be me because I have always been nice to you! And you'll have to give me somebody else."
Well, you can imagine where, with that small takeoff, this activity is going to go, and so forth. And there's somebody pale and shuddering, and he has finally found her goal, which is, "to love my husband." [laughter, laughs] He lists her on this, and they—it's all gone very ruggedly. In passing by the phone one day—she's upstairs sick—and he says, "Well, I-I-I won't say anything. I maybe just better call up and tell him how things are going." And so he does and you've taken care of the emergency. And you check out the goal and you find out that wasn't the goal, and he by this time is thuuu, and so forth. And he finds somebody to find the right goal, or he'll go get trained to find goals, or he'll do something effective. Do you understand?

After, of course, the US Army Air Force Signal Corps has plowed in 50 percent of its aircraft, why, they would begin to become aware that there was something more to this. But they would think there was nothing to it at all if somebody had not set up the emergency ward for it, you see. So, you do them up a paper, something like that. You say, "Well, I can get in contact with about twenty-five auditors on emergency and we can set up an emergency unit, you know. And we can take care of the various suicidal and depressive effects which you're going to bring about, and so forth. And we want the name of every person you employ on this auditing project, because we will hold them as untrainable thereafter and as not suitable for training in Scientology. And we'll do this and we will do that." And you do it all up, you know, make sure the commanding general hears all about it, and so forth.

Just like this other guy, he's going to laugh hollowly at first, you see? But finally, why, he's going to get those first bad reports. And he's going to say, "Uh-uh, uh-uh, uh." He's going to get some more bad reports and very few good reports. Doesn't look good to him. He probably won't go that far. He'll probably be on to you, and he'll say, "Wait, you're—you're a member of the original group on this sort of thing, and you're supposed to know your business on this sort of thing. How about straightening this up?" And of course, at that time, you straighten it all up for him under the same conditions they imposed during World War II: unconditional surrender. You just impose all of your conditions, with no monkey business about it.

Now, you see how to take care of this situation? We're walking into an emergency situation. Our second-goal Clear got out of here—you probably don't know this story yet, and you probably haven't had it on the grapevine. My lines are faster than grapevine. My communication lines are the only lines in the world that are faster than grapevine. [laughter, laughs] She got down there, and she announced a clearing co-audit, and to quote her, she practically got her clothes torn off of her. She just got ripped to pieces in the rush.

A clearing co-audit announced in Bulawayo, the place where they all got killed, caused a stampede of magnitude. And she was absolutely knocked appetite over tin cup in the rush. And the reason why she signaled for John to come down there is she was actually going down for the third time, and she had to have somebody on deck, now. She was trying to audit ten hours a day, and run a co-audit, and straighten everything out, and handle everything, and she couldn't make any part of it, see.

Well, can happen, you know. It can also happen like this: You go back into an area, and everything is nice and sleepy, and there's nothing wrong, and everything is going along.
quietly, and you clear somebody up, and you're going to do all of your own listing, and all of your own goals listing, and you're going to do all of your items listing, and you're not going to have to groove it in anyway, because there isn't anything much to do about it, and you – you – so you clear up this person, and then you do something with that person, and then the next thing you know, it – you're opening the door in mornings, it just seems a little more crowded out there.

And one morning you open the door and the whole house gets swept away. It doesn't matter how quietly it starts or how long it takes to happen, it's going to turn into an enormously confused area in your immediate vicinity, no matter what you do about it.

Give you some kind of an idea: I was living a sleepy life, quiet, everything was going along, rather interestingly. Peter had very little to do, sorted papers, and he took most of the important despatches off the line and handled them and I didn't have anything to do. I'd just sit at my desk and breeze along. And practically no emergencies anywhere. This was 1960.

Well, in the last month, the last thirty days, let's not look at seven thousand some odd miles of boat travel, and seven hundred miles of car travel, or congress, or any one of these things. Just omit those, because frankly I had no time for them. So they just have to be deleted off the time track.

You add the amount of auditing I have done in the last thirty days; the number of cases that I have directly consulted about; the number of cases I've straightened out; the number of plans and solutions which I've had to put forward because the area was screaming for it; the number of new transcription and communication activities which I've had to try to set up to cope with this sort of thing; and you would realize what I was talking about.

On top of all this, of course, there are several emergencies around that have nothing to do with any of these lines, don't you see? But I actually could not at this present moment and have not been able to handle in the last thirty days, just my auditing supervision, see. I haven't been able to handle that much of my job thoroughly.

Now, when you add to my job all the things that are added to my job, you get sort of a feeling like things are going rather rapidly. You also get the feeling like things are kind of out of control. You get to wondering where it's going to land. I know this. I know this before. I've had it in 1950. And you're facing another 1950. But this one will come out straight and right, providing we all keep our heads screwed on, and keep the show on the road, and don't monkey around with a bunch of squirrel nonsense and don't tolerate a bunch of bad clearing. And if we can do these things, why, it'll all come out all right in the end. We'll get through this all right. And if we don't take care of these things, however, if we just say, "Well, my job is an auditor and there isn't anything else to do on this particular line," let me tell you, we won't get through it. I mean, it's that rough. We'll practically be wiped out in the rush.

Because the number of times I have raised my voice in the last few days, in exasperation and in total dismay, well, it must be six or eight times. And it's enough so the kids are now getting used to it and smile and pat me on the back. At the same time, I've been able to kind of get things grooved in a little bit. So, that just before the lecture tonight I was able to show them a movie on Tarzan of the Apes, and that sort of thing. I hadn't put my tie on yet,
but I showed them a movie. You can also do living at the same time you're doing this, you know, if you kind of fit it in edgewise.

But I see all the symptoms here. Now, what's even more interesting to you, perhaps, is a whole new country just blossomed open, suddenly. Crash! Japan. And the biggest evening paper in Japan has just run column stories on Scientology and has tied up their switchboards totally. John Ockard, from University L.A., Department of Mathematics, was over in Japan and he gave a public lecture – talked about clearing and that sort of thing. Now, a little bit of pioneer work had been done there, a few contacts had been made; he evidently went along these lines, and I don't think the Gentleman who is sitting right there realized that this wire was that live. He thought maybe it had a hundred and ten volts in it, but it's got a couple of hundred million volts in it. The Japanese public, four hundred – four and a half million readers of that one single paper almost knocked the building down.

Now, this leaves me – of course, I know we don't have time to do this, but I have to do this – leaves me with the job of writing special articles for Japanese papers. Of tailoring up and editing Scientology textbooks to be translated into Japan, without time to train an auditor as a translator. Grim.

I can't read Japanese characters. I can read a little bit of roman, which is their romanized letters. My Japanese is far too rusty. I spoke it a bit once, but not anything in gear, see. There's just nothing in gear here at all. Now, there's a country, a large population. Vital, a very vital, a very forceful people.

George Jellinek going over some surveying with me this evening. You say, "Where did that hat come from?" Well, it just happens to be another hat. We were standing out here, talking about surveying, and surveying things up, and we were talking about various types and classes of architecture, so as to plan up what's to be done with that courtyard over there. And he was talking about how vital Japanese architecture was, and how powerful, how forceful and how brutal their architecture was. He didn't think he could cope up to it. Well, I doubted the last fact, of course.

But here's a very vital people. Poised on the threshold of Asia – the newest awakened nation in the world – these people, with a handful of battleships and so forth, almost made it, just a few years ago, man. I know, I was on the receiving end of some of that. They darn near made it. Now, a nation which is whipped in war inevitably goes into thought. They'll move up from force to thought. But remember, a thetan never gives up. They had conquest in mind, and conquest they will attain, only it'll be a conquest of thought.

There is an arrow poised at the heart of communism, poised at the heart of all these enslaved states. There is a very interesting situation. Now, sooner or later the Japanese are going to break out, they've already broken most of their treaties with the US. The US can't keep them in line now. Student riots, and that sort of thing, prevented Eisenhower from going in there.

There's an interesting people. There is no philosophy tailor-made of a political nature which would handle that situation. And all of a sudden this wide people, already they are – their communistic aspects is they believe that the individual should have a greater chance and
the state should have this and that, but the individualism of the individual should be terribly maintained. In other words, this is very confusing.

Karl Marx is dead right, except where he was confused with Nietzsche, see. And this is pretty it's pretty pretty confused. That nation isn't half whipped. All right. If one can guide ist it, by the way, owes its primary upsurge of civilization to an incursion of Buddhism. Many centuries ago Buddhism was the first civilizing agent in there, and they taught writing, and they taught the various arts. Japanese had no writing up to the time the first Buddhist monks arrived from Tibet.

It's very interesting that into Japan swept Buddhism, centuries ago, and brought about a literate civilization, which eventually was opened up. And suddenly, with enormous enthusiasm, we get the wide arm embrace for Scientology coming in from the West, which of course is a whole wisdom all in itself a moment when it is delivering the goods. In other words, you can take off all the slack of the years of hoping, and waiting on Ron, and hoping it worked, and the forward surge, and so forth. No, it'll just come as the total impact. From first book to last book all in one package, bang! Pretty startling.

Well, what's this going to do? I don't know. I haven't any particular plans of conquest in Asia. But it looks like I don't have to have any, it's... [laughter] There goes China, man. There goes China.

Well, which of you, which of you right this minute could go to Japan and train some auditors, and do some "clear up" of the situation, get a sort of an organization together which can serve as a library, and can control the activity in the vicinity so it doesn't go all to pieces, and so forth? Well, which of you are going, you know? It's that sort of a question.

Because of course, you can't go, because the place where you're already going to probably already expects you, and so forth; but there are many places in the world that need you equally as much. You understand? Any Saint Hill graduate that doesn't know where to go, for Christ's sakes, get in touch with me, man. [laughter] Despatches in my mail just this evening were demanding two Saint Hill graduates before yesterday morning. The situation is totally out of control, see.

Now, it's also interesting that the FCDC income has doubled since the congress and is remaining at a doubled state. This has never happened before. Usually, it'll last for a week or so, as an upsurge income, and then drops off quite markedly. Well, it is doubled, and is slightly increasing. Their units are kicking now around seventy cents, with every sign of rising income.

They've just moved into another building, and so forth, and an additional building just for the HGC alone, and all kinds of things like this. And they're on my back on the subject of more Saint Hill graduates.

There's a new plan of clearing, and all clearing plans are the same plan now. Only we call them "Staff Clearing Project"; we call it the "Public Clearing Project"; we call it a "Staff Co-audit Clearing Project." I don't care what you call it, it's all the same plan; is you get an untrained or a well-trained untrained is PE level or well-trained HPA-level auditor who does the Prepchecking.
The first PE level, of course, does it under heavy supervision and the HCA would do it under less heavy supervision. He does all the basic auditing. In other words, he gives whoever comes in a Problems Intensive, and he lists all the goals, and he gets them all padded into shape and their needler's fine, and he gets their withholds off. He gets them straightened up, in other words, so that they can fly.

Then he turns them over to a Saint Hill graduate who audits them just long enough to find their goal, and as soon as that person's goal is found and proven out, that person is put back into the pack again to get the goal tiger drilled at the beginning of every session and listed. So, your auditor who's doing this has to know how to tiger drill at one goal alive and list out a goal.

All right, now, that is the clearing plan. That is the way it is working out. You don't let a Saint Hill graduate do Prepchecking, you don't let him list the original goals, and you don't let him list the items. You're doing it here so you'll know how. But here's ordinarily how it goes.

This is your – your HCA-level activity or very heavily HCA-supervised public activity, and it runs along on this track and then it does – just – this person is ready to have his goal found. Or there is auditing time to have this person's goal found and it suddenly goes tick, tick, boom, bang! And he's back on the track. You understand? He comes right along this line here, and so forth, and then he's totally derailed off it into the hands of a Saint Hill graduate. Person's goal is found and instantly he is put back immediately on this other line. Anybody who isn't doing that, any Saint Hill graduate who isn't operating that way these days is operating at a hell of a waste. Not just for himself, but waste of treasure and waste of human time. See, because that's the way it ought to run.

Now, what do you have? You have Staff Staff Auditor number one is a Saint Hill graduate goals finder. You call him the Staff Goals Finder. And staff co-audits on their own time. See, they co-audit each other and then soon as one is ready to have his goal found, why, he's passed over to this Staff Staff Auditor number one, and for that period of time he is in that auditor's auditing room getting his goal found. And as soon as the goal is found and checked out, why, he is put right back into his co-audit thing.

But you have two things running on staff. One is a co-audit; that is, the untrained staff people are done in co-audit that meets Monday, Wednesday, Friday sort of thing. And then you have the trained staff member who is permitted to co-audit on his own time and doesn't attend this co-auditing – these co-auditing sessions which are supervised. You see how that's done?

And the Staff Staff Auditor number one has an HCA assigned to him who operates – could be as a part-time, or even two part-time HCAs or HPAs. And these people review the folders and make sure that the staff members that are doing the co-audit hand in their auditor's reports, and keep the thing scheduled and that sort of thing and handle the administration for them. Or you can have a full-time administration person who also does the supervision, so on.

Doesn't much matter exactly how this is worked out, the basic plan is that there's a Saint Hill graduate there finding goals, and people are being all handled and squared up – he's not having to do any of this handling – squared up and then they hand him a person, and he
finds the goal, and feeds the person back into the other lineup. You see that? All right, you do that with the public.

For instance, we have a new release form, the darnedest release form that anybody ever heard of. You know our old release form? It says, "Nobody – we're not responsible for anything that happens in the HGC." You ever read one of those release forms? "If you fall down or break your neck, or anybody audits you badly, why, you daren't sue L. Ron Hubbard or the organization or the Assoc Sec or anybody, and it's nobody's fault but yours," and that's what the old one reads.

The new one reads just this and no more: It says, "The organization takes full responsibility for clearing you. And you on your part pledge to make yourself available for processing and pay for the auditing until this is done." Signed by the person, signed by an officer of the organization. You look it over from a legal standpoint, it's very amusing that it's a more legal contract than the other. I can just see some old judge trying to settle this thing as a release form, see?

"Well, they took full responsibility for you, what did you do? You're suing them. What did you do? What did you do? I mean, did you make yourself available, as it says here, for what... [laughter] Well, you didn't. I thought not. Thirty days or... Oh no, it's a civil suit." [laughs]

You see, a different spirit pervades the land. So what happens? What happens? This guy receives this contract someplace out in the field, and he signs the contract and sends it back in. What does he get for signing the contract? A promise that we will not raise our rates to him for a year. That's the only reward he gets for it, because believe me, cost of processing is going up everyplace. We promise not to raise our rates to him if he signs a contract. And this is the person we promise to clear.

Central Organizations some time ago sent out letters to everybody saying we were – had them on our clearing list. Well, this is their first issue on that subject afterwards, is this release form. And it says, sign it. And tremendous numbers of them will be signed and sent back in.

But that – same thing – all of a sudden, you've got two, three, four Saint Hill graduates on the staff and you got a lot of staff auditors. And all these Saint Hill graduates are doing their – but not being permitted to be Ds of T or anything else. They can only be Technical Directors by my special permission. And Assoc Secs. Yes, they can be an Assoc Sec, providing they're not needed someplace else. You get the idea? I mean this is a different look.

So you got two, three, four of these people and they're on staff, and just as fast – you bring these people in from the field, fix them up, get them all ready, and so forth. And when you've got a Saint Hill graduate, call him in again. And find their goal and feed them back to listing and zip them out of there.

In other words, this is assembly-line clearing. And this is World Clearing Program. Of course, your co-audit is you get sixty people together, and there's a lot of tricks that you can use on that. I'll talk to you a lot about that later on.
And I figured out a new angle on how you charge for this, if you're going to do one of those so that it makes the people who join the co-audit very anxious to bring in new people because it costs them less. See, the basic cost of the co-audit is five hundred dollars, or a thousand dollars a week, and of course, if they only had one person it'd cost him a thousand dollars a week. He's very anxious it'll have a hundred people. And in any event, you get – you get twenty-five dollars more per week, or something like that, for every person there. I can just see some guy trying to leave that co-audit, you know! [laughter]

But anyway, these are the problems. This is the atmosphere of the – the world is living in right now, Central Orgwise. And Central Organizations are short of Saint Hill graduates. They're trying to start this and trying to do that, and not enough time and not enough people and not enough technology, and already using the bulletin that's going to be received tomorrow, you know. And this is the operating climate that we're moving up into. And that operating climate, of course, will smooth out some years from now, perhaps. If you live long enough, maybe even in your lifetime.

But this is what you're walking forward toward, and this is what it looks like. And I just wanted to talk to you about these various things, and talk to you about the ethics of the situation. To talk to you about – you got to keep clearing good and you got to keep it getting done. That's the only thing that's really effective. And take the steps necessary to make clearing effective and keep it from being messed up. And we've got our job done.

We got the technology, we're on the way, and so forth. And even you will be Clear very shortly.

Thank you very much.
Okay. Lecture two, 25 Sept., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and we'll talk to you about 3GA.

Well, you know all about it, of course. There's nothing much to learn about it. The first thing you should know about auditing is auditing is what you get away with. That's it. And that sometimes is disastrous. Because you get away with something and then you never get away with it again.

Now, the best auditing, I think you'll agree, is very standard auditing. There's somebody here right now that was screaming about the wound-up doll character of a Saint Hill graduate, got twenty-five hours from one and thought, "Man, Saint Hill auditing is the most." When you're on the receiving end of good, stable, standard, high-skilled auditing, it makes all that difference. It is recognizable miles away.

Now, the difficulties of goal finding are generally put there by the auditor. The pc is perfectly willing to be audited, but the pc has a bank that is very often unwilling to be audited and the first step of any auditing activity is to make the pc auditable. Now, that's quite interesting – he makes the pc auditable.

Now, that's quite important, because the pc has got to be in a very auditable condition before you can do very much with finding goals. And if you ever want to have a hard time, take some pc who isn't very auditable, who has an anti-Scientology goal, don't improve the pc's auditing quality in any way and try to find the goal. Now, you just – I don't know. I don't know how the devil you could do it. It'd just be too wild for words.

Now, you take somebody who is quite auditable, but has a goal that he conceives to be an overt against Scientology or the auditor or something of this sort, you'll find that's tough enough, without adding the fact that the pc has no familiarity with auditing and isn't grooved in in any way. That's really asking for trouble.

Now, the best way to make a pc very auditable is to give the pc very accurate sessioning.

I can't emphasize this too much. If the pc feels all self-auditish and all run around and messed up and that sort of thing after some auditing, the reason for that lies with the auditor. There aren't ARC breaky pcs. You must remember this. There aren't difficult pcs. You must remember this.

There are auditors who can't handle pcs. And this will come home to you with a crash. You should have seen poor Wing Angel after he got out of here.
By the way, Wing's goal was completely listed out and he was checked Clear a couple of days ago and it's time that he was, because he's handling the Academy in Washington for a few weeks. And I went in and I saw the (quote) "auditors" walking around, you see, very stiff, "With your right hand, touch that wall. Thank you." Ruf! ruf! ruf! ruf! ruf! And I said, "My God, Wing!" And he says, "Listen boss..." He's always calls me "Boss." Gag! He says, "You should've seen them yesterday!" [laughter]

Well, someday you'll be handling some situation like that and it'll just about – you'll always have somebody coming up to you saying, "This is a very difficult and a very bad pc that I am auditing. This pc is very ARC breaky, this pc will not stay in-session, this pc this, and this pc that," and blame the pc, blame the pc. Whenever you see that kind of a situation you just know that lousy auditing is going on and you concentrate on training the auditor up better.

That's the answer to it. Because if you've been at this long enough, you find out that there aren't bad pcs or good pcs – there are pcs that are more auditable than others. This is for sure, but the auditor's job, of course, is to make the pc auditable, not blame the pc.

Now, it's a very funny thing. You take some pc that's been been very roughly audited – audited with the rudiments out, auditor has been cleaning cleans madly, you know, and missing the reactions, and the very things that you're struggling with. And this has been going on for several sessions. And, man, this auditor is just getting the pc so the pc is kind of coming up the leads, you know, of the E-Meter. You know, the pc's crowding into the session and the pc's falling back out of the session again and the pc's trying to keep his own rudiments in and all these various things which you occasionally see when you're moving in on this.

Now, this pc is weird. This pc is ARC breaky and had lots of problems and appears to be leading a very messy life and ifs all very upsetting. All right.

You take that pc, just as an experiment, and you just give him three sessions, each one about thirty to forty minutes long. That's within the hour limit of the session. Just give him three letter-perfect sessions. Don't do a thing for the pc. You understand? Don't try to do anything for this – don't try to handle the pc's problems or anything of this sort. See, nothing extraordinary. Just give this pc about three sessions, see, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. Or week one, week two, week three, you see? I mean, just three sessions. And watch the difference in that pc. Because good, positive auditing is pure magic.

This pc all of a sudden will stop trying to keep his rudiments in, this pc will relax, this pc will say, "This is a good auditor," this pc'll say this and that. He'll give you praise you probably don't deserve. See, you could even miss a rudiment or two and still get a pc into marvelous condition

But you haven't run anything on the pc. This is what I'm trying to make a point of. You've not run anything on the pc. You've not taken up this pc's constant and continual worry about his lumbosis. See, you've not done anything for this pc. You could even go so far as to just, well, prepcheck the buttons, Careful and Agreed Upon. Not even Suppress, you see? Since – well, I don't know, pick some random date – since last Tuesday – just any old "Last Tuesday," you know? And that's all you ran in the body of the session. See, you maybe just
cleaned one of them, you know, see? Or since Saturday, or since this morning. We don't care what you did. See, you weren't really doing anything.

Now, all you did was get in those three rudiments up front and clean up this one button for some short period of time and then get your end rudiments in and end the session. Just do this for three consecutive sessions. And you'll find yourself looking at a different pc.

You should get a good reality on that, because it'll keep you from keeping auditors in the lineup untrained. If you recognize that this is true, then you won't put up with some auditor monkeying up a pc, you see? You won't say, "Oh well, I don't know. It's just poor old – poor old Billikins there – poor old Billikins just has a terrible time get – he's unlucky. He always gets bad pcs. Now, somehow or another Billikins always gets bad pcs," and so forth. That's not true, you see?

You see, if you don't know for sure what I've just told you, then you will keep Billikins in there and not do anything about Billikins. See? He just isn't auditing pcs. That's the only adjudication you can make out of it. I've had the experience a few times... Oh, well, right here, in your TV demonstrations, I've had a pc tell me afterwards – pc hadn't had any cleans cleaned on him, hadn't had any reactions called when there were none, you know. I mean, the pc was just given a fairly straightforward session – tell me afterwards, "Yeah, well, that was a marvelous session!" you know, "Never had such auditing!" I didn't do anything for the pc. See? Except just give a straightforward Scientology session, that's all, without any monkey business.

Now, the worse off an auditor is, the more he figures. Now, that's a stable datum that you can put down. The worse off an auditor is, the more he figures.

And the conclusions he draws will hold at dismay the origins and answers of the pc. The pc is always talking up against a foregone conclusion. See, the auditor has got it all figured out, every time. The auditor never sits there as just a – you know, he receives the origin, acknowledges, and so on. He's wearing himself out, man! He's just working! You talk about work! You never saw so much work as this! Oh, God! The foot-pounds of energy being put in by this auditor there if added to a steam engine would drive a locomotive the length of the – Great Britain or drive the Queen Mary halfway across the Atlantic. That's steam, you know! Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, now let's see, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, and then some more figure, figure, and figure, figure, figure, figure... The auditor says, "Do birds fly?" You see? And as soon – just before the auditor did that, he said, "Well, I know what this pc will answer. The pc is going to answer the fact that birds don't fly because actually he's got – he's sort of flighty, you see, and he's going to have – he's going to have all this, and so forth. And therefore that's – that's the cause of his long-long nose and so forth. And when he – when he answers up, it doesn't matter what's running, I-I-I-I know what the answer is." Got it all figured out in advance.

So he says, "All right. Do birds fly?"

And the pc says, "I don't know. I guess so. Haven't given any thought to it at all."
And the auditor says, "See? I told you." Confirms it and so forth. Well, actually this auditor hasn't received any communication from the pc. He's received a proof of his own conclusions. And of course, he's never in communication with this pc.

And after an auditor has been at it for a while and he's done an awful lot of auditing, he's getting pretty smoothed out about the thing, well, he says, "Do birds fly?" and it's all right with him if he gets a positive answer, and it's all right if he gets a negative answer, and it's all right if he gets a screwy answer. It's also all right if the pc doesn't answer the auditing question; the auditor just tells him to answer it. And it's a very relaxed emanation coming out of this session – if you want to specialize in emanations. It's very relaxed, see? The theta waves are very smooth in that vicinity. [laughter]

And the pc knows. He knows he's talking to somebody. He knows somebody is talking to him and that there's not a lot of crisscross going on. See? There are not a lot of crosscurrents going on.

Now, this doesn't say that an auditor never has to figure out a pc's case, because he does. But the thing to figure out and figure on are the important things, not the unimportant things. "Now, let me see. This is the fifth consecutive list of detested people and things that we have drawn up without a single one of them slamming. Now, what the hell is wrong here? What's going on?" See? And he has to come up with the right answer. He has to do something that is effective about this.

So, it's only when an auditor is being ineffective that he starts working it all out. He – otherwise, he could just sail through like a breeze. He knows his stuff, he knows what's happening, and so forth. The pcs he audits; the person sits down there – well, it's just the fact that the session is a very smooth, routine session and it all comes off all right, and the pc winds up at the other end, and the auditor's heard what he said, and the pc has answered what was given him and the rudiments are all straight, and nothing's gone out of line, and there it is and the pc starts building up a big lot of confidence. And he doesn't put all these think-think figure units, you know, to work, and get all stuck in the session and get to fighting and batting around, and so forth. The pc just cheerfully goes on and becomes a pc.

That's very important, because in that state, he'll give you the right answers and he'll be able to look into his own items and units and 'ead and he'll give you goals and withholds and… In other words, auditing really gets done if the person's being audited. You understand what I'm talking about?

Now, if that kind of an auditing session cannot exist, you haven't got a dog's chance of finding somebody's detested person, dynamic, goal, item – anything. And these things are just not findable! Because the pc is just, you know, all nerved-up and knocked around. "God! He – I won't talk to – about this because – yes, I will talk about – I can't find any other difficulties I'm not willing to talk to him about. Difficulties? Difficulties? What are difficulties that I wo-da-da-da. I – but I've told you all the answers. Well, you say it still reads on the meter, but I – let's see! Difficulties? I can't think of any other difficulties that I'm unwilling to talk to you about." [pants exaggeratedly]

Have you seen something like that? Heavy! Pc will go around the bend! Now, that's no frame of mind to be looking for a dynamic and an item and a goal, man.
So the first requisite of 3GA is that the *auditor* can carry on a smooth routine, unworried, unharassed auditing session. That's the first requisite. And it takes a lot of training to get an auditor into that and it takes a lot of self-discipline, and that sort of thing, to get up to that point. Some auditors just seem to be naturals. They seem to be naturals. And other auditors seem to be – have a hell of a time to achieve it. But they can all achieve it.

As far as discipline is concerned, you'd be amazed that every now and then I have to take myself by the scrap of my neck and audit exactly by current procedure. And I do! I work it around and audit by current procedure – exactly current procedure, you see?

Sometimes I audit just a little ahead of current procedure. For instance, I'm asking two questions now, you heard in the demonstration last Wednesday, probably baffled several of you. There is "done" in the first end rudiment. Did you hear it as it went by?

*Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.*

Now, it was more important to ask that one than it is to ask the old one, see? Put "done" in that first rudiment. "To impress me," "Is there anything you've done to impress me?" You know? "Have you done anything to impress me?" That's the idea. "Done anything." It's not "said anything to impress me," but "done anything to impress me." You'll find out it's much more effective. And also critical – well, if there's anything misunderstood in the session, the pc's going to be critical; so it's much more beneficial to ask them, "In this session was there anything that was misunderstood?" And you'll find out this will work out much better as the session goes.

Well, those are little changes, and so forth, and I just get so flat out I don't have the time to issue them to you, and it's not terrible important, and I know I'll get around to it sooner or later, and you'll catch up with them. But of course you do this to yourselves. It's all your fault, you know, because you scream like mad every time I change a comma on you. But otherwise I audit with a very standard approach. I can give a very, very standard – very, very standard session. Extremely so. And groove it in, clean no cleans, miss no read – just give one of these sessions. Quite interesting what happens in it.

When I think of the times in the past twelve years when – or longer than that for me – that I have sat down and utterly sweated blood over a pc trying to figure it all out and not being aware of what conclusion was going to be reached by the end of session and all of this sort of thing. Well golly, I would have given a lot over these years to have been able to audit this very smooth, quiet approach that we audit with today. And man, if you do it right, it holds a pc in-session as though you had him tied down and threatened with wild bulls! They don't move. You really get them into session these days.

Well, it's that attitude of auditing: the calm, effective, certain, hopeful approach. You know what you can do. Sometimes you do it sooner and sometimes you do it later, but you know you can do it. That approach is fundamental for 3GA.

If you're still in a frame of mind where you sit down and audit a pc and "Uhhhh! I don't know how this is going to come out," and so on, and "I know what this pc's going to say, I know what his goal really is. His goal is to – his goal is 'to catch black catfish.' I know what his goal is because he says he's colorblind, and then obviously, I mean, and so on," and et
cetera, et cetera, et cetera, figure-figure-during the session, see? You're under big strain all during the session. "How is this going to come out?"

Well, just to that degree, this strain is communicated to the pc and the pc is incapable of producing the things which you want. You understand that?

Now, that's something to cultivate in 3GA, if you haven't already got it down. You got to be a relaxed, hopeful, positive, effective auditor. You've got to know your business in order to emanate the fact that you know your business, in order to get the pc to do exactly what you want him to do. And that is how to get a pc to get – to do what you want him to do – not hit him with your fist, but hit him with total competence. And you'd be surprised how far you'd get in that frame of mind.

But for the nerved-up, uncertain, questioning, technique all slipping out of his fingers, you know, like greased pencils. Uhhh! It doesn't go across. It's auditing attitude. It's auditing accomplishment. It's auditing effectiveness.

You actually should be up to a position where you can sit there and hand out a rudiments-havingness session. And just know that by the time you've given your pc two or three or four such sessions, he's just going to be calm as a millpond. You just get up to a point where you know that and you're ready to hand out 3GA.

That auditing attitude is important. All right. It's something that can't be neglected. And that's the basic reason why you're not going to get good, accurate goals finding, and so forth, amongst half-trained, poorly trained, uncertified auditors and that sort of thing. The discipline is just not adequate to it.

Well now, what I'm pointing out to you is, there is an actual auditing result as a result of calm, competent, effective auditing. Now, that's what I'm pointing out to you. See, it's on that fundamental that 3GA is built. And lacking that fundamental, you're not going to get another thing done. You could have the data memorized by the mile, be able to spit it out by the geyserful and you would not find any goals or make any Clears. Do you understand that?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

So there is something on which clearing is built: It's competent, calm, effective auditing. And that's your first requisite. And no trick will get you over that zone. So everything I tell you about 3GA is based – understood upon that fundamental.

Now, the next thing that you need in 3GA is luck! See, you want luck. Well, you don't have to have luck to succeed, but it makes it so nice! It's so nice.

Now, look: Total competence will breed luck. But it takes some luck just on its own hook, too.

Every now and then... Let's say you're running a clearing co-audit and you're lucky on fifteen pcs out of fifty. You're just lucky, you know? The person just laid the goal in your lap, you know – bang! But there it is and it rocket read, and everything was fine. You – the pc – just before you started listing dynamics on the pc, the pc was waiting for you and he's sitting there reading a magazine – this is what I mean by luck – reading a magazine. It was *Time Magazine*, which is a companion piece to *Dog's Life*. [laughter] And they just happened to be
reading this magazine and they opened it up and they were reading the obituaries (which I think is their most common commodity that they peddle in that magazine). Obituaries, see, obituaries. See, he was reading that and he comes in and offhandedly – giving the dynamics. And he says, "Well, there's God, and there's obituaries and there's so on and so on," and you assess it all out – bang, bang – and my God, it's "obituaries," and it just falls off the pin. You see? Crash! Crash! Crash! Terrific rock slam – so on.

And you start checking around hurriedly and he hadn't given you the dynamic, he'd given you an item and you're already there. And all you have to do is list a few goals against the obituaries and it's there. See? That's what I mean by luck, you know? It always takes just a little bit of that luck, you see. It didn't – and that – all luck does for you is just shorten it a little bit. That's all it's going to do. It's not going to make it. You don't have to have luck to find the goal, but it shortens it. It makes it more rapid.

And you sit down in a session and your pc has done an old goals list. And he's found this old goals list and he drags it into the session and he gives it to you. And he says, "Look," he says, "there's three goals on there, I just happened to see..." Before you go into the arduous listing of about a hundred goals the pc has, "There's these three goals, and I wrote this about a year and a half ago. And I just happened to find it there and I thought – and it's a very funny thing, but the first three goals on that are all overts against that dynamic, ha-ha!" And you look at it and it's the first one on that list. It rocket reads three times, you clean it up, you have it checked out and that was the pc's goal. You get what I mean?

It's all in the direction of time shortening now. It's not in the direction of total consequence, because you're going to find the pc's goal. Don't worry about that. That's why I'd like to see you find several goals on pcs, because you suddenly start getting insufferably cocky about the whole thing. And listen, you can be as insufferably cocky as you please. I'm not going to put any bulletin out about being insufferably cocky. [laughs]

So you see what I mean by the element of luck. It's there. It's there. You find the goal at the beginning of the list instead of at the end. You see? The pc opens his mouth and you say, "What is the – what person or thing have you detested in this lifetime?" something like that.

The pc says, "Uncle Joe."

And you say, "Yeah, all right, give me another one."

"No! Ha! Don't have to give you another one. Uncle Joe! That's the one!"

You're looking at the meter. Man, that's the one! It's slamming itself off its pins! You say, "Uncle Joe," and it renews its activity. You don't get any list – you never get a chance to. You got your detested person.

And you say, "Well, who or what did Uncle Joe represent to you?" see, which is a proper question there.

And the pc says, "Spirits – always talking about spirits." And you're looking at the meter and it's rock slamming. At this moment we're twelve minutes deep into the body of session. [laugher]
And you say, "Spirits, huh? Well, what else did he represent?" and so forth.

"Well, mostly spirits!" Bang, there it is, you see?

You say, "Well, that's good. That's good. Now, what do spirits represent to you?"

And the pc says, "Undertakers! An undertaker. Undertaker. Yeah, it's an undertaker. Yeah, it represents an undertaker. That's a spirit to me."

Ha-ha! There it is! [laughter] Fifteen minutes deep into the body of the session you got the item. You see?

And you say to him carefully, "Well, what goal" – you don't want to stretch your luck at this point. [laughter] You say, "What goal would it be impossible to achieve if you were an undertaker?"

And the pc thinks for a minute and he thinks for a minute, and you see a couple of small rocket reads, you see? Pc is thinking hard about it and thinking hard about it and finally says, "To live. Yeah." Rocket reads! Crash! Crash! Check it out, that's the goal! Twenty-two and a half minutes deep… [laughter]

All right. Well, you could be dodging around, you see, against fifty hours, for the – exactly the same result. See? Now, the element of luck has a shortening time value.

Now, the next pc after this pc, you're going to do slower than you would have done if you hadn't had all of this luck, because you say to the pc – this next pc – you say, "Who or what have you detested?" And the pc gives you a 425-name list and the item of detestation isn't on it. The list is not complete. There's not a single slam on it anyplace.

Well, the thing to do in the face of this much luck brings us to our next step, which is certainty. Now, we're not dealing in a "You might find the goal and you might not find the goal," see? That is not what you're dealing with at this time. You're dealing with "How easy is it going to be, how hard is it going to be, to find this pc's goal?" That's the quotient you're stacked up against. It isn't "Am I going to find it or am I not going to find it?" No, you're going to find it. And you go by the rules of the game that we've got right this minute, and you'll find that goal. It's a question of how long it's going to take.

Now, the length of time it takes is to some degree influenced by your certainty that the goal will eventually be found. You follow this?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Because when you become uncertain, you will start doing things that are unusual and extraordinary and which may very well lead you into some backwash that is going to take you hours and hours to get out of.

You say, "Well, I don't know if I'm doing the procedure that will find the goal or not." If that thought is occurring to you – "I don't know if I'm going to find this pc's goal or not" – if you're in that frame of mind, you're going to make mistakes. So it's up to you and you will perhaps acquire this somewhere up the line – particularly if I mention it to you – you'll get to a point, after you've done a few successful assessments, you'll realize it isn't whether or not
you're going to find the goal, it's a question of how hard it is going to be to find the goal. That is the measure or the yardstick by which you measure pcs.

When you achieve that, you will be in a very good situation as an auditor, because it will reinforce the first requisites – the calm, competent aspect of the auditor. And it will also tend to breed luck.

It's as a highwayman looks very, very dangerous to the degree that he has a tremendous reputation. I imagine some poor little old highwayman has gotten out on the – alongside the track and the mail coach has come along, and this highwayman has stepped out into the road and tried to flag the coach down and said something or other: "I'm Timmy Simpson! Stand and deliver!" You know? And the coach goes by and not only does it go by, but it throws mud all over him. It's a disheartening sort of thing. That's the difference between Dick Turpin. He's sitting there on a big, black horse and he hasn't even got a pistol in his hand and the coach comes up the slope to the top of the grade and sees him sitting there and the coach stops, and they stand and deliver. They even volunteer to carry it a distance for him this time. That's sort of the difference of reputation, competence – that sort of thing. That's the difference it makes. It's a big difference.

Now I'm not trying to give you an aspect of Fagin teaching his boys, but the aspect of "Well, it's just inevitable. You – there you're going to give me the dope and you're going to give me the withhold and you're going to give me this, and there it all is and that's it. Bing! Dm-dm! Inevitable, you're going to do this." And that certainty, actually, can take a pc and the pc's… That doesn't ever enter his head that he's going to withhold anything from you and a tremendous amount of the battle is won, see?

Now that's different. You box around with this pc, and you say, "What is this fall? Yes, well. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?"

"Yeah, well, I ate breakfast." And you say, "Thank you. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding.?" (I've been hearing this lately said different ways. I'm just throwing that in gratuitously.)

And the meter goes clank, and he says, "Well, I… tsk! tsk! Nothing!"

"Very well. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, you done anything you are withholding? It still reacts."

"Well, I don't know what it could be."

See, this is not a climate of auditing in which you're liable to get too much done. You see? As your competence goes up, your luck increases. See? And as your luck increases, why, the whole thing adds up to greater certainty. You finally get insufferable! And that's just fine, fine.

I've heard a person or two say, recently, "Well, whatever else I can do, I can audit. By God, I can audit." You know? They know that. I heard myself saying it one day. Yep. And they can, too.
Now, there is a stage, of course, before they've been trained when they believed that, too! [laughs] There's a small valley about the depth of the Grand Canyon between that state and the next state of competence.

Now, certainty. You're going to find the pc's goal. That's going to be done because that'll keep you at it until you do it. That's what's important. It'll keep you at it. And if you haven't got any real belief that you're going to find the goal, you're liable to be kind of weak and staggerish about it.

Now, I'll admit that at the end of about thirty or forty hours of slog on some pc who gets alternate dirty needles, and that sort of thing, and that is kind of hard to read and is stacking up lots of withholds and it slams on you like mad, you start getting a little laggardly about these things, you know, and you don't really pitch it in too hard. You have a tendency to slow down a little bit. And the more you slow down, why, the less certainty is entered into the session, the less certainty you've got and the less likely you are to finish your job off. You must always finish the job off. You owe it to your own morale to finish the job off. That is the whole thing.

So it took seventy-five hours to find Aunt Mabel's goal. Kick her in the head afterwards if you must, but spend the seventy-five hours. You got the idea? Don't go stacking up a bunch of people whose goal you didn't find, you understand? That's almost fatal along the line.

Now, let's get into the technology itself.

This is fairly well settled now. I'll just go over this very rapidly. On a Dynamic Assessment you ought to have your 850 goals audited on the pc just to have a good backlog supply of goals. It should be. You can violate that. Your pc should be prepchecked and be very auditable. Sometimes you will violate that.

But for sure, you enter into your next steps, they go something on this order. And this is current and this routine is susceptible to being changed. And if I find any shorter shortcuts, you're sure going to get them. But it runs something like this:

It's "Who or what have you detested?" Now, it's usually not necessary to add "in this lifetime," but you can if you wish. And you finally get yourself a list and if you've got a very, very close eye to the meter, you'll see that some of them slammed. You'll see that some of these names slammed. Sometimes it comes the first one on the list. After you've been totally spoiled and realized that every time you ask this -- any person who he detests, that you get the item the first time -- because it's in the majority of the cases you do -- you then run into the pc that the item is 436 down the list. That makes a citizen out of you again and there you are.

But you get this detested person and this slams. And you take this slamming detested person and you find "What part of existence" -- this is paraphrasing; it's almost any phrasing of this -- "does that person represent to you?" You don't say, "What is -- what part of existence does this person consider the dynamics to be?" or "What dynamics does this person consider to be?" I've made that error two or three times and it never works. It's always, "What part of existence."
So you say, "What part of existence does this person represent to you?" and the person will give you, usually, a dynamic list. And this list is going to have some slams on it probably, of one kind or another. And you're going to get a long list there. And you may not get a slam that you run out on that particular one, you see – that's possibly not slamming.

Your first list of detested people only had a few slams on it. You had no dwindling slam or anything like that. It just slammed once in a while, you know. And you got this list of dynamics. And it just slammed once in a while. And it isn't necessary that you have any dwindling slam yet because you haven't entered that zone or area.

Now, you assess that on "cons..." – and all of these assessments are carried on with "Consider committing overts against" or some such phrase. "Think of doing bad things to." There's a lot of these things. Those are not optimum. Someday we'll get a better phrasing for that, because the pc thinks you're telling him to do something and he always tries to do it and sometimes gets all gummed up on it. We don't know a better one though than – at this particular time, than "Consider committing overts against." That is the assessment question.

So we find this thing. And then, having found this slamming item on this list, we then know we have or think we have, the dynamic. And now having the pc's dynamic, we want "Who or what would this represent to you?" See, this dynamic, see? Well, let's say the dynamic was families. See? Well, "What do families represent to you?" See, now you're going to get yourself a slamming. Now is the first for sure dwindling slam you're going to get. If you're right, you're going to get a dwindling slam.

Now, what do we mean by a dwindling slam? You take the item, the dynamic in this case. You take the dynamic, you get it so it reads. Now the rule is, if you're going to list anything, you get it to read first. If you're going to list from anything, you get it to read first. I can tell you a lot about how to get things to read. But you get this thing reading. And most – a lot of your lack of success is, is you have this thing so suppressed or so unsuppressed or something that it won't read. And you don't – you find the item on Tuesday – I mean, the dynamic on Tuesday and it's families and it slams like crazy. And you pick it up on Wednesday to continue your session and it doesn't even tick. So you tiger drill it a couple of minutes to see if it – and you finally get it so it gets a little tiny dirty needle. And now you go ahead and you list from this thing. You're going to lay an egg, man!

You want a slam in that thing. You want that item slamming, just as before, before you go on listing from it. You understand me?

Now, when you list that item down on, "What does that item represent to you?" the pc – you're going to get a dwindling slam. And that's going to start wide and item by item it is going to diminish.

Now, a sporadic slam is different than a dwindling slam. These things are enormously different. A dwindling slam diminishes item by item. Written thing by written thing, you get a dwindling slam. It's less and less and less and less and finally a dirty needle, and it isn't even a dirty needle and gone.

Now, when we say dwindling, it may start two inches wide and then it'll be an inch-and-three-quarters wide and then a few items later you're watching this thing and it will be an
inch-and-a-half wide and then it'll be an inch wide, and then it'll be a half-an-inch wide and then it'll be a quarter-of-an-inch wide, and it's just a little dirty needle, and then it's disappearing and then you complete the list. You bleed the meter. You ask the pc, "Are there any more?" and if you see a reaction here you write it down, you see. And you got that thing complete.

Now, that is a dwindling slam. That is different than a sporadic slam. A sporadic slam is you write down, you know, "What does families represent to you?" See? And Oooooo! It goes bang, bang, bang, bang! And you write the next item down and there's no reaction. You write the next item down, there's no reaction. You write the next item down, there's no reaction. And then you write down an item and you get a big bang, bang! big slam so forth. And then you write down another item and there's no reaction. And bang, bang, bang! Another slam, you see? And when you finally finish the thing up it – you aren't getting any slams anymore. But if you cleaned up the original thing from which it proceeded, you would get the slam back again. You understand?

In other words, this slam has not been listed out. This slam is occasionally turned on. And there's where an auditor is fooled more than anything else. And it's most heartbreaking to sit there and watch something that you're absolutely sure would list. And the darn thing... There's a slam about every third or fourth item and then you list eight items in a row. They all slam – same width, not diminishing. And then you list seven more after that and there's no slam on those. And then you list an item and it slams, you see? Nah, that's not a dwindling slam. You understand?

But this nice interesting phenomena – the dwindling slam – will occur.

Now, when you finally got the item, what do you do with the item? You want to know, "What goal might you have that'd be an overt against" – and let's say it's diapers. That's a good one for families, and so on. So it's diapers. And what would be an overt against diapers and, man, there's your dwindling slam again. If you're right, and that is the right item, it'll be your dwindling slam.

Of course you've assessed this item list, of course, with: "Consider committing overts against..." Just like you did any – the dynamic list, just like you did the person list, you see? Everything that is an – looks like a dynamic or an item or detested person or a thing, you see, that is always assessed with "Consider committing overts against..." You're assessing with slam for slam. Therefore it's Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam and you turn this thing on that way.

Now, when you list those goals out, you list a dwindling slam. And it'll dwindle down, just as I've described to you, to a dirty needle and drift out.

That doesn't mean the goal is on that list. That's just proved the fact that it's the item. And that dwindling slam is the proof of the pudding. The main thing that you're going to do wrong is you're going to ride this horse to death. See? You're going to get this long list and you're going to assess this thing and it's – there's nothing slamming anywhere on the list, you know? It's "Consider committing overts against..." and you got your rudiments in and there's nothing slamming and it's all dirty needle – everything's got a little dirty needle, little instant
dirty needle – and you finally pick out this little instant dirty needle thing and now that – yet you say that must be the item, and…

See, you've read all the way through this 329 list and you assessed it all and, oh man, you've worked like mad. Now, the horse drops dead, see? About the time you've been through it once and nothing has slammed on the whole list, that horse is dead, man! And yet you'll continue to ride the horse. You'll go over it again. You saw me do it about two or three times on TV on the research sessions, remember? Those were just research sessions, see – no reason why you should do it.

All right. Now, what's going to happen here? This horse falls dead and then you get off and you take your canteen, and you fill up a sponge and you wash out the horse's mouth, and you groom him, and so forth, and you polish all of his harness, you know? And you sleek him up, you comb his mane, you know?

What are you doing? You had no business around there. Get yourself another horse. Grooming dead horses: You're going to often find yourself doing that. Because you're so hopeful. You say, "Well, at any minute now a slam's going to turn on, see, and we're going to go through this 389 list, and it's only taken us five sessions to do it," because it takes so long to get the rudiments in and all you get out of it is dirty needles and all that sort of thing, and you're just nowhere, see?

Well, I'll tell you. Although I may do this myself once in a while – I tell you, I know when to get off that horse now. I unload before the horse drops dead. I know he isn't going any further and I drop into the sand and go find my – start whistling for another horse because I know he isn't going anywhere. He's got "Kansas City" or "Wichita" on his nose.

Now, you've got a tremendous list but this is why dynamic slams are – why you have trouble with them: they haven't got the item on them. Your rudiments could be desperately out in the session – which isn't very probable, not at the auditing skill level you're in – or the item isn't on the list. So actually the answer is, the item wasn't on the list. That's it. The item isn't on the list! If you can just get that through your 'ead! Of course, you – probably everyone of you have to learn as hard as I did. I've just done assessment after assessment after assessment after assessment on and on and so forth. And carry each one through to its final, total completion of finding out not one stayed in. There I am, sitting there. Or one is giving a little tiny slam of some kind, but won't list. See? The item wasn't on the list, that's all. And I found that to be true every time.

Now, I'll tell you how I do it these days. I go over the list once and if I get a slam, I stop right there and we go on about our business.

I advise you to go over the list twice because sometimes if a pc is somewhat out of session, the item will skip around. One will slam and another one will slam then it'll settle down on something.

I was reviewing a pc, a few – couple, three weeks ago, that'd already been done and had gotten the wrong item on the pc. Wrong item. But there was one item on the list that was slamming. So I just read down the list, came to the slamming item – I would like to tell you that I finished up the list, but in actual fact I didn't. This item was slamming, man! Boom,
bow! See? Like dropping a hot shell into a powder magazine, you know? Boow! See? All the rest of it dead calm, you know? And here's this one. Bow! And I just stopped right there. I said, "Well, that's that."

The reason I stopped there is because the pc cognited two-and-three-quarters yards worth. You'll learn that the pc's interest follows the slam and the pc's cognitions follow the right items. Pc's sitting there, you know, holding the cans, you know – sitting there doing nothing, sitting there. Pc is sitting there and you saying, "Hogwash and dillywumps and buffaloes," and whatever the item. And the pc sits there, you know – hogwash and so forth. And all of a sudden you hit "crackerjack," see? And you say, "Crackerjack."

And the pc – "You know I had an uncle once who was in the Cracker Jack business. Manufactured Cracker Jack. I used to eat so much of those, used to always make me very sick. Cracker Jack always used to always make me very sick, and it's a very interesting thing that that ties in with the Supreme Being very well. Now, I have – have two or two or three instances here where the Supreme Being is tied in with Cracker Jack. There are several instances on record where Cracker Jack has been very, very interesting. That reminds me of a goal I had once, too." [laughter]

You read down the list, you see, and there's the pc, you know. All of a sudden, you know? What the hell? What are you going on any further for? The meter slams, the pc slams, everything slams! See, the pc's interest suddenly – bzzzzzzz!

Ah, go down to the bottom of the list and go down again. And you'll find your – you'll eventually find out that you're right. And you'll get very great confidence. You'll find that item slams every time you go by it.

You should know the item far earlier than the pc ever dreams of it. You should know that the item is on the list first pass through. And if you're insufferably cocky, you'll just pick it off the first pass through.

You'll be going on down the line and read on down to the end but you already know it's "Cracker Jack," and you just lay the whole thing aside, and say, "All right. Well now, Cracker Jack. That slams very nicely. All right. Now we're going to take this now. Thanks."

And pc is saying, "And my Uncle Joe once had a Cracker Jack factory and so forth."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much. Now we're going to take this piece of paper here and we're going to write on down the line here. Now, who or what represents Cracker Jack to you?" you know? We don't care what exact question we ask him, as long as we get "represents" in it "to you," and we get it stretched out there and we've got our next list. Or we've got our goals list.

Now, that's the way it's done.

The goal is ordinarily – occurs on List 6. And it occurs one, two, three or four on List 6, which I think is fabulous. "If you were a Cracker Jack, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?" If you're lucky, it'll be in the first three or four of List 6. If it isn't, your luck was out that day and you better follow the next plan of action, which is to tiger drill the posi-
tive-negative buttons versus Cracker Jack. "Your goal – would your goal suppress Cracker Jack?" "Would your goal invalidate Cracker Jack?" You just take the thirteen buttons. "Would your goal be careful of Cracker Jack?" Also you add a few buttons of your own selection. You say, "Cracker Jack, that's very interesting. All right, we'll put in 'devour' on our button list, and 'spit out' and 'buy,' and we'll put 'give away,' and then of course we'll have 'ignore,' " You get the idea? Just add them to your buttons list. You make up your own. That's what I've been doing lately, is making up my own Prehav assessment for the thing.

And it's quite interesting. So you say – you take the item – this item's well proved – and you say, "Would your goal," positive-negative, see, "Would your goal suppress Cracker Jack? Would your goal not suppress Cracker Jack? Would your goal invalidate Cracker Jack? Would your goal not invalidate Cracker Jack?" And all of a sudden you're going to be looking at a great big rock slam. You've got it. There it is.

Now, you have the pc list goals which would not invalidate Cracker Jack. And he'll give you four or five, and if your luck is in, it's on that list, maybe the first one or two. Got it?

Seems to do something to his mind. Got that as a method of finding goals? I've talked to you a long time about this, using the Prehav Scale to find goals. Well, I've been doing it lately, and it's been very successful. Looks good. Looks good.

Now, there's another shortcut. You can't find yourself the dynamic. All you can find is something that goes flitter, and thub, and dirty needle and disappears. And you can't find anything. You can do this horrible shortcut but I don't advise it or advertise it. But this horrible shortcut is just skip the detested person, skip the dynamic, skip the item and you just list straight out, flat out – you say, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" You make a great, big, long list. Get the pc well grooved in.

Make thirty or forty, fifty items on this list, and then throw it away. That gets him well grooved in, and you ask him, right sequitur to that, "What isn't part of existence?" and you go on down the line and his item will be on it, because the characteristic of all of these items is that they aren't part of existence. The pc has too many overts on them, so naturally, they're totally unreal, so therefore they aren't part of existence. You got the idea?

Now, you take that, and you do the same button trick on it, and so forth. Let's say and then you'll find out – this is how you got Cracker Jack. It wasn't part of existence and there it is slamming. All you do is consider overts against that "What is not part of existence?" list. Do you understand?

Supposing you wind up with a dynamic and you can't find the item? Well, the dynamic was probably the item. So you – after you can't prove it out, you abandon the whole thing and list goals against the dynamic. You got the idea? What – you list goals against what you've got. You didn't get a dwindling slam of goals, nothing. But you notice finally – here's the last desperate trick. This is the end trick and the most desperate and the last appeal (and if you got this far, I'd be ashamed of you), but you just find something that the pc slams against. You happen to notice in prowling around that the pc, every time you say "cheesecake" slams like mad. Every goal that has "cheesecake" in it slams like mad. Everything that has "cheesecake" in it slams like mad. So you just take "cheesecake" and list goals against it.
That's desperation with a capital D. Semidesperation is "What isn't part of existence?" You see that?

All right, that's your existing technology today; that's about the way it goes. If you're a very clever auditor, if you're very well trained, if you're lucky, if you audit with certainty and you follow the standards of the procedure I've just given you, you wind up with the pc's goal every time. And you can't avoid it. You understand?

Therefore, goals finding is actually pretty easy today. But I will say, after doing a lot of it myself, that it requires these elements. There's got to be some luck connected with it; you got to be able to think on your feet and keep your eyes open. There's no substitute for it. Think on your feet and keep your eyes open. You suddenly realize that this pc is not completing any lists. You never get any item on any list that you can have anything to do with, but you do have an item – you got to know when to throw in the sponge and do a semifinal action. Don't you see? You got to know when to quit on these things. You got to know when to take advantage of these things. In other words, you got to do some inspection and thinking for yourself within the broad framework of exactly how it's done. There then is no substitute on top of it – and I'll give you the last qualification, which is a clever auditor. And then you just find goals by the bucketloads. Okay?

_Male voice:_ Yes.

It's tremendously therapeutic to find a detested person on a pc. It's therapeutic to find a dynamic on a pc. Therapeutic to find the item on the pc. Therapeutic to find the goal on the pc. And the last comment I will make is the pc will throw you for a loss every time by telling you how good he feels and how wonderful he feels or how bad he feels, how much he hurts.

I've been telling pcs lately, "Thank you very much, I'm very glad of that. Now, that's very nice. I'm very happy. To hell with it. Now, let's get on with the session." I don't care how they feel. We're not doing these things to make the pc feel good, because we have this enormous gain coming straight up that's greater than anything any man on Earth has ever experienced, before us.

So the pc doesn't have headaches anymore. Well, that's dandy. Is he flying yet? No. Well, let's get on with the assessment.

Okay? All right.

Thank you very much. Good night.
Thank you.

This is what?

*Audience: 27th of September AD 12.*

[huge part missing]

Now, the subject of tonight's lecture has to do with something you haven't been paying very much attention to and on which there's very little technology and which I've even got notes for; it's the first time I think in history. I sometimes come in with notes but I seldom use them. In this particular case I asked Suzie to give me some data from an earlier lecture so that we could compound these lectures and put them all together. And this lecture is all about listing. And you never heard about listing before, obviously.

You've heard about listing for 3D Criss Cross and the list must be complete. And you've heard about listing this and listing that. Well, just so nobody misses it, see, when a goal is found, see, when a goal is found you then have a number of lines, called "lines." And item by item, you ask the question of these lines, you see. You ask the question of the lines of the pc and he gives you the answer and that is written down. And that is called line listing. And when you have finished all the lines completely, there is a free needle on all of the lines and you have a Clear. Unless you list the goal, you don't have one.

Now, I just wanted to put this in as data in case anybody had missed it. Listing is not Prepchecking. It's different. Listing is done in Model Session. Listing is done with very good auditing. And anybody who believes that it could be done with slap-happy, Q-and-A auditing sort of thing has got another think coming. And it is a very smooth operation.

Now, in view of the fact that it is not studded with stellar actions and... such as, "Well, I found the dynamic, I found the goal, I found the item!" Some people don't think it is important. But it is listing that makes the Clear.

Now, the things that are listed are items. And today we are listing forty lines. Forty lines – forty. You have sometimes seen marquees on carnivals and so forth: Forty girls – forty. But these are forty lines – forty. And these are all listed. And these lines each contain items which are terminals.

Now, lists are not done by significances. This is an important point because somebody, sooner or later, is going to mess up a line and fix it up so that it can only be answered
with a significance. I'll give you an example. Here's a goal: you say, "To be good enough," as the goal, and then say, "For what?" See? That gives you a significance. Well, the line must always be answered – or written in such a way that it can be answered with an item.

Now, there are several reasons for this. You want to know why people can't go Clear just by finding goals. Well, that's because you can reach infinite distances in the world of thought and therefore reach amongst all of these massy, massive, electronic, supercharged masses called items, which exist in spaces, and which are all jammed up on the time track to time zero, called the GPM. And the GPM is only slightly composed of thought. The GPM is composed of masses. And the masses make up the difficulties that the pc is having. Now, please remember that. Please, please remember it.

It is so easy to face thought, that in all fields of philosophy they thought that thought was enough. And it aren't, you know. Read the philosophers if you want to know how far they thought thought could think.

No, the GPM is made up of masses. And it is masses that keep the pc from going Clear. Not thoughts. In other words, you could audit forever – forever, spelled: **f-o-r-e-v-e-r** (underscored with an exclamation point afterwards) – in the field of thought without producing a Clear.

And the reason we've made it and others haven't is based on this one point – this one point: that we have discovered that the bank and the reactive mind contains masses. Whether those are expressed as pictures, as in engrams, as circuits, as machines or anything else, they are masses and they exist in space. And the confrontation of those masses is what makes deaberration. And you could thought and think and thunk and figure and figure and think and thunk and thought for generations, for eons, and for the next two hundred trillion years without making a Clear. Now, do I make myself very positive on this?

**Audience:** Yes.

Because you're liable to slip on this, you see? The reason this is liable to slip is thought is so easy for a thetan to confront. He's nothing, thoughts are nothing – duplicate perfect. See that? Perfect duplication. See? So he most easily goes to think and he avoids the masses. And you're going to hear, as the years roll on, people leaping up here and leaping up there and expostulating the fact that somebody could go Clear with "thinks" – because it's so painful going Clear on masses. They're so hard to confront, so people are going to take the easy road out and try to go by thinks. You understand?

So we have to make that clear on listing – that listing consists of getting items, getting the pc to confront items and name them. Now, that is what listing consists of. And you don't, as an auditor in listing, don't have to stress this point. All of the mechanical data is already there. You just go through the action of listing and all the rest of this takes place. But that pc is confronting masses! It's terribly important. See?

Now, the mind, according to every philosopher on the track from here back to none, is composed of thought. See? They all believed it was composed of thought. It was full of think. And nobody ever asked, "What the hell is all this think stuck in? How come he can't un-think?"
And you know, I pondered this one question for years and years and years and years and years before I finally came down to the answer of it. You address masses. And you will never think a person through to anyplace. Interesting, isn't it? You confront him through.

Now, all of the material that underlies clearing, it's tremendously extensive. There have been tremendous quantities of it deleted as unnecessary and it comes down to this simple operation known as listing. And the operation looks so simple that it can slip. It is near perfect now; it is very near this. And it contains a complexity of combinations which are staggering once you begin to look them over.

The GPM is composed of masses. And these masses are composited identities. It's actually masses of identities.

I'll show you what happens. The thetan sails through life, he's wearing a body the whole way, he's being hit by trucks and hitting trucks and beating his wife and being spat in the face of, you know? She's been hanging new dresses on herself and corseting herself so that you can put a circle of your fingers around her waist. There's all kinds of impacts, compression, suppression, so forth. And all the time, this thetan is emanating energy and absorbing energy and emanating and absorbing, and energy is being emanated at him or her and things are absorbing his or her energy and here they are, you see? And when they finally take the body and put it in the six-foot box, or in the tree or in the sand dune or other customs, or send it back to be melted down for the new doll-body factory; when they finally finish up with this, they don't bury with it the masses. That's very interesting. But those masses are not buried. The thetan tucks the old tin cans sadly under his arm and goes clanking away, dragging every chain of that lifetime.

And not having any way to get rid of them and not knowing what to do with them and being low on havingness anyhow, he sort of tucks them all together and wads them up, you know? He takes a whole lifetime and makes it look like a Kleenex and stuffs it someplace because it may someday be of use. And also because he's never known what the devil to do with it. He tries to shove it into bodies and it doesn't stick. He says it belongs to bodies and wears it on himself. This thing is pretty fabulous when you come to think about it. What the devil is he going to do with his accumulated bric-a-brac? A lifetime looks like a picnic-ground Monday. With no place to put any of the debris. So he's sort of liable to pack it over into the corner and wad it down. When you finally get all through he's got a GPM that's a honey. Because he's done this hundreds of lives, thousands of lives, millions of lives, and every one of them had its residue.

Well, there it is. There's the stuff. There's the junk. Not only that, but this material has the oddity of appearing in his vicinity as a whole beingness, as a machine, as a circuit, as a thinkingness. All kinds of weird things occurs. He sees himself yesterday and he says, "Ooooh! There's somebody." Yes, there was somebody. And this is very, very often compounded. But sometimes he does see somebody, don't you see? He sees you or he sees somebody, or he sees another thetan and he wonders whether or not it isn't a valence or an item, or whether you aren't part of his bank. And you know there are people walking around right now that think everything else and everybody else they see is just part of their own reactivity.
In the story "Fear" (not calling off any of my own bibliography), the stunt of walking
down the street and being absolutely sure that the whole street is knocked down and di-
smantled as soon as one is out of sight of it, you see, and making sure that the people who are talk-
ing together don't just stand there like dummies after one has gone by and never move there-
after, you see – this feeling that the whole world is an emanation of self could be a result of
one of these packed-up banks. He can't any longer tell the difference between an identity in
the bank or an actual being or anything like this. It gets to be pretty mixed up. He finally gets
so he doesn't know them and he doesn't know himself and he doesn't want to know. He doesn't
know how it got that way and he doesn't know what to do with it.

So he invents psychology, which proves to people that you've got to be crazy to be
clever. "Be Glad You're Neurotic" – have you ever read that great textbook? Well, that actu-
ally is the type of textbook that a thetan writes when he's just given up, man. He says, "There
must be some use for it." He's been saying that for trillennia, you see? So finally he knows the
use for it; you write a book about it and say, "Be glad you're neurotic." It's a valuable posses-
sion.

Well, you'd think processing some pcs that you were trying to take away their head
when you take away an item sometime. They'd be very sad about it and they'd be very upset
and they'd be very this and very that. The item you're trying to get is a crazy man that has
made this person unsuccessful his whole lifetime, hasn't even been a game, he didn't even
know he had it. See? This thing is pretty wild.

Now, it's listing that gets rid of all these items and that accumulation. The fantastic
thing has occurred of finding out how it is that the masses came into being in the first place.
And that's really pretty fantastic to plumb that particular secret. But that is the secret of any
being. That is his secret. How did the masses materialize in the first place?

They materialized through an alter-isness of his basic purpose. And if he never altered
his basic purpose and never lost and never had any conflict with life because of his basic pur-
pose and was always able to carry it out, theoretically he would have gathered no mass. Theo-
retically. It was never opposed, he never opposed anything with it, don't you see? Theoreti-
cally it'd never happen. So it's an alter-is of this one idée fixe, the basic purpose of the being.

Now, he just – one day he was floating out amongst the clouds and he was awful
bored and he didn't have anything to do, and by God, he thought something up.

He says, "Well..."

See, he doesn't care – he's gone beyond caring now, see?

And he says, "Well – no games. I think I had better have a basic purpose. I really
should have a purpose in life. What would be a good purpose in life?"

There's no reason for him to have it at all, you see?

He says, "To catch catfish. That will be it. That's a good, laudable purpose. Catfish are
evil beings and I'm going to catch catfish. And that's going to be my purpose in life."

So he gets a job as a street sweeper, walking around with a dustbin, spearing paper.
There aren't any catfish. Well, he's in trouble now, you see? He's got to go through all the mo-
tions of materializing catfish so he can catch catfish. And then he's got to have some opposition to him doing this. And then he's got to have this and he's got to have that. And the laws of games set in at once. And he starts individuating out of existence, having made this basic purpose.

Now, he little envisioned any vast consequences of this, or that he would forget his basic purpose, or it'd be so lost as to be unexecutable. Or to face the fact that the one thing he did with strain was his basic purpose. He could do anything else well. But this one was tough to do. He had to do it and it was very hard to do. It practically wore him out, but he never much paid any attention to that. But the reason he was accumulating everything and had unsuccessful lives and didn't have a game was the reason why – the only thing is he is specialized in his game, you see? The game must only be to catch catfish. He may play no other game.

So there is his idée fixe, his total limitation of ability. And as he goes along the trillennia, this thing snowballs in terms of mass. He accumulates beingnesses. He opposes beingnesses. He gets mental image pictures of these things. He tries to oppose his own goal. He does everything you can think of. And eventually he's walking around and he doesn't know whether he's afoot or horseback, much less able to or not able to catch catfish. Finally he has – thinks he has thousands of purposes and he can't execute any of them and he is a confused boy.

Now, there is a school of thought, an interesting school of thought, that tells you that livingness is necessary. You very often hear an auditor say this. I've never come down under it or made many comments about it. But here's the truth of this school of thought of "livingness is necessary": Familiarization with something raises ability. You go out and pat an automobile for a while and you'll improve your ability to drive.

Now, that is true. Because it's an analytical, causative motion whereby the individual is actually touching and withdrawing from an automobile. And familiarization will result so long as the person is at cause. Now, that's as far as that livingness thing goes. But because it exists to that degree it has been stretched to an enormous extent. And what does it look like now? Well, if you have enough automobile wrecks you won't mind them. And you know that isn't true? It just isn't true.

Now, if you have a goal to wreck cars, you won't have much trouble in automobile wrecks, because that's your basic purpose, after all. You'll be able to wreck cars with enormous impunity. You'll be amazing. You'll be somebody like Lucky Teeter. You can go out on a fairgrounds and run cars over jumps and smash them into walls and lock them up in barns and set it on fire, and do all kinds of mad things on the subject of wrecking cars, and it looks like familiarization. But every once in a while this fellow, Lucky Teeter, will pick up some young fellow that he's going to train – and here's something very peculiar – he never seems to be able to train these young fellows. They wreck cars all right. And wherever Lucky Teeter has gone, you come in the town a short time afterwards, you will find that there's one or two young fellows in the hospital there recovering from burns, breaks and contusions.

Now, you know by experience that if you break your leg once it'll heal up pretty well. And if you break it twice you have a little harder time at it. And if you break it three times it
starts to get pretty difficult. And you break it four times you don't even bother to heal it up. In other words, you don't get used to it.

And the basic lie on the track is that you can get used to this universe. See? That is a wild game that passed off in some direction or another and it's never materialized. So a thetan keeps on going up the time track expecting at any time to get used to the universe. And he's getting less and less and less and less effective, picking up more and more psychosomatics, picking up more and more difficulties, having more and more GPM, always hoping he's going to get used to this livingness. That's one of the biggest operations that was ever pulled off on life. And it's one of the primary operations of this universe. That you can just get used to it – you're all set – if you can get used to it. If you just fall down enough wells, you'll eventually get an expert well-faller-downer.

Familiarization, oddly enough, requires an entirely different action. The pc must be at cause. And the pc must do the reaching and withdrawing. And life, if you will notice, does most of the reaching. And the person is carefully educated in this universe that he cannot have caused it. Having built it, he's now told somebody else did. Uniform lie.

You get the compositings of these lies and you get the fact that there was no possibility of a person living his way out of it. This is one of the earliest philosophies that you run into when you start to do listing. I'm not berating this universe. One isn't berating it just to say what it's about.

The individual, then, as far as the GPM – take any cycle of the GPM; operates as the whole GPM – the individual, then, is a universe. He is building up as a universe; he is collecting the mass of a universe, so on. Because he apparently follows identically the pattern of this universe. The physical universe is a ba – is basically built on a postulate which was alter-ised. That's apparently the mechanism of the sixth dynamic. That's apparently how it was built. Now, a thetan does this same thing and he builds up on this basic purpose.

Now, here's what's wonderful about this. There is only one basic purpose at a time. This is quite fabulous. There's just one at a time. Now, why that is, I don't know, see? You can find an earlier basic purpose in the individual – it governed an earlier cycle. But you won't find that earlier cycle. I've thought for a while you could reach deeper in the bank and you could do some things like that – no, you can't. You find the goal you find and you will only find one. That's qu- that's nuts, you see? You're only going to find one goal in this individual – until it is gone – and then you can find an earlier goal. Then list it out. And then you can find an earlier goal. But at no time do you find two goals! This maybe comes as a surprise to some of you, because I've never said it that emphatically. There isn't any such thing as two goals.

As you sit there as an auditor finding goals, you've paid your money and you takes your chance. There it is, man. There's only one. I don't care how long the list is, there's only one goal on it. You can console yourself with this interesting fact: that it does exist. Or the person wouldn't be here. It is here, in other words, and there's only one.

Now, that one has accumulated unto itself, by collisions with other identities and activities, many more purposes. What is the purpose of a catfish? Well, this is one of the ways – you get it by oppgoals – one of the purposes of a catfish could be "not to get caught." And an
individual who is catching catfish will eventually pick up the goal "not to be caught." And it's all tangled up in the GPM and he very often doesn't know whether it's his or somebody else's or anything else.

Other way: He goes up the track – the silly goof – and he's been catching catfish and catching catfish, but for some reason or other, Town and County Planning has eradicated all catfish, you see? They've gotten rid of them all and they passed an ordinance, you see, against them and said that this is it, see? And this is unreasonable because it isn't even in their department, you see?

But the individual is kind of wiped out about the whole thing so he gets the goal "to eradicate all governments." He decides that because, you see, he has to eradicate all governments in order to catch catfish, see. You get how this works, see. Now, in the process of eradicating all governments he finds out that he can't rouse up people to doing anything about it. He goes around and they're all reasonable, you know? They say, "Well, Town and County Planning men mean well, and they aren't all idiots the way you say, and they're perfectly reasonable, and you have to have planning."

Here's all sorts of weird and odd things, you see. So eventually he decides to hell with this, I'd better dream myself up another idea here. And he does. And he decides to increase his ability to convince people. Here's another goal: "to convince people." Now he finds out that the people are just in total overwhelm with regard to the government, and even though he convinces them, nothing happens. They just go on paying their income taxes and tearing down their homes and so forth.

And so he finally says, "To squeal with this." He says, "I'm just going to be above it all."

Now, you try to get him on an E-Meter and, of course, he yo-yos all the time. It's all right, I washed that one out last night so I can use it.

Now, you think your old goals will never be used again. You'd be surprised. They live on and on.

You see how it goes?

Now, he could have thousands of these things. He's got the oppgoals, and he's got the goals he had to have because of the goals, and then he finally finds out that catfish are sympathetic and come around and nibble at him when he's in despair, so he has a goal to be in despair. See? And it's all around. And then he doesn't know what he's trying to do after a while. Is he trying to be above it all? Or to eradicate governments? Or convince people? Or what? And somehow or other he overlooks the basic goal. He never seems to be able to get near it. It's so charged up by this time that he can't approach it. He doesn't recognize it. He doesn't know what he's trying to do.

And here is a being who is totally built, you might say, as far as the mass he's collected, on a purpose, being purposeless. And the result of his purpose is eventual purposelessness. And the reason he's purposeless and can't seem to get anything done is because he has a tremendous purpose that he doesn't know anything about, and to break your heart, didn't need in the first place.
Now, finding the goal is difficult. Sometimes it just drops in your lap. Finding the goal is difficult. And therefore, listing it by comparison appears to be less vital and so you're likely to neglect it. But this is true: Bad listing, or bad auditing during listing, can wipe out and cancel any benefit of the goal and make the pc worse! Just remember that when you're teaching HPAs and other people to list, see? Just remember that. Bad listing can wipe out all the hard work that the goal finder has done. A goal can become utterly and completely submerged and unrecognizable, completely challenged, mishmashed and the pc turned into a bundle of sensation and dizziness and no pain, and everything pushed out of line and messed up with bad listing.

How can you do this?

All right. Let me show you the basic mechanism. When you're checking out this goal, it isn't a goal unless it has pain on it. You all know that. All right. Their sen comes and goes. Sen is not opposition. I will tell you what sen is: Sen is the product of the three buttons: Suppress, Careful of and Failed to reveal. Now, I'll tell you some other time about Big Tiger, but you can just rack it up for now that you've got, in an ordinary Tiger Drill, you've got – this is an ordinary Tiger Drill – you've got over on the left side – if you can envision it here.

You've got three buttons here; you've got Suppress, you've got Careful of and you've got Failed to reveal. They're the guard of the left. And here we have: Invalidate, Suggest and Mistake. And they're the guard of the right. Got these three now? Group your Tiger Drill this way.

These buttons, Suppress, Careful of and Fail to review [reveal] produce sen, and these buttons produce pain. That ought to make Tiger Drilling awful easy for you. Not Big Tiger, but ordinary Tiger. See? Awful easy. There they are.

It doesn't much matter the order in which these buttons are hit in this particular drilling. But remember this: The goal fires falsely on the buttons on the right, Invalidation, Suggest and Mistake. They make the goal fire falsely. See? This goal I just gave you, "to be above all," it fires falsely if there's any fire in it at all, you see? You know, ticks and things – not rocket reads – but ticks and so on. It makes it look like it's the goal, you see? Because of these three buttons: Invalidate, Suggest, Mistake.

All right. Sen – sensation, motion, misemotion, so forth – these things are caused by Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal.

And when the goal doesn't fire it's in the left-hand column: Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal.

And when the goal falsely fires it's over here in the right-hand column: Invalidate, Suggest and Mistake. You got that? That's very neat, isn't it? All right. Well, call that just ordinary Tiger Drill. You see the goal fires, pick a right-hand button; goal doesn't fire, pick a left-hand button. Got it?

Sensation is totally not the product of opposition, although opposition will also give you sensation. You should ask yourself, "Why does opposition give you sensation?" It's because you're suppressing it and it's suppressing you. Actually, suppression gives you sensa-
tion. Being careful of gives sensation. Fail to reveal gives a sensation. See, it's a pull-in. Got it?

Now, these buttons can get tangled up with the right-hand buttons so that sometimes you get the goal firing and you find out it was a Suppress that was firing. But boy, that's all tangled up. And if you analyzed it very carefully you'd find out it was an invalidation which had been suppressed, you see? It's intertwined, it's a mess in other words. And you get it straightened out, but this is your order of action.

Now, you got this guy, he's got his goal – there's got to be pain, see, while you're listing that goal. There must be pain. There's also going to be some sensation and so forth. But while you're listing that goal, if you got the pc to suppressing you, the auditor, or if you the auditor got to suppressing the pc, his right goal will turn into a total sen. It is his goal and he'll get nothing but sensation on all lines. In other words, he's suppressing the auditing; he's being careful of the auditing; he's failing to reveal things. Don't you see? And the net result of that is it'll look just like a wrong goal.

And one of the primary tests of whether or not it's the right goal is whether on listing it produces pain. And if a goal only produces sensation, on listing, your first conclusion perhaps would be to call it a wrong goal. Ah, but supposing you have Joe Jinx who almost got through the Comm Course. He failed; he couldn't remember where the door was. And you got this fellow listing and you hear his auditor's report, see? You get his auditor's report.

And he says, "Well, I don't know, the pc, every time I ask these questions, 'Who or what would want to catch catfish?' and so forth, the pc just goes dizzy, or cries."

You finally say, "You knucklehead, what the hell's happened around here?"

Maybe you were the goal finder, see? "Did I miss? Could it be? Know that thing rocket read. Tiger drilled for hours and prepchecked and so on. It read and produced pain at that time."

Right then you'd start to think, "Well, look-a-here, I – this guy's doing something wrong!" And you'd find out, yeah, he's doing something wrong.

This is the way he was auditing the goal: "Now, who or what would-uh – would-uh-uh-uh-who or what would want to try cat – uh-no, that's wrong. Uh-who-uh-huh-uh ... What cat-. No, that's the wrong line. Who or what would try to catch catfish? Yes. What's the answer?" [laughter] Or he reads the auditing question, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

And the pc says, "A fisherman."

And the auditor says, "No, you had that, you had that a couple of lists back. You had that a couple of lists back. Can't have that one, you have to think of another one. You have to think of another one. That's no good."

Or supposing it went like this: The pc says, "Well, a fisherman."

"Well, why would a fisherman want to catch catfish? You sure that's the right answer? Now, what's the date of that?"
"The date of what?"

"Well, the date of that."

Or the pc says, "I'm sorry, I've lost the auditing question."

"Well, you must have a missed withhold then." And the first thing you know it's all over on the left-hand column. You got it?

Now, if you weren't the goal finder and you weren't sure it was the right goal to begin with, ah-ha! You're going to invalidate your fellow auditor and you're going to say somebody found a lousy goal. And you could just beat your brains out now because you try to do a Dynamic Assessment when it's already been done. And you can't find any dynamic and you can't find any item and you can't find nothing. You make yourself a lot of work and then you decide to prepcheck the goal. And accidentally the auditing gets prepchecked and all of a sudden the goal has pain on it again. Do you see that?

It isn't opposition that makes the sensation then. It's the suppression of the opposition and the suppressiveness of the opposition that causes the Sensation. See? Therefore, listing becomes very important.

Now, there are various tests for whether a goal is the right goal or the wrong goal. And with Tiger Drill these days and expert auditing and getting the goal to fire at the beginning of every session you're not going to get this type of submergence. That was another step taken. There's very little chance of a wrong goal being run. Very little chance of it. Because in the first place a goal when found ought to be checked by another auditor. I don't care who found it, including me; it ought to always be checked.

You always look it over, because in the first place, it might be one of these in-and-out affairs. You may not be aware of the fact that some goals have been tiger drilled, Big Tiger, for twelve hours and then faded. But they weren't rocket reading and they didn't look like a goal. They were very out most of the time, but they still produce sensation, they still produce pain on the pc for that period of time.

Some mornings you get up and you just should have stayed in bed, you see? You chose that goal to go into. The pc feels wonderful. So what! You didn't find the goal, you see? That's how long they'll hang on sometimes. But remember, those goals aren't rocket reading worth a nickel.

A real goal goes in and out and it rocket reads and doesn't read and it ticks and it ticks sporadically, and then it won't read at all, and then it gives you three beautiful rocket reads, and then the pc says, "Well, I'm in, that's it!" And having asserted this, of course, you get three ticks.

Or he says, "I-I just ... Well, I-I guess I'd better not have to put my attention on this anymore. They've just found it and if I just kind of withdraw over here and not pay any attention to the auditor, it'll stay in." Pcs do the darnedest things. And then you get – after these three nice, beautiful rocket reads – you get three complete no-read-at-all. All kinds of wild things occur on goals, but that is not necessarily the subject of this.
Let's say the goal has been tested, the goal has been checked out and there you have the goal. Now you've turned it over to somebody who lists or you're listing it yourself. Now, at the beginning of every session, which is done in Model Session, you want that goal tiger drilled until it fires.

Now, how fire is a fire?

Well, you'll find a goal which has been listed halfway out has about a half a rocket read left on it. And then they start going sporadic on their reads. They start going prior and latent and they start doing other queer things. They do all kinds of oddball things.

These, by the way, can usually be straightened out. You can usually resurrect a goal no matter how long it is – if you want to spend that much time on it – to make it absolutely read, a perfect instant read, every time. Now, how long it'll stay that way – the pc coughs and it doesn't read like that now, do you see? So you want that thing to fire every time.

Now, you see, that's a good provision. Because if it's the wrong goal and is made to fire every time, and if you prohibit listing unless the goal fires – you got that rule, see? Goal no fire; no list. See? Why, the worst that's going to happen to a pc is he's going to get three or four or five listing sessions and there'll be no goal. And nobody can make it read and nobody can do anything to it and nobody can resurrect it and – Big Tiger and everything else – nothing can pull it back to life again. There's no pain on it. There's no sensation on it. There's just nothing. It's gone. You see what would happen even if you had a wrong goal? See, that's a wonderful safety factor there, no matter how good you are as an auditor or how good the fellow who's doing the listing or the goals finding and so forth, you can always miss, see? So that's a good safeguard to have in there.

Completely aside from this, listing is not effective unless the goal is firing. You won't get listing done unless you get the goal firing. That's why old listing took so long. Did you know it took upwards to two hundred hours? Did you know it took that long? And that was done without getting the goal to fire. It was done on too few lines. And it was done this way and it was done that way. It still produced some Clears.

These characters are always very, very happy now to get sixteen or twenty-four lines at least. They say, "Well, that's funny, I mean, you know I kept rolly-coastering. I'd get up in the morning, I'd put myself on an E-Meter and I'd read 2.75; then after I'd had a cup of coffee I'd read 3.1; then by noon it would be settled down with a total free needle; by five o'clock in the afternoon it'd be reading 2.5." It worries them.

Well, why are they worried? Why do they put themselves on E-Meters and do other odd things like this?

They got pieces of GPM still kicking them, see? Their needle was free in the session, then a couple of days later a piece of the GPM from the same channel keyed in on them. Do you get what happened to them?

When that's all listed clear on enough lines, that doesn't happen. You see, you got a high degree of stability. And if the goal is made to fire at the beginning of every session – just at the beginning, right after the beginning rudiments – that goal was made to fire, and made to
fire so that you say, "To catch catfish – pang! – To catch catfish – pang! – To catch catfish-pang! That's fine. Let's get on."

     How much of a rocket read must that have?

     Boy, I pity you, I pity you – the questions that are going to be asked you and you and you by people doing listing on the subject of how fire is a fire? Because as the goal begins to pass away and the force and power of it deteriorates, you're going to get decided differences in what a fire looks like and what is a fire. Eventually the goal is going "Tsk, tsk, tsk." And eventually the goal is going "Tsk..." [laughter] You're going to have more people coming to you saying, "Gaaaaaaaaa!"

     Of course you look for the other signs: Pc still getting pain on listing, lines are going fine, pc's looking good, everything's going along like a hot shell. And there we are. Say, "Go on, go on, list, list, list."

     "Yeah, I know, but I can't get it to fire."

     "Well, get the pc to fire instead. Go on, get a listing."

     This is what – this is what you face. This is my subtle revenge on this matter for all of the questions you've asked me. [laughs]

     All right. Now, if a listing session is a wrong session, you're going to get certain manifestations occurring in that session which are very easily distinguishable, and so forth. But the subject of what I'm telling you right now is, is smooth auditing. (Take that up in the second lecture, see, the exact lineups.) But the trouble that you're going to have, is – been because of the various preventions. Really not with wrong goals. The trouble you're going to have is with lousy listing, see. Because that's unspectacular.

     Listing is quite exciting. You find lots of items. And all of a sudden you find an item and, "Oh, woof, what's that? Wow, whoa. Wow!" the pc says.

     You say, "What's – what happened?"


     In other words, there's a lot of excitement to be had in listing. And there's the other thing that you want to train people to do about listing: Is the randomity produced by the pc is usual, ordinary, standard; the convulsions, the foam at the mouth, these things are not anything to worry the seasoned auditor. What he is supposed to do is ask the next listing line. That is what he is supposed to do. And when people come running to you and their face looks so white that a paper company would pay a fortune – they'd – that is – they, he says, "Huh-heh-huh-a-heh..." Pc ...

     You go back and you find out what's happened. Nothing. The pc just got off items one and two. They were counter-opposed, they both stuck together, and all of a sudden the whole back of his head blew off and his body coordination went kind of baaaah for a minute, and he's sitting in the chair going like this, getting over the shock. Now without an auditor. [laughter] What you're supposed to do is ask him the next auditing command.
And if you can train a listing auditor to be able to confront pcs and ask for the next auditing command, and write it down and not fumble paper and drop the sheets all over the floor, and a few things like that, your listing sessions will go off like a bomb, the goal stays in, the pain all stays on, you don't – you need a minimum number of Prepchecks and the guy goes Clear – swish. That's very much to everyone's interests. It's a minimal number of auditing hours.

Now, the worse a listing sessions are, the longer it takes to list a goal to free needle. And the monitoring thing is not the state of the pc's bank but the smoothness of the auditing of the listing auditor. That is almost the total determination factor on how long it takes a pc to go Clear after the goal is found. One pc doesn't have more items than another pc. That is almost neglectable. You don't have to do anything about that. They all come out about even.

But one pc's list will get longer and longer and longer and longer and lo– what's he doing? Well, he's actually not blowing anything, so he keeps putting the same items back on the list, hoping they will blow, you see. He isn't in-session. The rudiments are out. Other things are wrong. So therefore, it appears that he has a much longer list.

The length of time it takes to go Clear is determined by the skill, quietness and ability of the auditor doing the listing.

And by and large, so far I've found that the goals found at Saint Hill, that those goals which were found to have been – gone out, apparently, or weren't the goal – that was of last year, you see – goals were found and run on other Routine 3s. They were the goal, but they'd just been very badly listed. And the pc was total sen and hadn't gotten any better and everything ...

A person takes his life in his hands leaving here without his goal listed, let me tell you that. I'll just put that across the pan. You think you save time by going home. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Not so.

So anyway – just holding that horrible thought up to you – it's the quality of the listing auditor. So my point of this lecture is simply this: is listing may not be spectacular. You might say anybody can do listing. But just remember this: Anybody who can do listing must also be a very excellent auditor. He's got to be smooth. He doesn't have to be clever, he doesn't have to be spectacular, but he's got to be smooth, he's got to be able to keep the pc in-session and he's got to be able to do his job without chopping the pc up. In other words, he's got to be pretty good.

What you try to keep from happening in a listing session is randomness, questioning, Q and A, auditor taking up items, all of this nonsense. The best listing session is an almost totally muzzled session. No comments, no two-way comm, nothing. That's the best listing session. It's just a bare-bones session.

Okay?

Thank you.
A lecture given on 27 September 1962

All right. This is lecture two, September what? Twenty-six?

_Audience:_ 27.

Twenty-seventh. You got a day ahead of me. Holy Cats! Here I've been in Wednesday all the time, and you're in Thursday. September, 27, AD 12. And this is lecture number two, and it continues on the subject of listing.

The rules of listing. The rules of listing consist of good Model Session, simple auditing, minimum two-way comm, rapid writing, rapid writing, minimal paper-shuffling, get the goal to fire before you list. Goal no fire: no list. And in addition to all that, be alert for free needles on lines, and when some line has gone free needle, you drop the number of items to be listed on it.

You still include it in the lineup, to make sure that it doesn't, till you're absolutely convinced that it's going to stay that way, and then you can drop it out. But that's adventurous. You just minimize the number of items. You are listing right now – probably this number will change, this number I'm about to give you will alter – forty lines is the current number of lines being listed on a goal, and those are all listed to free needle. And the number of items you write on a line is four, and you include it in the auditing command.

You say, "Give me four items for the line, 'Who or what would want to catch catfish?'" And you take your four items. And if the pc forgets the auditing command, you can repeat it for him. But you omit the "give me four items." You can say, "The line was... 'Who or what would want to catch catfish?'" is the way you repeat it, okay?

Now, that's total standardization. You don't want five, you don't want three. Now, after a line has gone free – and this is subject to amendment on experience – after a line has gone free, you want just _one_. If it's sitting there with a free needle, it's been sitting there with a free needle, you can cut down the number of items listed. And you say, "Give me _an_ item!"

And you get one item for it. That at least keeps the balance. Otherwise that thing is liable to jam out, don't you see? "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

Now, this permits you to catch up old lines, because some lines have been listed a lot longer than others. Don't you see? Because somebody has been listed on four lines or sixteen lines, and therefore, those lines would wind up as being overlisted. They're liable to go Clear, or free needle, before the other lines. There's a possibility of this happening. So this four and one proposition permits those things to catch up.

Now, however many lines are listed is not very important, and exactly how you handle items after a needle has gone free does not invalidate the data I'm giving you. That's susceptible to amendment. But the facts are these. That you don't want to overlist a free needle. That
is one of the rules. Don't overlist a free needle. This person is very, very free, and you overlist it, and you're going to run into the possibility of jamming it all up again. Because the pc is having to create answers, and you have entered in on an area called Creative Processing. And it's not permitted these days.

You see how that would happen? All right. Now, a pc looks like he's dreaming up the lines, and thinking them up, and creating them – actually not. They're dealt to him like a stack of cards. He's just dealing out the GPM. He's not inventing anything until he gets to a free needle. And then to have an item he'll have to dream up an item, unless he repeats an item. So you mustn't overlist free needle lines.

Now, the next thing is, is what is a free needle? Well, a free needle is best described as a free needle. Somebody – this is also – you're going to have a happy time with this; more power to you. I can see you now, standing there, somewhat overwrought, having to answer off the bat three people in a co-audit, all of whom are asking you, "But what is a free needle look like?" And they show you proudly a stage four needle, you see.

They say – the other one-another one is saying, "Is a free needle a quarter of an inch wide, or a half an inch wide?", see. "Is it a free needle at sensitivity 16 or sensitivity l?" "Is it a..."

And the answer to that is the same answer I'm going to give you. When you see one, you will know one. I've never had anybody fail to look at a free needle that didn't recognize it as a free needle. It suddenly has become unattached to anything. The needle apparently is not connected to the meter or the pc or anything. It's just sitting there floating. And it has an odd, floating characteristic, that has nothing to do with falling or rising. It floats up the dial and it floats down the dial. The pc will be somewhere in the vicinity of Clear read, depending on the accuracy of your meter.

Do you know that after you've carefully set up a meter, during the process of a session, the discharge of batteries, the warmth of it, the heating of the cans, a number of other things, can change the position of the Clear read? Did you know that? So the way you handle a test, for whether somebody is sitting at Clear, is not to take the meter which you tuned up this morning, and test the pc with it this afternoon. You got that? You have to set it up instantly before the test, and the meter has to be warm. Okay?

If there's any doubt about it at all, have an electrician get you five thousand ohms, and twelve thousand five hundred ohms, and put them on a couple of clips. They're resistors. And get a pair of resistors. You hook those between the cans, and it's very simple. You get two resistors and just – they've got little clips on the end of them, you just hook one end to one can and one end to the other can, keep the cans apart, and your meter should come exactly to the Clear read female and the Clear read male. Okay? Should come right on. In other words, you could know your meter sat someplace else. Don't you see?

But actually, the resistors can be changed inside this by the trim knob. That's why the Mark IV and later designs will be found to be built with a variable resistance inside the meter. Meters can be changed, meters can be dropped. You can suddenly start using a new type of
battery or something of the sort in a meter, and have some other situation set in, don't you see? Something can happen to your meter so that it is no longer accurate.

But as far as exactly reading on the Clear read, you should know that five thousand ohms and twelve thousand five hundred ohms is standardized only on fifteen people. That's the original standardization. And that wasn't a very good standardization, don't you see? It was accurate, it was accurate, and it has held amazingly accurate. But what is amazing about it, is that it has held accurate. Do you see that? What's amazing about it, is that they do go to five thousand ohms for a female and twelve thousand five hundred ohms for a male. I mean, that's rather fantastic when you come to think about it.

How come? You'd think all thetans were built on the same battery circuits, you know. Actually, it's just the residual resistance of the body itself, and it's not so amazing, because a body is built against certain potentials and actions-electrical potentials. And a body does not depend for its electrical potentials upon the mass of the body.

You're going to get this little four-foot-eight little girl midget, see. Here's this four-foot-eight little girl, she's a very petite package. And here's this girl who has been one of the chorus, she's six-foot-four, see. And the little four-foot-eight girl, why, she weighs upwards to seventy-nine pounds wringing wet, you see. And here is this beautiful chorus-line girl, and she's six-foot-four, you see, and built like an Amazon, see. And she weighs something on the order of two hundred and ten pounds, you see. But because these are girls, they're both five thousand ohms. Gets me, you know. In other words, this is inserted amongst the same set of anchor points, you might say. It's this – this – anchor points are the similarity, not the mass of the body. All right. That's beside the point.

How accurate this is, to some slight degree, remains to be seen, see. How dead-on this is remains to be seen. I have to give you that word of warning because I tell you what the calibration was based on, see. Based on only fifteen people. All right. And on an American 1957 meter. Something to know, isn't it?

And I tuned up its resistances afterwards, and I said that's what they are. And the electronics boy, Scientologist, there working in the organization went down immediately and... You know, it some – it's something like carrying the measurement on a piece of string. You've done it yourself. You've taken a piece of string at one end of the garden, you know, and carried it over to the other end of the garden to find out if you could get the chair through the gate, or something, you know. You've done things like this. Well, that's – that's about the accuracy of it, see. He took the piece of string, you know, down to the electronics workbench and measured it. Actually carried the meter down, and measured its ohmage.

Now, that was the score on these things. Now, the basic datum on which this is taken is interesting. It's the United States Army meter resistance, or electrical resistance of a dead body. And they claim it is ten thousand ohms approximately, with great differences. They never noticed, see. They averaged this amongst men and women corpses. Get the idea? That's the only other known datum on this.

Now, if you want to go down to a mortuary sometime with a volt meter, why, more power to you. And if you do, for heaven's sakes send me the data. They got some stiffs down here and so forth. There are three white men, a Mexican, a Negro and a Chinese, you know?
And their ohmage is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. Good. I'd be very happy to have the data. You see, the data's quite scarce. Very scarce.

Now, just with that word of warning, put your reliance on the free needle.

Now, you're going to get somewhere near, on your meter, the "M" for males, and the "F" for females. But as long as it's in that range, don't quibble about it too much. But let me tell you, that if men are reading at 2.0 with a free needle, and women are reading at 3.0 with a free needle, I don't know what's reading with the free needle, but it's not the pc. See, if it's within a tenth, within a quarter, something like that, of male or female read, fine, see. That's fine. Don't argue with that too much, see. But a whole division, or a swap-around that way, no, I – that's too far out.

Now, as far as somebody reading with a free needle at 5 – nup, nup, nup. Ain't never happened, ain't never gonna happen. When they get up to 5, man, there is something wrong! When somebody's reading at 4.5 and 5 constantly, and never comes down from 4.5 and 5, all tone arm motion is somewhere in the vicinity of 5, like 4.75 to 5.25, see – you've got something wrong. That we have learned. That is just experiential, that is absolutely, completely, empirical data. Just by observation.

Somebody's listing, and they never move off 5, and one session they're at 5.25, and the next session they're at 4.75, and next session they're at 5, and they just – 5 and 4.5 and 5.5 and 5, and ... Well, you better look into that, man, because that's one of the warning signs. That's one of the warning signs. That's wrong goal, wrong auditor, you know.

Now, these things are important to you, because they are the criteria by which you're making a Clear. It isn't whether or not the pc can spring over the back fence with one leap, see. Or whether he can now do a hundred and seventy-five handstands, whereby yesterday he could only do one, and collapse, you see. That has nothing to do with it. That is spectacular, but it's not data. Clear is registered on a meter. Not on a pc. Because, boy, can you be fooled.

Somebody can go into some tearing manic, you know. Man! They've never been able to lift pianos before, and they got one in each hand, you know? [laughter] There they are! And you say, "Well! Fine! He's Clear!" Yeah, he's Clear, till that valence called Hercules suddenly slips into another part of the bank, you see. That was always the trouble with it, anyhow. It was never there when it was needed, long enough.

No, it's not the conduct of the pc that makes a Clear, see, never. Now, the only use – the only thing you use the pc for is to find out if the pc is looking worse. Now, how much worse is worse? Well, I could again see you standing in that lecture room with eighteen students standing around you, saying, "Well, the pc looks worse." And they all think, how much worse is worse, see. "How much worse is worse? Is worse worse than worse, or is worse worse than worse?" Well, worse is how the pc looks when they're being audited on wrong goals or by the wrong auditor. That's – that's what worse is. That's how the pc looks.

Frankly, it is basically a question of how old they look. There's another factor which is interesting. It's a glowingness of the skin. When a person is going wrong way to in goals finding or Prepchecking, and it's all getting very weird and rough and mean, or they're being audited on a wrong goal, their skin goes dull, very dull, extremely dull. So much so, that I can
usually tell at a glance just about where somebody is in processing and how well the processing is going.

Because it's the youthness of the skin. And after they've been audited properly, you'll find that they glow. The skin has a glow to it. Has nothing – anything to do with color, it's just that the skin glows. And the skin doesn't glow, they are not making good progress. Skin does glow, why, they're making good progress. Skin was glowing yesterday, isn't glowing today, well, they're having a bad day.

Skin was glowing on Monday, but on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, you in observing them, decide that they're looking older, and look less glowy, and less glowy, there is something wrong. You understand? They'll get less glowy for a period, like a day, or two sessions, or something like that, and more glowy. But consistent unglowiness, we don't tolerate. Got it? It's – you might call it the firefly effect.

But you'd be amazed. Now, the funny part of it is, is their physiological structure changes in clearing, and they look older, and they look worse, and they – their bones go worse. Body mass and – can be measured on scales. But these other things aren't as measurable as that. Their body mass will ordinarily lessen on proper auditing on the right goal. It'll streamline down. And it will increase, definitely, on the wrong goal. And will not decrease on bad auditing. Not decrease on bad auditing.

Won't necessarily increase on bad auditing, but it could. But not necessarily. On a wrong goal, it increases fantastically! Zoom! You're liable to have him put on two, three stone-twenty-eight, forty-two pounds, to Americans. I didn't get this "stone" stuff myself until a short time ago. They didn't have any weights over here, they had to use stones. That's ... [laughs]

Anyway, weight goes up on wrong goal and doesn't decrease on wrong auditing. That's just a casual mark, not of any vast importance. Might be of some interest to you. This glow principle is very important. People run on wrong goals unglow fast. The tides of night sweep across the psyche.

Now, physiological facial structure can alter, too. I've seen jaws, jawbones decrease in size, increase in size, faces fill out, so on. Quite a common thing is for the face to start sinking under the wrong goal or bad auditing. The face gets sinking – it starts sinking in. Gets flatter. And starts to fill out on good auditing and the right goal. The shape comes forward.

All of these are various manifestations. And you'll get a little experienced on this, keeping your weather eye peeled. And one fine day, why, you get to the point where you can just – actually just look at a case and know whether it's running right or not, you know. Bang! Just like that.

You say, "Well, that isn't so good."

You would ask the auditor, "Which lines is the pc ARC broke on?"

And the auditor would say, "How did you know?" you know.

You'd say to the pc, "Well, are you very dizzy today?"
"Oh, how did you know?"

The room is going round and round and round, you see. Wrong, suppressive auditing. Other things, see?

Now, if the goal is found but the pc is running wrong in listing, you have these items that could be in error. It could be one of these: One, the goal could be wrong. You never really trust a goal till it's been listed a bit. Yeah, all the other signs are fine, and the wrong goal won't keep on firing, and a lot of other things, but just for your own peace of mind, why, the goal is found and proven when it's been checked out by a – found by the – an auditor, checked out by another auditor, and listed a bit. How much is a bit? I can see you now, in the lecture room... [laughter] Why should I dream up figures for these things, you see. They depend basically on observation and judgment. Trying to communicate them to you with a bunch of invented facts would, I'm afraid, serve no purpose at all.

Now, these are quite correct, these, these six things. Goal could be wrong; (2) lines could be wrong; (3) auditor has not cleared goal by "in auditing, on the goal..." Tiger Drill and gotten goal reading, see. Didn't get the goal firing – number three; (4) rudiments are out. I think you possibly have heard of rudiments being out in sessions. That includes, of course, missed withholds. Bulletin May the 3rd, 1962; (5) pc protesting about listing a line or listing lines – listing and lines. Pc's saying, "Whra-whra-whra-ne-wra-I don't need these lists-ah-tha-wrah-tha-nah." Something wrong; and (6) the consequences of being cleared. And that you haven't paid enough attention to.

That's a very, very interesting one, however. Pcs have been known not to put their goals on a list, because they were so frightened of becoming cleared. What happens to you when you become cleared? Oooh, you turn into solid glass, of course, and then put on display in the Metropolitan Museum. They know what happens to you if you get Clear. They – of all of the aberrated balderdash and nonsense you ever want to listen to.

Well, get somebody who has been – who has got "Nothing" confused with having been imprisoned. You know, they got a complete identification. Remember people get identifications. You've heard of A=A=A=A. Well, it's never more present than in the vicinity of the goal – never more present.

And they get some wild identification of some kind or another and they want to be cleared, but when you come right down to asking them for their goal, you'll have a person here or there who will suddenly – you can hear the squeal of the brakes, you know? You can see the furrows in the roadway as the heels dig in. And they'll have various interesting things go wrong. Odd part of it is, this is not the thetan operating, see. They got a valence, and it's having a ball! And of course the keynote of any valence is survival. That is the common denominator of valences. And things that valences do to perpetuate themselves is fantastic! And one of the things that they do, is resist clearing.

You see all the time the pc was living that life he was trying to live, wasn't he? He was trying to survive. Well, this valence is just the leftover shell of that life, which go on – goes on operating in the bank like a thinking being. Well, there it is, and its basic motivation is to survive. And all of a sudden the person gets the idea that something's going to happen to va-
lences. You know? But as a valence, gets the idea that something is going to happen to valences, you got that?

This is very funny. As a thetan, the person is all the time cooperating with you to get Clear, see. But every once in a while in an auditing session, or something like that, particularly somebody who has a goal that is in the direction of good auditing, or something like that – a person with a goal, "to be a good auditor" – you know, let's say that was the basic purpose of the person, which it wouldn't be, you see – we get a "to be a good auditor" and then you get him shifted, and they're in a valence of a pc. And they aren't themselves as a pc, ever, you get the idea? Something weird like this going on. And they set up the awfulest commotion about sometimes about going Clear. And they stand back, and look at themselves and "Look at this silly mess I'm making. Now, what it is?"

You know, if you ever believe it, you almost crack the person up as a thetan. If you really pay any real attention to this. You know, besides clearing it up. If you should say, "Well, he doesn't want to get Clear," and so on, man! You'll see this as we go along the track here on Earth, you'll see this.

There's somebody bra – he's throwing brickbrats – bats, you know, and he's drawing cartoons of us, and he's raising hell with us, and so forth, and he's screaming in an awful fit. And if you really want to break his heart just tell him, "Well, we're not going to clear you." Maybe the very subject of the cartoons is "Getting Clear – that's terrible! They're making supermen! They're doing Germans' stuff! And we're going to be invaded again, by men from Mars!" and any kind of idiocy, see.

And you just say to the fellow, "Well, we're not going to clear you." He'll really go to pieces. This is the most fantastic thing you ever wanted to see. And if you Q-and-A with this, and if you get a pc actually in there saying, "Oh, no, no, no! I-no, no-tha-da-listing lines is terrible!" and so on. Just finding trouble, see. The auditor's wrong and the lines are wrong and the goal is wrong and everything is wrong and you're wrong and the room is wrong and everything is wrong and you can't audit and so forth, and what did they teach you at Saint Hill anyhow, you know. On and on and on and on and on and on and on and so forth. This could be one of the things.

Well, you don't condemn the person, you simply audit it. Because if at any moment during all those protests, you were to say, "Well, all right, then I won't," you should see their face sag. And a person will come right out of a session doing that who hasn't found his goal yet, or something, and write down lists for you and give them to you and force them off on you and everything else, you know. This is the most fantastic phenomena that you ever wanted to witness, when you really see this in high bloom. And you never suspect it because the person is quite often quite cooperative while they've got their heels set. Covert. Only their cooperation will be quite real. But they've still got their heels set.

There's various ways of doing this. The simplest one of course is "What would be the consequences of my clearing you?" Remember it must be "... my clearing you" or "... our clearing you." It is never "What's the consequences of going Clear?" That is a wrong auditing command. It's generally tied up with the person's valence, which is opposed to some valence that you are. Let's say you're a male auditor and it's a female pc and she hates men. And the
consequences are not that of going Clear, but of being cleared by a man. She knows what that means. And this is basically what is at the bottom of it, see.

Going Clear gets associated in people's minds with being killed and exteriorizing from a dead body, which of course it isn't. See, being Cl– going Clear gets reactively associated with the idea of ceasing to exist. They very often will give you some of the silliest answers. Some of the answers you hear coming off of this, the person listening to them himself or herself doesn't believe them either. They just sound utterly balderdash. And it's a valence proposition is what you're looking at.

Well, if the pc is stuck that thoroughly in that valence, that valence is oddly enough not going to list out. It'll be the valence the pc doesn't see or the valence the pc sees last is the valence the pc is in most. Now, I call to your attention the old Reality Scale, and some of all of that data. See, it's the last one they see, is the one they're in the most, see.

My God, it'll kick up an awful fuss. And you're having trouble, trouble, trouble. Well, there's various reasons pcs can get ARC breaks in goals finding. We're not touching on those now. Although this consequences of being cleared does enter into goals finding. But it certainly enters into listing. And it enters into listing more than it does goals finding. Person might have sat there like a little wooden soldier and let you find their goal. And you start listing it, and this is another story. Because you're asking for valences, and the valences restimulate, and all of a sudden everything is blowing up and going to blooey, see. Yow!

"Oh, you mean to say, me as a soldier is going to get killed. Me as a mother is going to get killed. Me as a ..." see, "... is going to get killed. I am being wiped out. I am being slaughtered," so forth.

Well, I don't know. It's exteriorizing them from a valence. They also restimulate, of course, death. And getting rid of a valence may restimulate the idea of exteriorization from a body. You see these various things, how they cross up. But they're just reactive and they have no basis in fact and they're nothing to slow you down. And if you don't clean it up, you of course have got somebody who is ashamed of being so ARC breaky. And you just hung the person with shame-shame, so therefore they suppress this, and the next moment you've got sen, sen, sen, in all directions if you let them stack it up, stack it up, stack it up. Okay?

Now, the – as I say the auditing command "What is – what would be the consequences of my clearing you?" "What would be the consequences of our clearing you?" whichever seems to fit the bill. And you run that. And how flat do you run it? Well, I can see you now, standing in that lecture hall ... Anyhow, let's go on.

Actually you never do patch - I'll give you a rule for that. You never do patch-up jobs longer than is necessary to get done what you were trying to do in the first place. Now, if you'd just had that when you were coming up the track – I hate to be critical – but if you'd just thrown that second goal away, you see, at the time that it ceased to be of any use to you. You'd – that is to say, in effecting the first goal – see, you're trying to effect the first goal so you get a second goal. And if you use this second goal longer than is necessary to get the first goal effected, why, then you've got your start of the bank. And auditing can actually approximate that little goofball situation there.
So, don't ever do anything longer than is necessary to get done what you are trying to do. You'll save more auditing time that way. That's a nice, crude rule of thumb, but it's awfully good. You're running O/W, and you're still getting needle ticks and actions when on the question, but the person's needle is now smooth. And you keep on running O/W. Well, you're being a knucklehead, of course.

Similarly, any such thing as, "What would be the consequences of getting Clear?" you'd run that long enough to get items on the list smoothly and without trouble. Because of course it's just coming from a valence anyhow. And this process is not going to get rid of any valences. Trying to change the mind of a machine, a valence or a circuit is – underscore this – impossible. You cannot change the mind of a valence or a machine or a circuit. It's not possible.

You can submerge it, you can suppress it, you can wreck it, by making it inactive. You know, hit it – you can hit the steam engine hard enough on the valves and controls, and so forth, so it apparently won't run, but you can't change it into a petrol engine. You know, say, "Run like a petrol engine," and keep stoking up the boiler. Won't work. You can't change the mind of a valence.

That by the way goes back to the first lecture I was telling you, why thought, see. Well actually, the thought is encased in mass. And you can pull some of it out, and you can alter it in the mass, but in aggregate, the mass exists on and on and on and will continue to encase thought. You can't take the thought out of the mass, but you can take the mass off the thought at which moment the thought evaporates. I've lectured on that before. Quite interesting phenomena.

Yet you can list these consequences of being cleared out, providing the consequences of being cleared aren't causing suppression in the session. So you see you can deintensify a mind, but you cannot change a mind. So all you're doing with this is deintensifying the objections. Got that? When I'm saying "a mind" you realize I refer to the mind of a valence or the mind of a circuit. These are little minds that guys have stuck around their own mind, the mind majeur, and I was referring to the mind mineur.

All right. Somebody sooner or later though, is going to take that out of context and say, "Well, Ron says you can't change anybody's mind."

Now, that's an easy one, and you wouldn't have any real trouble with getting this. Providing you do it. The reason I'm giving you so much talk on this, is it keeps getting lost.

Because the truth is that the pc actually wants to be Clear, would do anything to get Clear. That these objections are so much of a lie and are so aberrated and the pc knows they are aberrated that you very often ignore them. By tacit and common consent. So this is one of the things you must do in listing. Let's find out – if we're having a hard time finding a goal and certainly if we're having a hard time listing – find out what are the consequences of "our clearing you" or "my clearing you." What are the consequences of it?

See, the goal-finding auditor actually was just finding something. But the listing auditor is clearing somebody. See, he couldn't do it if he didn't find the goal, and the goal is the
important part of it. But the clearing will not take place unless the listing is done, don't you see?

So the consequences of being Clear are very, very important to the listing auditor. You'll see that a tremendous number of cases go right down sometimes to the last two days before all lines go free. And they just go to pieces, man! Oh! They're up all night, and they come in, there's circles under their eyes, that go clear down to their chin.

"What's the matter?"

"Oh, well, heh-heh. Heh-heh, heh-heh-heh-heh. Why don't we just knock all this off now?"

And if you've run very bad sessions you don't have the pc at all, you have a telegram from Edinburgh – they're still heading north.

It'll just be some valence that's very, very reactive and the pc just going through a total dramatization on this silly valence. And it'll deintensify, and the pc will come back rather shamefacedly of themselves, and you start to list them again, the valence goes into full cry, and they try to dive out the window, see. This is the wildest thing you ever heard of.

It is the entity fighting for survival, is what this is. And why does it fight for survival? Because it wants anything? No, it's not even sentient. It is a reflective area which mirrors a lifetime in which the pc fought for survival as that thing. So therefore, a restimulation of it restimulates a fight for survival. That's the wildest thing you ever had anything to do with, is battling around with some stupid entity this way.

The pc: just as mild as milk and everything is fine on Monday. And on Tuesday: "Ny-ah-lyah-yah-wrah-rah-rah-rah ... !"

You say, "What's gone wrong?" Well, you can take the explosion out of it by pulling the missed withholds and getting the pc in-session, and that sort of thing. And you can also realize that once you've cleared the consequences of clearing, sometime down along the line of listing you may have to clear it again. Got that?

It isn't an action which you only undertake once. You may have to undertake it two, three times. Remember, as you list this person you're shifting this person into different parts of the bank. And you finally get this person into the part of the bank named "Space Opera, doll-body bin number 8647."

Now, at that particular section of the bank, life was tough. Life was hard. One was either the galactic police or one was this pirate commander or one was the rebel or one was the tough spaceman's crew or one was ... And everybody was practically unkillable, except that the weapons were very painful, and life is hard.

And you – this pc's been going along just fine. And you run into this where survival is spelled with a capital "S," you see, and all of a sudden the pc's: "No! No! They don't know! They don't know about being Clear!"

They made a mistake. They think they better go back to Australia or something. Anyway. And there it is! You're confronted suddenly with this, and you don't usually go back and try to reason it out or say why. You'd think maybe you'd go back and – but you might out of
curiosity and interest look at the last items the pc listed. Here's another little rule in listing or in finding goals, or in listing goals: The pc tends to dramatize the last goal or item put down.

Pc comes in in the morning and says, "Oh, my God. I just all night long lay there smelling fish." Look on their list. The last item they wrote in the session the day before was "fishmonger." "A disgusted fishmonger" is what they put, see. All night long, fish! That's odd, but the last item – it isn't the next item up that they haven't told you yet, it's the last item down. They'll tend to dramatize the last goal.

I'll tell – give you an instance of that. I told Reg this one time. And he – somebody who had just been put to listing goals as a therapeutic measure which of course is quite therapeutic – this person, in listing goals, had been listing them away, and all of a sudden "Yow-yow-yow-yow-yow-yow!" and was on the phone and was terrified and everything else, and Reg remembered this little rule.

So, he made her write a few more goals. Got the last goal – sure enough, she was dramatizing the last goal she had written down, see. She hadn't actually stopped writing goals, because it was that goal, it just was the last goal on the list. So then she started dramatizing that goal. I don't know what the goal was, maybe it was "to be terrified." But you can count on that.

And it's very funny. You'll go along on a day's auditing, you take a break – take a break sometime – and the person has written down "a sad Chinaman." And during the break, you look at the pc – [laughter] it's quite wonderful.

You – the mechanisms of the mind are gorgeous indeed. You say, "Well, all right. The fellow regurgitated it. He's already got rid of it. That is the reason why, it is now out there," so on. Well, that must not be the case. In other words, he doesn't get rid of it all the way. Apparently items nudge, and goals nudge, the last one out, see.

You get some weird theories on this. It doesn't matter whether you have a theory on it or not. The fact is, you got to get items listed. And when they're listed down, why, they're down. And very ordinarily the ones higher on the scale are out. But the one you just put down isn't. And sometimes in a listing session, your pc will be looking at you suddenly, beadily, meanly. You say must have a missed withhold, and so forth. Don't be a knucklehead and bust up the whole session.

Actually, the less you do in a listing session, except list, why, the better off you are. Because that's auditing. So the less you do, why, the better off you're going to be. And the less trouble you're going to get into. And the reason the pc was sitting there, looking – well, why don't you look at the list which was right in front of you? You just got through looking down and you've written down "an angry mind reader." And there he is, the angry mind reader, see. Quite amazing.

Pcs apparently – not always, but sometimes – peel these things off by putting them on their own body first. I don't know, it's like you deal cards backwards, you know. Instead of – you know, you pull them on to the deck, see, not throw them off of the deck before you throw them out, see. It's like taking dealt cards that are scattered all over the place in the pc's bank,
and then they put it on themselves, and then they throw the valence over their shoulder or something.

Well, in actual fact, they don't do anything with the valence. The valence is evaporating because the alter-ising thing is the basic purpose. See, valences and units and items don't go anywhere. They vanish. They don't go back on the track, or out into space, or clutter up anything. They just vanish, because they are built of alter-is of the pc's basic purpose. You understand? You don't have to worry about them.

Now, the signs of a wrong goal or bad listing is (1) the TA is mostly at 4.5 or 5 – it never comes down; (2) pc is ARC breaky; (3) pc is looking bad – there's your "firefly factor"; (4) no pain. Doesn't matter how much sen is present, as long as there's also pain, you understand, but no pain – man, there's something wrong, see; (5) all sen – which of course contains no pain but all sen, nothing but sen, nothing but sensation. The pc has been weeping for the last four sessions. Now that's sensation, man.

I had a pc tell me just a moment ago that no sensation was coming off, and I know the pc was crying in session today. See, pcs are not reliable judges of this. The auditors have to ask. You understand? You have to ask. You have to check up on this. Don't just sit there forever. Just ask once in a while if the pc's got any pain or if the pc is dizzy or if the pc feels any emotion. Think of that once in a while when you're listing. But of course, keep it to a minimum, don't chatter on it, because it's just for your data.

"Is everything going all right?"
Pc hurts. "Fine."
"That's dandy."

Now, if it's all sen, this is really going wrong. Now, this is something that you should start worrying about. All sen – now this is wrong. There's something real wrong here. Now, you're getting suppressions and you're getting all kinds of things, and it might even go back to a wrong goal, you see. But suppress, protest, the pcs auditing under protest, pc is ARC broke, pc is suppressing the lines, pc – usually, the commonest cause of a pc going all sensation is not wrong goal. The commonest cause of it is the pc doesn't understand the listing lines. Pc no dig.

You say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and the pc doesn't understand it. You see, because you the auditor understand the line is no test at all of whether the pc understands the line.

Now, number (6) is bank beefing up. Now, that's a colloquialism. But I don't know anything to express it better. If you said, "The bank is becoming more solid and is pressurizing the pc, and this or that and the other thing; and sensation is tremendously and oppressively present, and there appears to be more bank in the morning than there was in the afternoon previous; and there's more and more bank, and there are ridges of the bank are getting rather solid," and so forth – this is what comes under the heading of "bank beefing up." See, in other words, it's just there's something being fed to this bank. It's getting solider. And it can become as solid as a board. And if you let a pc go that far, you'll half-kill him, see. It can really be gruesome.
Now, (7) what you can expect after that, is the pc is sick and nauseated.

Bank will beef up – that's not too bad – bank beefs up some more. It's getting kind of solid. It's got solid fringes on it. The pc feels like he's in some kind of an invisible iron suit or something weird is occurring here. In other words, the engrams and things are getting heavier and more solid. And he can't see them, he can feel them worse, and that sort of thing. This kind of thing happening is the result of wrong goal or bad listing. That's mostly seen when you're listing a wrong goal. It can become awful gruesome on a wrong goal. But it can also proceed from bad listing.

Pc's becoming sick and nauseated, that's pretty much wrong goal. It's seldom that listing drives them that far. But a wrong goal can drive them that far. They can start losing their cookies, man. Their weight going up, pc nauseated and dizzy and room going around and mest going out of plumb. You know, a room has eight points at the baseboard and ceiling, you see, and those will sometimes go completely askew. You know, eight points no longer make a box. They make a twisted space. The room looks like that to them. You get the idea? Well, motion goes haywire on these people. Bzzzzzz! Bum show. Rough, rough on them.

That's a wrong goal overlisted. And you should've been able to detect it before it got to there.

Now, how do you patch up a case that's gone wrong? How do you patch them up? Well, you check over and get rid of all earlier found goals than the goal the pc is listing, or all other goals than the pc was listing that were found at any time and were said to be the pc's goal. You understand? We'll take all excess goals whether they were before the goal or after the goal that is being listed. See, all excess goals on the pc.

Sometimes, several goals have been found on a pc, and then they find one of the earlier goals is it, and then everybody neglects to do anything about the last three goals found that were listed maybe. Well, clean them up. Clean up those goals. Pc says they've been cleaned up already or it appears in an auditing report, check them for a cleanup. Just a rapid Tiger Drill on them. After all, it's only four or five goals, see. There's three minutes worth of work, see. But check it up. These goals charged up in some way or another. Something going on here.

All right. Get rid of them, in other words, and you'll find out sometimes that they have oppressed the right goal. So that as the items were listed, or something, the session's becoming restimulative, ARC breaks and that sort of thing have tended to throw one of these other goals into action. And it's oppressing the right goal. And the pc is beginning to wonder if the other one wasn't his goal. You got the idea? So you get all kinds of oddball things going on. So just make sure that goals the pc has supposed – been led to suppose in processing were his goal, that those goals are out and flat.

It isn't that they'll charge up again and come back in, but just make sure that it is done. Of course, if they aren't, what you do is give them a Big Tiger Drill and get rid of them. You see, a Big Tiger Drill that you were watching last night on TV demonstration is not Prepchecking. It just adds more buttons and plus-and-minus buttons, and plays it out to get off the maximal amount of sensation and somatic in the minimal amount of time.
Then you prepcheck the goal. And the way to prepcheck a goal – this might be news to you – is give it a time duration and name the goal.

Now, "On auditing" – or "in auditing, on the goal to catch catfish ... " See. Ah well, this is all right. "In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish ... " that's pretty good for patch-up. That's good! You can get old goals firing, you can do all kinds of things with it.

But if you're going to prepcheck, and you're going to sit back there with a repetitive question and do a full-blown Prepcheck on this goal, then you'd better use time duration. Remember in your releases on Prepchecking the importance of time span. Don't worry about listing, don't worry about this, don't worry about that. Let's use a time span.

So you get an auditing command something like, "On the goal 'to catch catfish'" – and this is one month before the goal was found, as far as you can figure it was "... since January 1961 has anything been suppressed?" "On the goal 'to catch catfish' since January 1961, has anything not been suppressed?" Alternate question, back and forth, and you will work your- self out quite a deal.

Now, that seems to be a rather large mouthful. But you would be surprised how many self-audits you catch. The interest of a goal is such that it leads people to self-audit far beyond any processing ever did. They speculate, they do it, they figure, they think. After all, you're monkeying with their basic purpose, so of course it goes into a high degree of restim. And they wonder about it and they occlude it and they try to prepcheck themselves, all kinds of weird things. "I wonder if I've suppressed my goal?" Well, why don't they ask themselves the auditing question and they're off to the races.

Now, it happens to be impossible – impossible, I repeat – it happens to be impossible to self-audit a goal. Now, you can list the lines on a goal, if somebody makes them up for you and says he'll beat your head in if you don't write the answers down. As long as the thing is tiger drilled in, the person's still got an auditor, don't you see? It's an extended session. But – now watch this – you've got the opposition terminals, which are mostly sen, and you've got the terminals of the goal. And those sit in the bank, to a large degree, opposite each other. Got this? See, they're opposite each other.

We'll say, blob one faces blob two. Well, blob one is some kind of a mishmash of own terminals that also had the goal. And blob two are opposition terminals that never had the goal but always opposed it. You got that? All right. The fellow's going to prepcheck his own goal. Ha-ha! Now, he's sitting there in blob one, see, very happily.

So he says, "I think I'll prepcheck this goal. See, On the goal, to catch catfish, let's see, has anything been suppressed?" And he of course is instantly into blob two, facing blob one. And blob two has sensation on it. And it's a mess of sensation. And he can't feel any pain. And one of the first things that alarms him is the fact that he's dizzy and doesn't hurt. So he says, "It can't be my goal. It can't be my goal, because there's no pain on it. There's only sen- sensation. And I remember Ron saying this."

Well, he goes down the street a few minutes afterwards, and he slips accidentally into blob one, see, that has the goal "to track" and the pain on it. And he says, "Ouch!" And tends to avoid, now, blob one. He says, "Well, that doesn't feel too comfortable," and he kind of
tends to back out of blob one, and there's no place to go but blob two. So he backs into blob two, and he's had it.

Do you see, that self-auditing on the goal leads to these very interesting things. Now, self-listing: it'd be very unlikely that if somebody found your goal and didn't make up your lines, and didn't do this for you and didn't do that for you, and didn't tiger drill the goal, every time, that you would ever be able to list it by yourself. But given those requirements, you probably, possibly, could sit down and list the goal at somebody else's behest – see, with the auditing commands at the top of the sheets in somebody else's handwriting. You see that? Possibility of doing that.

As a matter of fact, if you were very powerful and pervasive as far as somebody else was concerned, you could actually tell them to go ahead and list the goal by themselves after you'd prepared all the sheets. And then you tiger drilled them regularly to throw them back into the right valences and lines. But even that throws them into the wrong lines, see, for the wrong questions, unless that's been very thoroughly impressed on them.

But you see there is some possibility of self-listing. But there's no possibility of self-tiger drilling, or self-prepchecking. Won't work. I make my point? You go flippity-flop.

I'm sure in this room there's hardly a person who hasn't, to some slight degree, wondered if his goal has been suppressed, and thought it over, just suppressively: "I wonder if he's invalidated something today?" I don't know if you've all been alarmed at this. But every once in a while you wonder if anything has been invalidated today, and you get sensation, you see. If you're very educated as an auditor, and if you didn't know these other points I'm giving you right now, you could become quite worried.

Of course you say, "Has anything been invalidated, on the goal to catch catfish?" and instantly the goal items which you're in are over there, and you're in the items with sen. In other words, you get the pain and sen on wrong lines, and everything goes to hell in a balloon, see, when you start doing this. You follow this activity?

Now, when you tiger drill the goal every session, that's an insurance against the – a wrong goal. See, that's good insurance. So it actually leaves as the main problem, bad listing.

You have to watch and be very alert, on listing sessions. And the things you're alert for are: high TA, 4.5, 5; pc ARC breaky; pc looking bad; no pain, all sen; bank beefing up; pc sick and nauseated. These are all bum things. And when you see those things, you start worrying.

And the answers to them is check over those earlier found goals, let's find out if anything happened there. Let's prepcheck the goal with the date line. Let's tiger drill the goal into good firing condition, and so forth. If we can't get it that way, then just prepcheck harder, and you'll either get the goal back or it was the wrong goal.

There's not any trick to listing. You don't have to be terribly clever. You don't have to be clever at all to list. You've got to be very workmanlike, very thorough and very competent. This is what it takes to run a good listing session. There's no clearing without listing. So don't relegate it as an unimportant activity and just toss it off and say that is that. Listing is good, and it's as brief as the auditor is good.
Now, I haven't talked to you anything about listing lines or what happens on lines, how you put lines together, because let me assure you, that is another story. But the actual conduct of a listing session should be very steady, very press-on, lot of confidence on the part of the pc in his auditor, no slips, no goofs. Regular, nice, smooth, keep the pc in-session, get the middle rudiments in only when the pc looks like they're completely gone on something. And just carry on and do a good, sound, competent session. And he'll go Clear as fast as he has confidence in you as a listing auditor.

And it's very tough on a pc to change auditors in the middle of listing.

Can be done, but only if the second auditor is as good as the first one was. A good listing auditor is a good thing. He – they're not always to be found. Because auditors will obsessively get in there, talk too much, try to do too much, alter-is too much, interrupt the pc, try to stop the pc from talking, Q-and-A on the things, question the items, write too slowly, improperly pronounce and call the auditing commands – all of these things lead to bad listing. So that what you want is smooth, steady, straightforward, predictable competence. You got that, man, your pc will go Clear and you'll see free needle on all those lines.

In absence of that you'll have a pc that'll look like he has a wrong goal.

It'll just be all sen, all ARC break, all upset, and *blah!* You don't want that, you want Clears. So listing to that degree is extremely important.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

You'll have to pardon me for being late. It was really quite an emergency.

You see, there was Gary Cooper and he was all by himself, you know, and he was fighting off these Indians. [laughter] Gary, you know, he actually was raised next door to me in Helena, Montana. It was very, very funny to see him done up like Rudolph Valentino in the old 8-millimeter movies, you know, from way back. I run one off for the kids every night. And even they're starting to laugh. [laughter]

Well, the subject of our lecture this evening ... This is the 2nd of October, I think. I hope you're in the same day as I'm in. If you've been listed on these lines today, no telling what day you're in! This is the 2nd of October, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. And the subject of this lecture is "Listing by Tiger Buttons-3GA." This replaces, and you can to all intents and purposes destroy your notes of lecture number two, 28 September, AD 12. Because since that time you have had a complete revisal.

*Male voice: 27th.*

Twenty-seventh? Your notes of the 27th of September, second lecture.

First lecture stands. I made them that way – figured there'd be something that you'd get into, and you did. Because after that lecture you asked enough foolish questions and pronounced enough imponderables that it was very obvious that the work which I had been doing slowly and casually on listing had to be done in a hurry. So you cost me my weekend. And there will be a fee.

At something on the order of 4:30 A.M., Monday, I was just finishing this work up. This was quite a sprint.

There were many things wrong with listing. There are many things right with listing. And we must remember, first and foremost, that the old type of listing we were doing – writing down the buttons – answers, pardon me, writing down the answers to lines; on four lines – "Who or what would want goal?" "Who or what would not want goal?" "Who or what would oppose goal?" "Who or what would not oppose goal?" – brought a lot of people to free needles on these lines and made first-goal Clears. It had to be in the presence of very smooth auditing. It had to be in the presence of good auditing.

And wherever any rough auditing occurred – now, I'll tell you what happened to these four lines – where any rough auditing occurred of any kind whatsoever, you got a jam-up and
the tone arm started up toward 4.5 or 5.0, which is standard position for a tough stick. That's standard position: if you've got somebody's tone arm riding 4.5 or 5.0 during a listing session and it just goes on riding there and on and on and on riding there, man, that is wrong. Something is very wrong, as I will go into in this lecture.

But in the presence of rough auditing, a pc suppresses. And in that suppression is able to produce sen and no longer gets pain even when he's listing on the right goal.

That's quite important, because a right goal can be listed so roughly, with the presence of sufficient rough auditing, that it'll look like a wrong goal. And, of course, in the presence of the smoothest auditing in the world, the same phenomenon takes place when you're trying to list a wrong goal.

But, in other words, rough auditing during a listing session can make a goal look wrong, fire wrong, act wrong and otherwise raise the devil with the case and everything connected with it.

Anyway, there is no substitute for good auditing. See? There's no substitute for good auditing and a good auditor.

Now, what's odd is that there are lots of people in Scientology whose goals are not answered up to or compared to or measure up to or declare that they should be active in Scientology, who are in Scientology and who are doing very good auditing. It's not true that everybody in Scientology is dictated to be there because of their goal one way or the other. That's a lot of – lot of nonsense.

But it also is true that goals very often assist people to be a good auditor. Let's say – let's have somebody with a goal "to listen to people's troubles" or something like that. He won't be as smooth an auditor as somebody who has a goal "to build mountains" or something, but he will still have some little special skills of one kind or another that pcs will find quite, quite attractive. You understand?

And then there is the broad majority of goals of people in Scientology which are just neutral. I mean they don't necessarily make them better auditors and they don't necessarily make them worse auditors. And that is the majority.

And then there is a small group, a minority, whose goals are in opposition to Scientology, who feel desperately that if their goals were ever to be achieved it would be over the dead body of Scientology. In other words, as long as Scientology exists, why, they'll never make it, you see? In other words their oppterm is Scientology. And those people make very rough auditors. They're practically unteachable. It's terrible. And they also stop auditing and they'll do that sort of thing.

You determine what people these are just with your rock slam test – you know, your HCOB that gives you the new Security Check – which would just rock slam. You know? "Consider committing overts against ..." and then you say, "Well, Scientology, the organization, your auditor, Ron." You get rock slam on one or more of those things, you got somebody who'd be awfully hard to train and who will make a very lousy auditor until you've got that goal. You just take it from me, I've watched them now. I've watched a lot of them. I've won-
dered why is it that some of these people can audit and why is it that some of these people can't audit and why is it that the vast majority of people in Scientology can audit?

Well, the goal sometimes assists, sometimes retards, and the vast majority has no influence. Now, the rock slam test takes care of the only part of it we have great interest in, which is the people who can't audit. The reason they can't audit is just that they can never get grooved in on the subject of auditing; they're always doing something weird in auditing. The pc says something and they jump down their throats. One way or the other they louse up what the PC does or says, you understand? And what they do is either add or omit and they never just audit. They add or omit.

Give you an idea. PC gives him an item: "a centipede." All right, the auditor who has an oppgoal to Scientology says, "a chrysanthemum."

And the PC says, "No, a centipede."

And the auditor says, "Well, how does a pc – how does 'a centipede' answer the question: 'Who or what would have many feet?' Well, I've got it now: a naturopath."

And the pc says, "No! A centipede! A centipede. A centipede. A centipede. A centipede!"

See, you've got a missed withhold going here, see? And the auditor says, "Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?"

"Well, you haven't taken this item!"

"No, that couldn't be it. The missed withhold must be earlier."

Well, things like this happen in auditing.

Well, you start mucking that into a listing session or never acknowledging anything the PC says. He does 465 items, see, 465 items and finally he gets an acknowledgment, which is "Mm-hm." See? Now, that's an omission. But you can use an acknowledgment the same way to just louse it up like crazy.

All of a sudden the PC gets a horrible gleam in his eye, "Who or what would have many feet?" you know? And, my God, he thinks of armies and centipedes, and so forth, and this avalanche is just about ready to roar, you know? Just about ready to roar, and he says, "A centipede."

And the auditor says, "Thank you!"

The PC says, [in a feeble tone of voice:] "Uh-eh-yeah, all right-uh-an arm..."

"Thank you!"

And the PC says, "What was I talking about? Where did they go? What part of the roof didn't fall in?" Get the idea?

Well, therefore, in view of the fact that errors of one kind or another can interrupt a listing session; and in view of the fact that PC protest, ARC breaks and rough auditing can make a goal simply – well, it can be found again – but it makes the goal turn on sen, look like a wrong goal, make the PC upset, not go Clear (that's the main thing that's wrong). He can list
for months and months and months and months and months and he wouldn't go Clear under this type of auditing. In view of that fact, we required a type of listing which permitted a minimal chance of error on the part of the auditor. See, so an auditor's – an auditor would get minimally in the pc's road. And we have it in 114 line listing. Listing by Tiger Buttons we will call it.

And we have that for this reason: The auditor doesn't comm lag by writing the item down, he simply makes a little strike on a card. He can't forget the auditing command because it's right on the card in front of him. And all he's trying to do is get all the items he can on the card – now, this is important to you because it isn't in the bulletin – he's trying to get all the items he can on the card without dragging the PC into an overlist. He doesn't want this PC to go into a long comm lag or feel badgered so items become missed withholds.

The only judgment the auditor has to make is: Is he demanding more items than the PC has or is he cutting the PC off before the pc has given him all he has? And that is the only point of judgment in this listing.

That is the single, most important point of judgment. Does he shut the pc off before the pc has given all items pc easily has? Or does he badger the pc into giving more items than the pc has on that line? Because he'll drag the pc, on the second case of demanding more items than the pc has available, into a condition of invalidate. Items, when they're overlisted, feel invalidated; so, the pc becomes very doubtful and everything becomes unreal.

And, in the earlier case, the first case of cutting the pc off before the pc can give all of his items, the auditor introduces sen. So, you see, demanding more items than the pc has, produces invalidation, unreality on the part of the pc. You understand then? And keeping the pc from giving you all the items the pc has, produces sen.

So, if the condition of the pc degenerates on Listing by Tiger Buttons into total sensation and no pain, you know that the auditor is demanding more items from the pc than the pc has. You understand? If he's got an unreality growing up, you know that the pc is being made to overlist. Let me put it that way very straightly. Don't want to mix you up on it. I, myself, haven't got it out here in front of me. You understand?

For instance, pc will list on a flow and he'll list as long as the flow is flowing. But when the flow stops flowing he is then listing against a backflow which brings about a sensation of invalidation. Because the items which are backflowing against the items which he is trying to give, see, causes an unreality to take place. He doesn't think any item he's giving you is the right item for that line. Do you see that?

Audience: Yeah.

So if you run this flow too long in any one direction by demanding more items than the pc has, the pc will begin to think that the items he's giving you are unreal. Because the sensation of invalidation occurs when a line has been made to flow too long in one direction.

Now, on the other side of the picture – on the other side of this is, you keep the pc from giving you the items he has, then you put him on a whole string of missed withholds. He protests the session and turns on sensation.
So the two things you can expect, principally and primarily from rough or bad auditing on a pc where the auditor is getting in the pc's road most God awfully—it has to be pretty extreme. Most of you are sitting there thinking, well, you drop your pencil once in a while and this upsets the whole session... No, no, it—you have to stand back of a session that is really being run by somebody—just whisper "Scientology" at him and the... Well, you know, it isn't the needle that rock slams, you see; the needle doesn't rock slam. What happens is both ears rock slam and both eyeballs rock slam, see? Ah, you watch him trying to give a session; he'll pull one or the other of these things. And it has to be awfully extreme before it starts really showing up. It's colossal. The little blunders that you make from time to time, and so forth, that isn't going to upset anybody. You pick them up in the end ruds, and so on.

But you start this kind of thing, see, this big avalanche, and the pc's got centipedes, armies, so forth. And these things are just sort of stacked up in the slot and they're all ready to go down the chute, see. He just wants to hand them out to you, brrrrrrrrr. See, like that. And you say to the pc—not you, but this auditor says to the pc...

THE PC SAYS, "CENTI-"
"Thank you!"

And the pc says, "A-a-ar-armies, ar-armies, ar-armies, I think, ar-armies."
"Thank you very much! Now, you don't have any more items, do you for this line? We're getting awfully long on this particular list anyway." [scrambles with papers]"Let's see, how many do we have here? Let's see. Awful lot!"

It's pretty bad. You'll see it. You'll start a co-audit someday and you'll see it. You'll actually see it with your naked, bare eyes; and you'll be ashamed. Be fantastic. We stand back of some co-audit, untrained auditor and he'll be trying to do this listing on somebody and, honest, they practically do everything but pull the wall off the wall and shove it in the pcs teeth.

Now, what happens to the pc? The pc suppresses. He's being made to suppress. He suppresses the auditor, he suppresses the list, he suppresses everything, and so on, stacks himself up on a bunch of missed withholds, with all the consequences of the missed withholds, because each item, then, that he didn't give you becomes a missed withhold. And the next thing you know, this goal that has been turning on sen once in a blue moon and pain all the time, now turns on sen all the time and pain never. And he's just going wog, wog, wog. And you can take a real goal and monkey it up this way, and you can actually have the pc getting the walls out of plumb.

I was fooling around with some research one day—during a demonstration session (withhold from you)—and I had been doing some research lines and I'd been trying to put some lines together and was doing some research—actually, analogous to this bulletin. But this was many weeks ago, before I went to America.

I was sitting there and I had been, of course, fooling around with a bogus goal. You know, and trying to list this bogus goal. And it was actually the way I was working it out, you know—I got to a point trying to work out lines where I turned on motion. And you don't just turn on motion so that you sort of feel like things are moving and they're not or you get dizzy or something like that. Man, you can turn on motion which is really interesting. And while I
was giving that session (it was to Reg there) why – I didn't miss any meter reads as you noticed but – well, I never have – but that – the meter was moving away from me like this suddenly. It was a little bit hard to find out where to look for the needle. And the table – the table was going swoop. And every once in a while the floor would go the opposite direction, swoop. I knew what it was so it wasn't disturbing me any; it was just where was I supposed to put my eyes.

But pcs don't have that much equilibrium and they often get very worried when they walk down the street and have the sidewalk in the middle of the road and then back where they aren't. You got the idea?

They also will become sick and nauseated if they're really roused up.

And if this is done on a wrong goal, you'll just put the pc in the hospital. Supposing you had a wrong goal and then you wrong listed it: pc – hospital. I mean, that's about all there is to that.

Psychiatric special. If this stuff ever got into the hands of psychiatrists, why, they'd have full institutions, brother. They'd make up their mind what goal it was.

So I myself through listing wrong goals and through fooling with goals in research have a very good subjective reality on what can happen to somebody like this. It's very rough.

Now, the other one is not quite what you would be very familiar with.

It's sort of a hidden manifestation. But have you ever seen one of these characters walking around who is totally doubtful all the time? You've tried to sell them Scientology, I know that, from time to time. One of the ways to get to them when they do this to you; you say, "Well, now, well, you help people, see. That's what we do in Scientology; you help people. You know, you do things for them, you help people."

And they say, "Well, how do you know you really help them?" You know? And, "Studies of the mind are no good, really, because, I know, because I had a brother once and it was all pretty bad, and so forth. And what do the medical doctors think of this?" You know, all this kind of stuff that goes on and on and on.

It's very interesting. You've only got to ask them on any analogous subject, such as medicine, you say, "Well, what do you think of medical doctors?"

"Well, I don't know. Well, how does anybody know?" What's amusing is, is this person is so disoriented in general, is they will do the same thing with all subject. And you think they're talking about Scientology. No, they're just talking and this is the way they talk, see? And because you're interested and sincere in what you're talking about, you never – you miss the boat. All you've got to do is take your index finger and just shift the conversation about a degree and get them to talking about psychiatry. You get agreement, see, because the psychiatrists are no good either, see? See, and you get – they're just like the wind in the willows. You know? Any breath of air will blow that unreality around. And it's all unreal; the sensation is it's unreal. Those walls aren't real. They know that people have been kidding them. Other people pretend things are real but this only convinces them that everybody pretends. You see?
They know that there are no well people. See? They know everything is bad. But, basically, it isn't real. Nothing is real.

Now, although this is a phenomenon which can be produced by lessening the overt, which is how it's normally produced – things aren't real to somebody who has many overts against those things. See, the person – well, fellow's been burning houses and he's been spending lifetimes burning houses, and he's – just does nothing but burn houses. You watch him go up to the front door of a house someday and he can't even find the doorknob, you know. He tries to walk through walls – houses don't exist. There aren't any different kinds of houses. It's the most remarkable thing, you see? Tremendous numbers of overts against some object or item or type of person brings about an unreality on the overter's part for that thing, see, and it becomes totally unreal.

For instance, I have this to some degree on religion myself. And it traces immediately back to burning whirling dervishes. I just got into a bad habit, you know? Whirling dervishes show up, why, you execute them, you know. That kind of thing. I mean, that's the wrong thing to do, let me tell you. It produces an unreality on the subject of whirling dervishes. See, you go around whirling dervishes and they just are a blur – when they're whirling and when they're not whirling. They're thin. You can see straight through them almost. See, that's under the phenomenon of they become unreal because one has overts against them. That's the rationale back of this.

But the same exact phenomenon can be produced by causing a person to outflow too long in one direction on a goal line. See? So that he gets a backflow inevitable. You understand? You see this dramatization in life as somebody does bad things in the community until people have to do bad things to him.

Well some dog – he goes around biting people or something like this for a long time, and eventually they'll do something to the dog.

You see this in real life that an individual committing overts has things committed on him, see. You see this in life. People enforce this one.

But I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the simple thing of the fellow who throws a bowling ball out in front of him long enough will mentally restimulate a backflow against bowling balls. And the way to make bowling balls unreal is just to keep throwing them away from you and never recovering them. And they will eventually get totally unreal. You see why? You see that?

So when you make a pc overlist, what he's done is go out the flow line. Remember this is a very aberrated zone of action in the pc's mind. He's pretty spiny on these subjects. He's very identified and overflown and he jammed up. Well, if his goal was to be a pinball machine, he'd have a marvelous mess on the subject of everything was a pinball machines and the basic purpose of everybody in existence was to do things to or with pinball machines, don't you see? And everything is identified with everything; all purposes are identified with his purpose, you see?

And you're going down this channel ... You are operating now in Book One's A=A=A. You see, you're operating right where it lives. And don't be surprised sometime if the pc has
some weird identification and you just can't make any sense out of it at all. Yet the pc says it's an identification. He looks at you quite blandly and says, "Well, all ashtrays are just exactly like roofs. You know that. All ashtrays are roofs," you know? Or "All women are mothers." He believes this, you see.

But you could understand that – how he could get into that. But now, how all ashtrays are roofs! You say, "This guy is unhinged someplace." Well, of course, you're operating in the zone and area of unhinged hinges. They're by the gross lot on the goals channel because he's got everything identified with everything, and so on, because his flow lines have been all overflown and backflown. You see?

He's got a whole lot of specialized flow lines – all of them overreached, all of them backflown on, and so forth. And when you're taking those things apart you must take them apart as to what's there. You can only take apart what's there. Do you understand? And although it looks to you, the auditor, as you sit there listing on a pc, that he's dreaming up these items and handing them to you. No, he's looking right straight down one groove, and it'll be just one single bunches of file cards in the file machine, you see. There it is it's just that many items. And it goes right on down to that many items. And one more item will regenerate a backflow so that the last item he gives you he will now be doubtful about.

Now, he can put it down as – with perfect certainty, "a centipede." And then you cause him to list ten, fifteen more items in that direction. He hasn't got them, man! He's got to go in past the opposite flow, which is now generated and flowing, and reach around. It's like going upstream against a roaring river, don't you see? And, after a while, he kind of says to himself, "It isn't worth it. There's nothing there." You know? The spray in his eyes and everything. So, you ask him for all these additional items and he hasn't got them: "Centipede" that he put down as totally real now seems not to belong on the list. See, he put it down as totally real and if you gave him the item back, he'd tell you, "I really don't think that that would want to walk. No, I don't think so."

Similarly the next ten, fifteen items, they just go. I mean, they're so unreal they'll just start disappearing. He won't even be able to tell you what item he has just said or anything like this when you overflow this.

But the basic thing I'm trying to get to is you can produce a total unreality on the part of the pc. You can make him feel just like he is in a world which doesn't exist. Now, there are characters around whose world doesn't exist and who don't exist in any world of anything to them. You run into brick walls but this pc never does, see. Never seems to be able to run into a brick wall. Of course he's always coming in scratched and contused, but he cant tell you how. See, brick walls are unreal. That's his difficulty. And, of course, he always runs into them – they don't exist.

But his reaction toward life is uncertainty and insecurity. So, making a pc list too many items brings about a mental framework of insecurity, unreality, doubtfulness. And, of course, that extends over to the auditor, it extends over to auditing, it extends over to everything.
So, you could get a guy's goal and then list him wrong and have him believing at the other end of the line that Scientology was totally unreal, that it'd never done anything for him. I mean, you could list him into a hole to that degree.

Now, the weight factor of overweightness, and so forth, also belongs on the other side of this. That's not letting somebody give you the items. You can actually put pounds on somebody by continuing to miss the withholds. Isn't that interesting? Increase somebody's weight with this kind of auditing. Now, smooth auditing would decrease somebody's weight. Definitely.

Now, do you see then, these are just – these are the two major factors. There are probably other things you can do. You could confuse a pc. You can get him wog-wog, so, you start in on the line "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" The pc answers "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and you say, "No, you're answering 'not want' to catch catfish." You ask him "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" And then all of a sudden you make a mistake and the pc – he doesn't know, see. So he's sort of on a not-know. See, you can produce confusion; you can produce various things. But they're not as serious as these other two phenomena.

Now, therefore, this type of listing is designed to minimize the amount of time necessary to record the fact that the pc is giving you items. And that is its first advance.

A lot of you have asked me, from time to time, why we wrote them down at all. Well, we had to record them in some fashion. And I wasn't yet sure that we wouldn't have to do something about them. And I've become sure we don't have to do anything with these items. So, therefore, all you want is a tally system. You do have to have some check on parity to find lines are overlisted or underlisted. You do have to have this. So all you need there is a tally system. And I've introduced the crudest tally system there can be, which is four slants and a bar. And if you will look down at your right hand you'll find you have five fingers and man counts ably. It's instinctive. You go slant, slant, slant, slant, crossbar.

You know that man's method of counting is based on five, not ten, see. You know that you can conceive five objects just like that. Science was, by the way, trying to prove fifteen or twenty years ago that a man could not conceive more than four. And I didn't go into the root of this thing, but I think it was being put out by some sociological, electronics computer man who had no thumb. Because the one thing you can count with a glance – you can count five.

As a matter of fact there are four hinges on these doors and one lock, if you consider the lock a huge lock. You can certainly grasp that number at a glance.

So five is the easiest recording number. It's instinctive. Now, that's chosen not because auditors are stupid but because auditors becoming involved with a pc, and so forth, haven't got all their attention on numbers. So I've taken the most basic unit or cluster figure which is five, so an auditor won't be thrown by it.

He's trying to handle a pc who's having a hell of a time. PC's squirming all over the floor and falling out of the chair and ARC breaking and writhing and all that sort of thing. Well, he's liable to get completely blooey on the subject of tallying. But if you give him an
instinctive tally figure that is an idiot's figure, you know, just – he can keep on doing that without any attention. You got the idea? That's why that's chosen.

Now, that introduces no slowdown. That introduces no slowdown, and it gives the auditor time to watch his meter and its behavior and also keep up his auditor's report and give the pc attention.

Now, most listing sessions, the auditor has become so engrossed in writing things down, that he has not been able to give enough attention to the session itself and so has lost control of his pc. But if you're good at this, you can take – and you can look straight at the pc who is giving you five items, let's say, and you can go one, two, three, four, five, strike. You see, you don't need to look at what you're doing to record it. See? That, in other words, has been reduced to an idiot simplicity.

You know, it's very interesting the research I've done on this. It was up as high as 182 lines over the weekend. And I had one system – you can probably all think up better systems maybe, one way or the other, but I don't think you can think up simpler ones than this. That's the one that takes genius. Anyway ...

I thought of getting a tabulator, but – every time the pc said something, you stepped with your thumb on something, you see. So, all you had to do was shift your thumb every time the pc said an item, and then before you turned the card over you simply wrote the figure that was on the tabulator on your card and turned it over. See, that's very nice. There's only one thing wrong with it: it clicks. They will inevitably click. So the most silent means – and furthermore, it's a mechanical; you have to have something. Furthermore, mechanical things often break. And this requires a minimum: it requires a pencil and some cards.

Now, one of the big things I had trouble getting over, and it isn't totally solved: how to make a maximum number of items on one card without having to rewrite the card. See? Well, frankly, this is not totally covered in the bulletin, but you don't have to rewrite the whole card list; you can get by overstrikes with three colors of pencil, use. Because you can always see a group. You probably couldn't see the little individual slant lines if you had a black one and a red one and a green one, don't you see, on top of each other. But you can see there's a black, red, green, you see, and the card is totally filled with black, red, green. You've still got an approximation even though it was very badly done. You get the idea? I mean ... Now, the way to do that isn't in this bulletin.

That card which totally fills up: You take a stapler and you staple to it another card and rewrite that one line on the face of your fresh card so they turn over two at a crack. You understand? And that doesn't let it all get separated out from underneath you. Now, that will, oddly enough, leave you rewriting only some cards. In other words, you don't have to rewrite the whole list all the way down. That's one of the easy ways to get on it.

Now, the odd part – here's another one: If you don't even want to rewrite the line, you can take a card that is less wide which still exposes the line and staple that onto the front of your filled-up card. You understand? I don't care what you do with this, but you can do this job with a stapler. Now, I wouldn't worry much about the backs of cards. If you turn the card over – if you turn the card over, you have lost sight of its overlistedness. You can make a little
mistake there, don't you see? Because this card turned over looks just like any card face up until you turn it over. You follow me?

Audience: Uh-huh.

Because – and it looks like it's a single card. Whereas if you've got a double width card comes up with this thing, it's immediately called to your attention that this line is awfully long. Do you see how that would be? This line is pretty doggone long if you've got a double card in your hand; whereas, this would not be observable to you if you had only one card turned over with the line written on the reverse side of it again.

Well, now these things – we probably will do things to them; you'll probably find things change. But I've gone over this pretty thoroughly and tried to reduce it down through its cycle. All things go from a complex – from a somewhat complex to a more complex to a simple basis.

You've seen this time and time again in Scientology. We'll run this cycle:

I'll bring out something that's very simple, some auditor will be complete idiot with it, I'll find out it's not totally workable, some goofball things will occur, some pcs will have some hard luck with it, and so I'll make it more complicated, see, and then add the things that you mustn't do to it, and then push it on forward into more complicated, and all of a sudden the whole thing falls downstairs to becoming simpler than it was in the first place.

Well, I've tried to make this listing run that cycle over the last weekend.

And I did it. One time I had it up to 182 lines. In other words, I was cutting it – it went way up; the complexities were terrific – and then cut it back to a simplicity.

Now, as you sit there listing, several questions will occur to you: How often should you use this question that is on the card to the pc? How often should you use this?

Well, you use it as often as the pc isn't answering it easily.

In other words, your pc says, "A centipede, an army and a black cat."

And you say, "That's fine. Thank you."

And you didn't get any comm lag there, did you? No comm lag. But he stopped. He isn't still thinking, particularly, he's looking at you now; he thinks he's done his duty, don't you see? So you ask him the question again and he says, "There aren't any more."

Now, you think, well, that's going to leave an unanswered auditing question, and sure enough it could, but he won't tell you there aren't any more until you really start straining him.

Now, the question you're trying to answer is how often should you ask the auditing command, don't you see? How often should you ask this thing? How often should you repeat it? And how hard should you pound on the pc's head in order to get answers?

Well, in actual fact, you only want answers until he comm lags hard over them. The comm lag is going to be followed by an invalidate. His comm lag will end up with "trying to find the right one." And "trying to find the right one" will move over into an invalidation of anything. Do you see? So your symptom of the pc having been driven too far – already driven
too far – is he can't get the right word. He's trying to think of the right word. Now, that isn't a phenomenon of the mind; that is an overrun of a flow. And you've already ridden him too far on that flow. You've goofed. That is classifiable as a goof, don't you see? So, where you want to stop is the comm lag which precedes that phenomenon. The pc is saying, "A centipede and-ah-ah-hmm-ah... A-ahhmm - ah ... " And if you just let him go on with that, why, he'll say, "Well, I'm trying to think of the right word for it," is his next stage, see? And if you let that go through and he thought of the right word for it, then the item he gives you after that is not the right item at all. See, first it's the wrong word, then it's wrong item. Comm lag, wrong word, then wrong item, see. That's the way he's going to answer you up on these things. So you got to catch him at that moment when he is just about to comm lag and hasn't done so very critically. Do you understand? That actually then requires some sensitivity on the part of the auditor.

That's why I've unburdened the necessity of the auditor in HCOB October 1st – unburdened the auditor's attention on the writing down lists and that sort of thing. Because that's the critical point.

Now, if the pc says there aren't any more items on that line, this is not a balk. Do you understand something about listing. Pcs never balk. Do you understand that? Pcs never balk! They can be overdriven or distracted to the point where they're not in-session. But if they're even vaguely in-session they just never balk. They're not balking at listing. Do you understand? A pc will not balk at listing. He will always give you an item or another item or three items or four items, but he can be prevented from listing, see? The balk isn't there but the prevention is there. And if you look at it in this framework, both doing auditing and supervising auditing, you'll see where the goofs occur. Do you follow that?

You see a pc balking – apparently, see – just recognize pcs don't balk. Pcs have to be prevented from listing. See, the balk is just an apparency. And there's something there that's preventing the pc from listing and it isn't in the pc's head. It's either the lines are wrong – somebody's written up his lines, like "Who and – who or what would want to help not suppress because he didn't catch catfish?" and the poor pc is saying ... The line was never cleared with him in the first place, you see? Nobody came along and said to him, "Well, can you answer this line?" as the first time the line comes up on the pile, you see. "All right, here it is: Who or what would want to run away when centipedes aren't catching Suppress-Help?"

He says, "Huh?"

The lines are wrong or the auditor is actively preventing him from being in-session. Session started out like this: He got into the body of the session, the needle was free, everything was clean, got the goal firing – the goal fired beautifully, and so forth. And the pc is all sitting there and he's getting steamed up. He knows just where he is: They're going to start on the Create. See, he already knew this because he knew the bulletin or something. And he's going to start on the Create, and he's already got the first item there, see, a "candy machine," see. And he's actually been thinking of this as the next item. He's about to say ... You know, he's just waiting. All you have to do, you know – all you have to do is just open that stack of cards at the right place and you're going to get a "candy machine," see, bang!
And the auditor says, "Well, now, all right, now, let's get in the middle rudiments for this session." You know that confounded candy machine will go through the rest of the session. It'll go clear around till they get around to it again. And it'll come up some day or another on a Suppress. He's prevented from listing.

So pcs – just as a rule of thumb on the thing – from your standpoint as a Supervisor, an auditor's Instructor, and in auditing, and so forth – they just never balk, they're prevented. And you look, not for something that's wrong with the pc, you look for something that's wrong with that listing session or what's going on in it.

Because, listen, you list lines on a pc, it's something like putting a button in a candy machine, see. Penny goes down the slot, hits the button in the machine, something in there whirs and some candy comes out the bottom of the machine. Only this machine never breaks. You can't ask him for anything on his goal line without him giving it to you. You just can't do it! You see, it's very nearly impossible. Unless when you ask him, you won't let him give it to you. You have to get in there with a little sledgehammer and monkey up the chute, you know. You have to feed it an Irish penny or something. There ought to be curve on this. He has to be prevented because, frankly, he just will deal these things out like a professional gambler dealing cards. He just can't help himself; he'll just deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal. You just turn up the stack there and you read the auditing command and you're going to get answers if you're anything on the beam at all.

Once in a while you'll get into trouble because he's got two buttons of the Tiger Drill crossed. That is to say, you should be running Suppress at this stage of the game and you aren't; and you figure it would be a Q and A to go back to the Suppress section and do anything about it, and so on. But you've already done something wrong if you get to that state. You've already done something wrong if you've got two buttons mixed up or something. See, something's already gone haywire with the auditing.

Well, the thing to do is just sit there and list. Get your rudiments in, get the goal to fire, make the pc happy and cheerful. And sit there with your pencil alert and your stack just right and don't drop them on the floor. Just sit there and deal them off and ask the question. And the pc says, "An army, a centipede, a bulldozer, a-uh-uhm ... That's about all I can think of."

And you say, "Thank you very much." And you turn the card and you ask the next question. See, just as neat as that.

And then you say, "Now, who or what would oppose catching catfish?"

And he says, "Oppose catching catfish."

And you say, "Yes, that's right." Don't make him give himself the auditing command. Don't you see? The rules of auditing all apply in listing.

And you say, "All right, yes, that's right. Who or what would oppose" – say it softly so as not to blow him out of the water, but give him the command. He obviously hadn't got it, he's muttering it, see? And you say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?"

And he says, "A-ah-hm-hm-hm-hm ... Who or what would oppose catfish?"
"Yeah, that's right. Who or what would oppose catching catfish?"


And you say (tick), "Thank you very much." And get the hell off of it, man. You got an answer to your auditing command, see, and you were lucky. Because that line was hanging fire right on the comm lag, and you opened it up on the comm lag. You understand? Get one item.

I sometimes ease the crush on a pc by saying, "Well, just give me one so the auditing question will be answered."

"Oh," he says very happily, "game warden." Gives you some old item. "Game warden!" You say, "All right. Well, that's fine. Thank you." Get how the thing goes?

But the whole attitude of the session must be one which permits the pc to list items. And if you want to know how to list, then delete all out of it that prevents the pc from listing. And you'll find out this is what has happened here on this Listing by Tiger Buttons. There's practically everything out of it that prevents listing, still leaving those things in it which make people Clear.

Now, the whole – whole aspect, then, of a listing auditor is somebody who is in benign control. Benign control.

Now, get this as a definite difference to Sec Checking. You say, "Now, have you ever robbed a bank?"

And the pc goes clang! on the E-Meter.

And you say to the pc, "Come on, come on. Have you ever robbed a bank? I got a read here. What – ever robbed a bank?"

And he says, "Ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha, no, not me." Clang! "No, I ... As a matter of fact, I was the victim of a bank robber one time. Uh-uh-I was actually in a company that had a bank that was robbed and they really did me in."

And of course, the Sec Check Auditor is not worth his salt who wouldn't have said at that time, "Done, man, done. You know, done. Have you – now listen carefully – you, have you, you, you, you, the one sitting right in the chair, you, now, you. Got that now? Now, listen carefully: robbed – robbed a bank? Now, that's the question now. Now, I'm going to ask it on the meter. Have you robbed a bank? All right, that's null. Thank you very much."

Or clang! "All right, what is it, man? What is it now? What bank? What bank? Come on give here, man, give, give, give." You know? You know?

You don't do that with listing. [laughter]

There are different types of auditing, appropriate to all occasions.

Benign control: you're running an airy session where we're all pals together. And sometimes the items are funny, too. And sometimes they're very sad. Nobody is asking you, the auditor, to shed crocodile tears in sympathy with the pc, but don't go laughing like a bunch of
goons when he's saying, "A dying mother, a perishing infant, a starving puppy." Don't sit there going to pieces, you see?

Sometimes I know it exerts your control because you know what he'll be doing a few minutes later: He'll say, "A starving mother!" You know? "Ha-ha!"

Another list this will come up: "Who or what is no damn good?" you see. That'll come up on that list. Different frame of mind.

All right. So – but the listing auditor is in benign control. Now, actually, benign control is far harder to exercise than very harsh "cop" 8-C. Guy is in-session and doesn't even know it, doesn't even think of being out of session, auditor isn't in his way. It's a little velvet little finger that nudges him back into session when he starts steering out.

Well, we – if the pc is saying, "Oh, God, I don't know, I mean, these pains through my stomach. They're just terrible. I mean, the pain ... Have we got to list any more today? Just one or two more items you know, and I thought a moment ago my heart was going to stop or my umbilical cord was going to go to pieces. Man!"

And you say, "All right, all right, all right. Now, look, we've just got a few more here, so forth. Just got a few more here. Let's finish those up. After all we've got a few minutes left in the session, you know." [laughter] That's the way you handle people under listing, see. Persuasion, it's coaxing, it's the old smoothie.

And the way not to handle them is just to sit back ... [pounds the table] "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" And yet you could very easily get into an overwhelm frame of mind. The boisterousness, the behavior of the pc is very often quite overwhelming. The pc all of a sudden goes into conniption fIts of one kind or another. The pc's interest is sometimes as burning as a blowtorch, you know? Like somebody said one time, about somebody listing here early on the course. And, "And the pc told me all about – all about spaceships and exactly how they worked, and so forth." This was a girl that was auditing him that had a well-known antipathy to mechanicisms. "And the pc told me all about spaceships and how they went and how they were built and everything else; and you know, if I'd had the money right there in-session I would have bought one, you know?" They get interested, man!

Now, the only thing that can make a pc disinterested in auditing off these lines is the auditor. The auditors enter something in there.

Now, this is a skill. This is a type of auditing. It has to be pretty well done. It has to be pretty well controlled. The more you interject into an auditing session, the sorrier you're going to be. And you just sit there and get them off and keep the pc at it and doing it and you're interested and everything is fine, the atmosphere is fine and the pc is in-session, so forth; man, he'll just go ripping through at a high rate of speed.

And if you sit there stopping him from listing, paying attention to a bunch of Simple Simonisms: he hasn't answered the auditing command, see? He went, "Er-ah-er-game, a game, no, not a game-uh-uh-uh-no, that wouldn't be the item anyhow; a-uh-uh-uh-uh-a person who supervises fish. Uh-uh-uh-no. No, that wouldn't be the item. A person whouh-uh-a person who-uh-uh-uh-would fish. Uh-no, no, that wouldn't be it. Uh-let's see-uh-uh..."
"Well, give me the item. Come on, come on, give me the item. I want the item, see. I want the item."

"Well, a person who changed... No, that couldn't be it. Uh-uh-who has no fi- hmmm, hmmm..." and so on.

And the auditor who just sits there and says, "I must have the auditing question answered," see. "Give me the item. I've got to get it answered. It says right in the book the question has been asked and it must be answered, and so forth and so forth." He's just making a mess out of the thing, man. He's got the guy to a point where the guy is invalidate, invalidate, invalidate, and the devil himself couldn't precheck the pc back out of it again.

No, the auditor's got to be slippy, got to be clever. He unfortunately due to his own stupidity, has asked one more time, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" He was sleepy or something, you see?

And the pc has already been searching for the word, "A game-uh-uh-that wouldn't be the right word. A-uh-a park off-. Uh-no-uh-uhuh-uh-mmm-umm-umm-a-a-a game warden."

And the auditor has stupidly said, "All right. Thank you very much. Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" See? And then saying, "I've got to get ... " having made the mistake, have to compound the felony of making the pc answer the mistake, see. Idiocy.

No, the thing to do is to come off of it and say, "Look, we got lots of items here, I mean, on the line and so on. Just scrub that one. Let's get onto the next one. You know?"

The pc says, "Oh, oh, oh, huh, what's the next one? Who or what would not want to ... oh! Who or what would not oppose catching ... oh, that's all right. Oh! Fishmongers. Fishwives. Safra-su-saf-ru..." You get the different aspects? So, you have to tune in. You have to know about this flow thing. And I spent a whole hour talking to you about this flow thing because it's the most important thing in listing. You miss that, you've missed everything. So it is very far from unimportant.

It's the aspect of the pc which determines what you do in listing. Whether you ask for more or ask for less, forgive the auditing command, that sort of thing, smooth him out and so on.

You want the pc listing easily all the time. And a perfect listing session is the pc is just sitting there, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. That's all. Next card: Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Thank you. That's all. Next card: Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Next card. See? That's a perfect listing thing. Practically no comm lags, pc knows when the line is finished, pc in good communication with the auditor.

And on a very good session that was run today, twelve hundred items were listed in a single session. Interesting, huh? Well, that's fast clearing.

So you've said goodbye, I hope, to two hundred hours of listing to get a goal to clear.

But remember, the one thing that can mess up listing is an auditor who doesn't understand it - an auditor who doesn't understand what he's doing.
He's trying to keep that happy balance. He's trying to prevent the pc from overlisting – he is actually trying to keep the pc from overlisting because pcs sometimes will, see? Or – and he's trying to prevent the pc from withholding items, inadvertently. He's trying to keep out of the road everything in the session. The pc, for instance, all gone wog-wog; auditor doesn't get the rudiments in for his session; the pc then can't stay in-session long enough to remember what items he's supposed to tell you, or he's being distracted by the fact his wife is going to phone him at three o'clock and say whether or not he's been divorced, see? Auditor didn't clean it up, you know. Bad auditing has happened.

And in good auditing you make fast Clears. And the cleverness of auditing takes place in goals finding.

The smooth hammer and insistence and 8-C of auditing takes place back there in Prep-checking, and so forth, see.

And then the clever, reassuring auditor – that's what it takes there in goals finding. When it gets over into listing, that takes benign control. Pc doesn't even know he's sitting on control and he just sits there and spits out items of express train, jet speed. They're all down on the list. Finished. Clear. Free needle on everything. That's all there is to it. It looks very easy.

If anybody is dead against anybody being Clear, though, he won't do it. Don't you see? Okay. Thank you.
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Thank you.

All right. The wishing well is outside for your convenience. A crown, why, that's a wish for a good auditor, you see? And a half crown, that's to – hoping your goal will fire quickly, you see. There's a nice scale of rates here of one kind or another. And a florin, well, that's hoping somebody won't start screaming in the rest of the room, you see. There's rates of pay on this. It's very interest... You'll find it's very workable.

Anyhow, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 2 Oct. AD 12, October. And we're continuing lectures here on listing 3GA – Listing by Tiger Buttons.

Now, your activity – now, hear me carefully – your activity as an auditor on a listing session has these responsibilities in an ordinary way: That you get the goal to fire and that the pc is not prevented from listing and you get the most items down that you can – it's quantitative. That you don't get him to overlist and you don't make him underlist.

Now, there's various ways that you could effect these various things and the first and foremost is you could get – be auditing with your rudiments out.

Now, let's be smart about pcs. We already know in Dynamic Assessment, if you're running any goal that has been gotten by Dynamic Assessment, you're fortunate because you have data on the pc. And I learned this myself just in the last twenty-four hours. I finally had to make up my mind about this, because, man, supposing you have a pc whose item is "floors." Now, look at this, man. The item is "floors." Now, this pc is going to run into a lot of floors. Right?

Now, take somebody whose item is "people." Or somebody, you know, or somebody whose item is "rain," and it's been raining for the last twenty-four hours, and so forth. Well, now, let's be smart about it, let's get intelligent about this. It isn't – you're not an adding machine after all, as an auditor or something like that. Let's take a look at this pc – this pc look all right?

Now, when I say that, I mean you take a look at the pc before the session begins. Go ahead and take a look at the pc. And the pc's sitting down and you're adjusting the chair and getting the can squeeze and all this sort of thing. Let's add something in there: Look at the pc!

Now, that might be new and novel, but you'll find out it'll pay very heavy dividends. You'll find out it'll pay very, very good dividends indeed. Your pc doesn't look as good today as pc looked yesterday at session end.
Now look, you don't have to have the pc on the meter and be studying the needle and studying the tone arm and all that. You don't have to hook him up to a battery of instruments to tell you that he looks sort of shopworn today, compared to how he looked yesterday. I mean, you already are a battery of instruments that can detect this kind of thing, don't you see? In other words, look at your pc. 

All right. The pc looked raggle-tagged and wogged up one way or the other. Well, what are you trying to do getting in your beginning rudiments without running O/W? Why don't you just start the session, run O/W, a few commands and so forth, and get – let the pc spit it out. You know, just general O/W and get the rudiments in before you put the rudiments in. Is there anything wrong with that?

And if this pc is normally quite withhold and has a hard time regurgitating items and so-so, well, run O/W, put in the random rudiment and then put in rudiment one. In other words, ask the pc if you missed any withholds while running O/W, see. You get the idea?

All right. Let's not just sit there and run some kind of a rote. Let's put the pc in a state to be audited, see. Straightaway – bang! "Is it all right with you if we begin this session now? All right. Here it is: Start of session." See? "All right, what we're going to do here now is going run a little O/W on you, just a few commands." Hope factor, see; you've already told the pc, "Just a few commands, see how it goes, so we won't have to waste a lot of time on rudiments," you know – anything you want to say. "All right. What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld?"

"Ah-oo-wa-woo-oo."

All right. Now you've gotten down – the pc is in pretty good shape. All right. And you say, "Since the last time I audited you, have I missed a withhold on you? That's clean. All right."

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Clean." See? Clean as a wolf's tooth.

"Since the last time I audited, you done anything you are withholding." You already got it. Clean. See?

"Do you have a present time problem?" Well, he did have. Clean.

All right. Roll up the sleeves and into a Tiger Drill. Get that goal firing.

Now, I've been taking sometimes as much as thirty-five minutes to get in beginning rudiments on a pc and I finally realized that I was wasting time, because ten minutes' worth of O/W in every case had finally had to be run after the agony. And actually tremendous quantities of time were wasted in the session trying to keep the pc in-session when I should have run O/W in the first place. You understand?

So your whole interest in a listing session is get the pc in some kind of shape so the pc can be in-session. 

Somebody here suggested the other day that "under the control of an auditor" should be added to the definition of "in-sessioness," and I think this is a very wise idea. Willing to talk to the auditor, interested in own case and under the control of the auditor.
Now, there's nothing better in running up havingness and that sort of thing than a good, flashing dash of O/W.

Now, how much do you challenge those answers? How much do you challenge these O/W answers?

You don't, man, because you're using O/W to promote the thing. So the pc gives you six motivators and a victim. Fine!! All right! Pc figures it's something they've done. That's all right. Because you're using O/W to get the pc to talk to the auditor about his difficulties. We don't care what the pc says just as long as the pc says something.

"What have you done?"
"I've breathed." Very sarcastic, see. "I've breathed."
"What have you withheld?"
"Everything."
"What have you done?"
"Sat here and let myself be butchered up day after day by you!" [laughter]
"What have you withheld?"
"My better self." [laughter]

Get smart. Get smart. The pc is talking to you. Don't interrupt it for worlds for the pc will slide right on into session as nice as a fish going down a chute.

This one I gave this fellow I was telling you about, in Washington, when I suddenly said, "Well, to hell with this. There's no reason of knocking him appetite over tin cup." Made him sit down in the chair and take up the cans and you know the first quest... answers I got to my questions, "What have we failed to find out about you?", man, they didn't even vaguely resemble answers. But he was talking. He was talking. And remember, your in-sessionness; this contains that as a primary action: pc is talking to the auditor. Well, it doesn't even matter if he's bawling the auditor out, he's talking to the auditor.

You don't recognize that the only serious condition of a pc is when they sit there too apathetic to say anything to the auditor. If you've driven a pc down to that point, you ought to be spanked. You must have done it, because at some time the pc was talking to you and then stopped.

Well, what did you do to stop the pc talking to you? That's what you would have to patch up. Matter of fact, you could take somebody that had finally run down and won't say another word to you and won't utter anything to you and won't say anything else to you and is never going to talk to you again and is just sitting there bthaaah. They're not mad, they're just sitting there bthaaah. They're too weak; they just feel absolutely clammy on the subject of talking. They can't, and so forth. If you were to say something like this you'd be surprised; you'd surprise yourself. You'd say, "How did I stop you from talking to me?" See?

And the pc says, "Oh, well, you just wouldn't accept anything I said."

"All right. Good. How else did I stop you from talking?"
"Oh, you were sitting there, demanding I tell you things. I told you everything I got. There's nothing else. And ..."

Look, get off of the significance, scenic railway, huh? It's beautiful – those rails going around the peaks and beautiful snow-capped vistas and forests and streams and waterfalls, and so forth. The significance railway, I mean, you know? To hell with what scenery, let's have some scenery. We don't care if this railway is going to start running through garbage dumps, see? We're not going to insist on the beautiful vista. Let's at least get the railway running, you see? Let's get those cars moving. We don't care what the cars are going to go through or how much they clank.

Some auditors are perfectionists. And they hear a screak in the wheels, you know, as the car starts up and they stop the car to oil it. And they've stopped the car, man, and that's everything there is to it. They won't get that train going again easily. See?

So the whole thing about a session is the pc's willingness to talk to the auditor. So in a listing session, this is terribly important. Because all doubt about willingness to talk to the auditor must be washed out before you start listing. That's real important. That pc shouldn't have any qualms about talking to you – no qualms at all, man, no qualms at all. Pc just talks to you.

You can always bring a pc out of missed withholds if the pc will give you any missed withhold or any withhold or any comment about missed withholds. If the pc will just talk, you can do something about it. It's when the pc will no longer talk that you're in trouble. So you really have to have those rudiments in for a listing session. The best way to get them in: get the pc talking to you. And you'll probably find necessary far more often to run rudiment O/W in listing sessions than any other type of session. And it's so easy that you can overlook these things about listing sessions, see. That pc has got to be willing to sing.

Now, anything the auditor does that is offbeat, off-line or anything like that is going to prevent the pc from talking.

Now, in-sessionness, then, doesn't have the importance of getting the meter to read. It's getting the pc so the pc will be terribly interested in his own items and will be able to as-is them and get rid of them, bing. And, you don't overacknowledge; you don't underacknowl-

What is acknowledgment? Well, it's to let the pc know you got it. And if you were actually to sit there and say, "Got it, got that one. All right, got it. Got it, got it, got it, got it, got it," it would be very effective. Of course, you don't. You say, "Good," and "Thank you," and so forth. But you've got to give the pc the idea that you're getting these.

Now, if you put your flat of your hand against the pc's nose and stop the pc while you very carefully, look carefully at the pc like you're going to hypnotize him, see, and you say, "All right; all right now." Pc keeps giving you items, you see? "All right, now look at me. Now, all right. All right. Good!" I don't think you'll find that's necessary. You see, I'm being kind of hard on you, but I mean – these mistakes will be made.

Now, you want the amount – the amount of acknowledgment so the pc knows you got it. And that's how much acknowledgment you want. Well, that's how many you acknowledge.
He gives you thirteen so fast you can't go back – you already checked them off here – but you should – you don't have to go back and count the number since your last acknowledgment and say, "Well, now wait a minute, now I'm going to give you a 'good' for each one of these." See? Those are all unusual actions. Pc has to be acknowledged.

Well, what is this? Well, it's what the pc considers being acknowledged is. Well, what is that? Well, it's being acknowledged. This is a human value. It's not a mathematical value; it's a human value. Acknowledgments aren't one-for-one or one-for-ten or ten-for-one. Some poor pcs get ten acknowledgments for every one item, you know? You wind up as-ising the pc, not the bank.

So keeping the pc talking to you is a question there of how skilled the auditor is in not getting in the pc's road and letting the pc know that the auditor has heard it. And that's the type of auditing you're looking at in listing sessions.

All right. Now, this getting the goal to fire – now, let me give that a little more stress: getting that goal to fire. Now, did you ever hear a pistol "tick"? Well, when you heard it tick, it didn't fire, did it? That right? Well, that's what I mean by getting a goal to fire. It's not carelessly used. See? We want rocket reads on this goal, man. Now, of course, there's this dividing line: You can put the pc into a terrific anxiety if you can't get his goal to fire. I can show you how not to do it. Sit back ... "Well, I don't know if it's your goal or not. I'm just taking you over from another auditor. I've never even seen the goal fire. Don't know whether it'd fire or not. Let's see, all right: to catch catfish. Well, it didn't fire that time. Heh-heh. Well, that didn't fire, so on. Who said this was your goal?" You see? And, "Somebody say this was your goal? Have you had any sensation on it at all during your listing with your past auditor?" Oh, well, that is just plain – plain awful.

You can slaughter a goal with the wrong Tiger Drill. Now, what you want to do with a Tiger Drill: just walk in on the goal and clean it up. See? Actually, as long as you're taking Tiger Drill buttons – it's Big Tiger that you use, by the way, at the beginning of session, not Small Tiger. On the sen side of the picture on this, why, you have three minimum and on the pain side of it you have three minimum. (I'll go into that in a minute.) But you want Big Tiger – you want Big Tiger. And you want that – you want that goal firing. And just remember this: that pistols that tick haven't gone off – they're not loaded. You want it firing. Now do you understand?

Now, how much is a fire? How much is a fire? How frequent must the goal fire in the three reads?

Well, let me tell you one of the things: You can work a pc up into an anxiety so you can get a rocket read, a half rocket read and a no read. You say, "To catch catfish." Rocket read. "To catch catfish." Half a one. "To catch catfish." No read.

Well, what's happened?

Pc is sitting there saying, "Did it fire?" You know? "Heh? Well, did it?"

You know, you say, "To catch catfish. The goal fired."

And the pc says to himself, "Did it fire?" You know?
Then you say, "To catch catfish," next time and he half hears you.

And he's got the goal somewhat suppressed. And then says, "Well, God almighty! It isn't firing!"

And by the time you've read it the third time, of course, it's totally suppressed. That's the end of that.

Then you start in again and this makes the pc very anxious.

Mostly what you do wrong – and this is pretty uniform – is you don't keep a pc genned in. You run a secret on the pc. You run a withhold on the pc about what's happening. You can tell him with perfect honesty as long as you put in enough hope factor. That hope factor is quite important. You say, "Well, we'll get this thing to firing. Oh well, we'll get it to firing. Well, let's brush this one up and get it to firing so we can get going here," see.

Now, take any of those frames of mind and oppose it to this one: "Well, I'll see if I can get it to fire. Well, I'll try. You know, oh - 'to catch catf-.' Doesn't look that good to me." [sighs deeply] "All right." That's a no-hope factor-a no-hope factor.

No, you keep it riding – even if it doesn't fire. Why, you know this is the pc's goal. The pc has been getting pain on it and that sort of thing and it didn't fire. So you say, "Ah, well, all right, let's get this stuff off of it so it'll fire." Pc sparks right up and gets the stuff off it and it fires again.

"Well, I don't know whether I can get this thing to fire or not. I had an awful time with it yesterday. And I don't seem to be doing very good with it." That goal won't fire. In other words, you can predetermine whether or not the goal is going to fire by your attitude of getting the goal to fire. Got that? You predetermine whether or not the thing is going to fire by your attitude toward the job of getting it to fire.

This isn't necessarily true totally, but it also applies in finding goals. You get too desperate about finding a PC's goal and the pc will suppress all his goals. So you want to go into it sprightly. You want to go into it rapidly, brightly.

And you just, "All right, let's get the suppressions and stuff off this and get this thing firing. Or maybe it is firing today. Well, let's hope; maybe it is – maybe it's firing already. All right, all right. Let's see now: To catch catfish."

"Mm-mm," see?

"To catch catfish."

"Mm-mm."

"To catch catfish."

"Mm-mm."

"What are you doing?"

"Oh," pc says, "I just had such an awful time yesterday getting the thing to fire, you know. I'm just holding my breath. You see, if I hold my breath just right, like that, the goal will fire." See? "If I don't hold my breath, the goal won't fire."
Sometimes you can say, "All right, now the way to make a goal really fire is you hold that cigarette lighter in your hand there back of the can. And that's a good luck charm and that'll make the goal fire." And sometimes it will. [laughter]

You follow your natural bent of, "What the hell are you holding your breath for?" Or even if you say it, it's better than nothing. But don't say to the pc rather patiently like they're a small child, "Well, you don't have to hold your breath to make the goal fire or not make the goal fire. Now I'll take care of that." And so forth. That's reassuring, maybe, but it's on the wrong side of the ledger. No, give them something that they will consider ridiculous or take seriously. We don't care which way it is, now. Do something effective, in other words. You influence the firing of the goal. You know that you can make one fire through all of its suppressions and everything else? It'll just fire – naked, all by its lonesome, right out into the blue.

You say, "Well, all right, now, I'm going to read the goal so it will fire. 'To catch catfish.' That's firing real well. Thank you very much. Now we'll get on with the listing." That would be pretty short, wouldn't it? Well, you actually, the auditor, determine how short that will be by your attitude, your strain, your worry, and your lack of assurance, and so forth – and your lack of hope.

You want that goal to fire. All right. Then have it your intention to fire the goal. That isn't because you make the goal fire; that's because you intend to take responsibility for its firing. As long as the pc takes responsibility for the goal's firing, it won't fire because the pc is sitting there in a total, "I've got to do something. I've got to do something. I don't know what I'm supposed to do." You hear every pc say this: "I don't know what I'm supposed to do in order to make the goal to fire. When you say this I don't know whether I'm supposed to sit here and not hold the cans, to hold the cans relaxedly, hold the cans carefully or if I'm supposed to sit up straight or so on and so on; if I'm supposed to think something, if I suppress something I'll suppress it, if I don't think something I won't suppress it." You know the pc's frame of mind is pretty ghastly right at that point, see?

But why? Its only ghastly because you're making the pc take responsibility for it.

"Now I'm take full responsibility for the goal firing. You just sit there and relax. 'To catch catfish.' That fired beautifully. All right, we'll go on into the listing session now." That would be the shortest one on record, wouldn't it?

Nevertheless, when I say fire, I mean fire. Any goal will rocket read. Now, you can't expect a goal to rocket read three times in a row if the pc suppresses the second one and cancels the third one. See? That's too much to hope for.

So therefore and thereby, your action in getting a goal to read is in the direction of effectiveness. Don't harass the pc, don't worry the pc about it, but get that goal to fire.

Now the pc says, "Well, I have a whole bunch of items and let's not fool with the goal today."

You say, "Well, all right, let's not fool with the goal today. Good. Then I'll just read it once and you just sit there. PR get it to fire. 'To catch catfish.' That fired. Fine. Give me the items." See?
See, you did what you were supposed to do. You would be surprised, if you will take responsibility for the goal firing, how often it will fire. And if you take no responsibility for it and harass the pc for it, how often it won't fire. You get this?

I'm just telling you some of the little tricks of the trade. This is completely aside from Big Tiger, which we will have other talks about and lectures on.

But, I've got to tell you that sen – sensation – this is the result of the pc being slowed down and not being permitted to list. And you can list a goal straight forward into total sensation. Now, I've already told you that. It gets to an all-sen proposition. Now, all sensation and the bank beefing up and the pc sick and nauseated are signs of a wrong goal when they're all present. But you can actually list a goal into all sensation without the bank beefing up and without the pc sick and nauseated. And when that condition takes place that is just knuckle-headed auditing. That is all. That's just preventing the pc from giving you items or being in-session. It's very easy and you can look for it.

Now, pain will turn off on a goal. Now, the way if – you tell if it's a right goal is the TA is moving and it comes down and the pc is cheerful and easily put into session, the pc looks good, looks young, there's pain on it, also some sensation, and the pc's bank is getting less and the pc isn't sick or nauseated and feels pretty good. Now, that'd be the signs of listing a right goal.

Signs of listing a wrong goal, of course, is the TA stuck up there at 4.5 or 5.0 and really stuck; pc ARC breaky, chop-chop, messed up; pc looks bad, looks old; there's no pain on it at all – it's all sensation; the bank is getting more solid and ridges are getting more solid and – outside and inside the body; pc is starting to get sick, nauseated; motion sets in – it's mainly motion – the whole physical universe starts going out of plumb and so on.

You want to know how it sounds? Just take some goal that isn't yours and invalidate hell out of it. Think of somebody else's goal and then go off into a corner and make a bunch of invalidative, critical, snappy, snarlish remarks about somebody else's goal privately to yourself. You can actually start throwing the corners of the room out of plumb. See, it's not your goal and you're gotten – getting overts on it and you can turn on sen yourself. I don't advise it, but that's – would be one way to find out how it feels.

Now, it's the responsibility of a listing auditor that he doesn't list a wrong goal. See, that's the responsibility of the listing auditor. You must not list a wrong goal! You must not do it!

So you get – this 114-line setup is very carefully squared away on this basis: because it's Tiger Drill buttons, you're getting a sort of a running Prepcheck anyway which makes the goal ease up.

Now, that's fine. And if you get the goal firing at the beginning of every session and at the end of every session, the possibilities of your auditing a wrong goal drop to nothing. See, just by the fact of following these rules: get it firing at the beginning of every session; get it firing at the end of every session – of course, it's just going to tiger drill out of existence.

Now, a goal that disappears without producing a free needle on the meter was the wrong goal.
A goal that only rock slams and you can't turn on any rocket reads of any kind is probably a wrong goal.

A goal that ticks only when it's protested – these kind of things – when you only get the Tiger Drill buttons are out, does the goal read. These are the symptoms of a wrong goal.

And you mustn't list a wrong goal. So therefore you must get a goal firing before you list. You get this? See, when we mean fire, we mean rocket reads. Now, those rocket reads will reduce in size as a goal is listed, quite rapidly. They'll come down to about half the size. A good rocket read is about an inch – three-quarters of an inch, let's say, that's a nice rocket read. Three-quarters of an inch. All right.

Your rocket read on that goal will reduce quite rapidly by reason of being discharged to about a quarter of an inch. You – but you still got a quarter-of-an-inch rocket read. It's not quite complete but it's a rocket read. It starts out very fast and decays very rapidly – the motion of the thing. And it strikes to the right on the fall side of the E-Meter. Rocket reads always strike to the right.

Those that strike to the left are just the reverse side of a rock slam. And you push them just – they're wrong goals always – you push them just a little bit further, they go into a rock slam. You push them just a little bit further and the rock slam drops out; they tick, you clean up the buttons and they're gone. That's the usual course of a goal which at first reading strikes to the auditor's left as he faces the meter.

But you actually cannot forecast whether it's the right goal or the wrong goal until it has been made to fire properly.

Now, if you demand that a goal fires three times in a row, exactly right, with the pc sitting there without much faith in you, holding his breath like mad, worried stiff about the fact that you may take his goal away from him, you're nuts. You're just expecting the impossible. Don't you see?

But one way to do it is to put the goal in a sentence: "On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" Well, it read didn't it? But just because it only ticks in that sentence is not meaningful either, because you haven't got enough intention behind saying the goal. You understand that? That's no sure cure, but you notice the goal is reading within those sentences – feel fairly safe as you're tiger drilling.

You'll see a lot of peculiarities about goals. But don't expect that a real goal comes up, reads three-quarters of an inch, right on through to the day that it goes free needle, all of a sudden vanishes then and free needle ensues, because they don't. The course of a goal is more or less this way: a course of a goal is not down to tick. The course of a goal is full rocket read and often, as the pc isn't suppressing or being careful or something else, you can tell it's a goal because it's got a nice full rocket read. You list a few sessions or a couple of sessions, and so on, you've got maybe a quarter – half a rocket read, something like that.

And then the rocket read starts to fall uninstant. It's kind of a slow rocket read but it's a rocket read and then it fires late or it fires early. It isn't firing instant anymore, you see? It isn't totally connected up with this goal. You see how that is? And then it starts degenerating and subsequent sessions – to a flick and a tick and a sudden rocket read that is maybe an eighth of
an inch long. See, it's almost undetectably a rocket read, don't you see? Just tick. And you run
an Instructor's check is the only way to tell it at this time. You got to make sure, by that time,
that it hasn't got any of these active buttons.

The active buttons that produce a read that looks like the goal read are the buttons of
the right. And the buttons of the right are: Invalidate, Suggest and Mistake. And also, of
course, with Suggest comes other things such as Assert and with Mistake, comes in Big Tiger,
becomes Protest and so forth. But you've got the three buttons to the right.

All right, they will produce a read and they can make any goal read. You say to some-
body, "I heard the other day that you had a goal to be an Odd Fellow and you know I think
that's the worst goal I ever heard in my life. A fellow who has that must be crazy!" You put
him on the meter and say, "To be an Odd Fellow," and you're going to get a tick.

Then you say, "Has this goal been invalidated?" Invalidate will tick. You pull the in-
validate off, read the goal again, "to be an Odd Fellow" and it won't tick. Were you aware of
the fact that you could do these things with a goal?

Voice: Mm-hm.

See?

Well, all right. So you have to be very careful, if you can no longer get rocket reads on
a goal – that is say it's listed too long – to do an Instructor's check. And you have to learn to
be glib. You say, "On this goal has anything been Suppressed, Invalidated, Suggested, With-
held, or Mistaken?" Get no reads on any of them, say the goal, "to catch catfish," at once – get
a read on it, see. You have to read it burrrrrrrrr – pow! Put the goal right on the end there and
get the goal – pow! Aahha-heh! You read it all during one line and the pc didn't have a
chance to do anything, and you read it fast enough and he didn't have a chance to get in there
and louse it up. You read it one minute afterwards and it isn't firing, you see? He's suppressed
it.

The buttons to the left are Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal. And the characteris-
tics there, most associated with these things is: Suppress is no read; Careful of is no read or a
rock slam – also Invalidate will produce a rock slam – but Careful of very often goes into a
rock slam and Fail to reveal, which has a small dirty needle connected with it – it's an instant
dirty needle, an instant tiny rock slam.

Now those are the buttons of the left, but they take a goal out of read totally.

And the buttons of the right put a false read on the goal when there is none or steal the
read of the goal. Got that?

The read actually disappears over here on the buttons of the left and a read can be
made to appear with the buttons of the right.

The buttons of the left are Suppress, Careful of, and Fail to reveal. And the buttons of
the right are Invalidate, Suggest, and Mistake. See?

Well, you wack-wack those things back and forth against each other and so forth, and
you'll do fine. Now early on, then, it's easy to get a goal to read and as the goal is listed, it
disappears down the line and you've got to be very careful to give it an Instructor's check. Got
to be able – you got to learn how to say, "On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed, invalidated?" You see, right straight on down across those buttons *brrrrrrr*. "To catch catfish," See. You got to learn to say that. Suppressed, Invalidated, Suggested, Missed – Withheld – because I've given it to you, see – and Mistaken. You got to be able to say those with no read on any one of them. See, there's no read appears on any one of them and a read does appear on the goal. And that's the – called the Instructor's check. You can always tell if it's a right goal. You get no read on any of those and a read on the goal. And that's actually, later on, the only way you can tell a goal. You've got to make sure there's no read on any of those, see. You can even be fooled by that occasionally. He invalidates it before you get to Mistaken.

But if you're going to give that check, remember to get Withheld, not Failed to reveal, and Mistaken or you can't say it in sensible English. You have to clean on your Tiger Drill, Withheld; and you have to clean on your Tiger Drill, Mistaken. Those are the versions that you can get all into one sentence that will make sense.

If you get no read on those and you get a read on a goal, that's the goal, man. You're all set. If you get reads on those and reads on the goal, of course, the read on the goal is the read you got on those and – on one or another of them. Or the absence of read on the goal is because Suppress is hot. You see to how this little cat's cradle works out very neatly?

The only way you can tell a goal that's gone along the line for a long time is with an Instructor's check. That's the point I'm trying to put over to you. There's a HCO Policy Letter form on it – possibly could be modernized a little bit.

All right. Now, the reading of the goal must occur before listing. And this will prevent you ever listing wrong goals.

Well, so you listed it wrong. You listed a wrong goal three days running. Well, that meant you tiger drilled it six times. You got it to read at the beginning of session, you got it to read at end of the session. By getting it to read at the end of the session, of course, you wipe out all the nonsense that might have occurred during the session on mistakes and all of that sort of thing and suppression on items. By doing that you obviate further Prepchecking on this unless the pc is really in trouble.

Now, a goal that ticks with a high tone arm – stuck. The goal ticks and the tone arm is stuck high. Well, you better explore this goal. You better look at this goal over pretty darn good. And you better find out what were the conditions of its finding. That's the first thing you want to look for on some spook line like this. What were the conditions of its finding? Did the auditor say, "That's your goal!" and the pc say, "No that isn't my goal."

Or just before the auditor read it off the list, the pc saw it upside down on the list and says, "You know, that's too – that's too much recent times. That's – that's – that's much too recent a time track area to be a goal."

And the auditor gets to it and reads it, doesn't pick that up and said, "Well, that's your goal."

And the pc says, "No, that's not my goal."
And the auditor says, "Yes, that is your goal."

And the pc says, "Huh-uh, that's not my goal." And, boy, you know that goal will read for months and years.

You got to go back and get that. See, you've got to get that Assert versus the Protest. You got to get the Suggest and the Protest off of that thing. That's a mistake, man, so that has to be big tigered out. You have to take it out with Assert and Protest. Now, it could be in reverse. The auditor says, "Well it can't be your goal because you're a woman and it says that the goal is 'to be a man,' and you're a woman and it can't be your goal. See?"

Some auditor, way back, and he did this assessment in upper Kokono County or something and it was done by an ex-PE member, you know. Now, this thing is really goofy.

And by God, you run across it in a session and then this is never uncovered and nobody does anything with it – you know that goal will read. The only thing weird-looking about the goal is it never rocket reads and it always ticks with the same tick. Or it always goes squiggle – with a little dirty needle. Squiggle. Bzzzzzt, bzzzzzt, bzzzzzt. And it never does anything else.

Now, a goal which is in solely by virtue of ARC break has a constant read. Real goals have a variable read. Got that?

So you see a goal that always ticks, no matter what you do – you read it to the pc with the pc asleep and on the cans and it still ticks. No matter what you do or how you read it, you always more or less get about the same read. Boy, you'd better be awful suspicious because that is not the way a goal acts.

A goal goes in and a goal goes out, and a goal rocket reads, and a goal ticks and doesn't read. And it does this, it does that. And the pc gets very nervous. And then you read it and it doesn't read. And then you read it and it reads. And then you clean it up and it goes: tick, splash, dirty needle. "Huuuh!" you say, "That's good. That's a real goal." You got the idea?

But the one that goes – always goes a thirty-second of an inch tick and a thirty-second of an inch tick and you say, "Oh, hell, this isn't your goal," and read it again and it goes with a thirty-second of an inch tick. And you clean that up – what you just said – and it reads with a thirty-second of an inch tick. You get the idea?

Goals aren't built that way. So the charge of "too constant" can be levelled at a wrong goal. And you get down to figure this thing out. Wen, this pc has listed it, suppressed items, done everything of this sort, has gone around trying to tell people that the goal must – this is actually a case – the goal must not be listed with "your" in the line. Actually the line would never clear; the line was protested. Every time the auditor read it, the pc protested the line. That line would never go clear until the protests were taken off of it. You understand? There was a "your" in it that shouldn't have been in it. There it was.

All right. An auditor says, "Well, I can't get this to go out. I guess that's your goal."

And the pc says, "What – I never even put it on the list. I've never heard of it before."
And then, of course, every time somebody tries to list this thing the pc said – tries to tell the auditor, "Look, this isn't my goal, I've never had this as a goal. It just came in this way, and I've just never had it."

And the auditor says, "Trying to chicken out." And consists [insists] on listing it, see. Hey, you know that confounded thing will tick and it'll tick and it'll tick and it'll tick but it always ticks the same tick. See how that constancy gets built into the goal?

Now, you – it doesn't take any vast Prepcheck to strip this out of the goal. Let's just get slippery, let's be good auditors. What do you got? You got a chain? You got a basic on the chain. What's the basic on the chain? First time the goal ever appeared to the pc's attention. When was it? What happened? Bzzztt-bzzztt. All right. The whole thing will rip up and it will no longer read. That goal is out. See? Nobody expects you to sit there by the hour to find out if it's a wrong goal. Let's get smart in our old age, huh? In other words, it doesn't take forever to tiger drill a goal, is what I'm trying to put across to you.

Did you ever hear of directing the pc's attention?

"What happened when this goal was originally found?"

"Oh, well, a lot of auditors have gone into that. And I always tell them all the same thing: It's not my goal."

And you say, "Thank you. Thank you. Now, what happened when this goal was found?"

"Well, I always tell auditors it's not my goal. 'Tisn't, and so forth."

"Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much. Thanks a lot, I got that now. Now, what happened when the goal was found? When was it found? When?"

"When? Oh, it was found last summer."

"All right. Good. Thank you." Got him talking. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Got him to answer. We'll take him right down to the ARC break that makes that thing read. Ha-ha-ha. They go bzzzzt – no goal. See?

Or if it is the pc's goal, even though the pc said it wasn't his goal, and so forth, it'll start rocket reading when you get the basic disagreement off of it. In other words, a goal can read by basic disagreement as well as by rocket read, but a real goal reads occasionally by a rocket read. Once in a while it reads by a rocket read – once in a while.

So you'd better see a rocket read before you start to list. Got that?

Now, as you sail down the line, one card at a time – you've got the cards all stacked up in front of you and your derringer laid along – oh, no, that's another game. You got the cards all stacked up in front of you and you got your pencil ready and you're reading off the line – now, the first time you go through these things take them up with the pc and... Doggone you, don't get in any arguments with the pc over these lines, because it'll act just like I've been telling you about the goal. I've been putting on the coal about how invalidation or protest or something can make a goal read forever. Well, it'll do the same thing with the line. And that line will never go free. And one day you'll get back there and by golly, you've got 113 lines
free, but every time you say, "Who or what would not help suppress a catfish?" the meter reads.

You'll have to prepcheck that line. You'll have to big tiger the line. Now, the best thing to do is to follow it down to the first time that line ever appears and you'll find every time, exclusively, that that line was the subject of a roaring argument that wasn't pulled in the session.

So if you get into an argument about a goal, let's get the argument off the goal. And if you get into an argument about a line, let's get the argument off of that line – both the right wording and the wrong wording.

Well, we had a pc around here for a while that went out and told everybody his goal was plural. And his goal was actually on the list as singular. And nobody prepchecked or nobody tiger drilled both the plural and singular goals because the singular goal may have been the right one, but that being the right one was the only one that was prepchecked or tiger drilled. Do you see that as an error? You've got to take both of them. See, you've got to take the wrong line and the right line. You've also got to take the wrong ...

Supposing the pc had a misapprehension. He thought his goal was "to secure elephants." He went around telling everybody his goal was "to secure elephants," when as a matter of fact the goal was "to keep elephants." Hey, this puts a bad mistake on it. He finally finds out his goal is "to keep elephants." Well, if you let "secure elephants" ride, you're going to have the goal line messed up one way or the other, because he isn't sure now. You've got to tiger drill this goal to "secure elephants" and it'll go out just in that much Tiger Drill. See? It's just out right now practically if you pay attention to this fact.

So you get into an argument when you're writing up lines on a pc and giving him lines and constructing lines and boy, you've had it. By the time you've added five or six versions of this line and tried to shove each one of them down the pcs throat and the pc has protested each version of this line, you have now six versions that will have to be tiger drilled in order to make the line go free at the end of processing. You got it?

So, don't be a knucklehead, man. You can dig your own grave. So just don't get in arguments about lines.

How do you keep out of arguments about lines? Well, you're supposed to sit down and compose the pc's lines, originally, in the first place, so they'd make sense.

All right. Look them over. These lines – the old lines, the create lines, the fifty lines, and so forth – were too hard for auditors to do. This has got enough lines so that a few inevitable errors that will steal into somebody's line is not going to louse up clearing.

When I say that, you're going to run lines five to eight on the – on the effect wording of the goal. See? All of you have been doing this. You've been listing those things as cause, see. You've been specialized in the cause side of the goal and never list the effect side of the goal. See? "Who or what would want to find? Who or what would want to be found?" And you'll neglect the "Who or what would want to be found?" And you say, "Who or what would really want to find?" and think you've got the effect in, see. It's not, see.
Well, you could make that mistake and it's still an answerable line and the line could still go awry and you'd still produce a Clear, see?

So I've built in a bunch of possible errors. But this one can't be built into anything. Get in an argument with the pc about the lines. Oh, no! See? You come to this thing and it's – you come to this thing and it's: "Who or what would goaling (blank)?" and you're running Suppress. See? And the goal is "to be" and you say, "Who or what would 'to be' (blank)? Who or what would 'to be' suppress? To be suppress. Well, all right. Yeah, we'll leave that in. Yeah, that looks all right." You've got to clear these things the first time you take them up with the pc.

Don't – you list a line – the first time you're going through these lines you take it up with the pc, then you turn it over and you take up the next line with the pc. In other words, you've got to clear those commands. You just ask him, "Is this line answerable?" And if it's not answerable don't get into a dog's breakfast on the thing. Make the changes he says unless it knocks the whole thing into a cocked hat and then delicately point this out. But, man that's delicate. And if you invalidate, run it off right there: "On this line has anything been invalidated?" You got it? Don't leave it sitting around because the line won't go clear.

Get in – if you do get in an argument about a line, tiger drill the argument, tiger drill the line – right now. Don't let it pile up because it won't ever list.

You say, "Who or what would 'to be suppress'? Doesn't – isn't grammatical: 'to be suppress,' so we'll put it down: 'Who or what to be suppressed?' No, that isn't right. Well, I'll take it up with the pc because I don't understand it and maybe the pc will."

Well, that's wrong thinking – you'd better take a look at that thing.

Many of you've turned sen on organizing some other – some pcs lines? You do to some slight degree, you know. It's all right – runs out.

But you can do anything you want to with a wrong goal except list it – on yourself, you know, I mean. You say, "Who or what would beingness suppress? Who or what would beingness suppress? Who or what would being suppress? Who or what would being suppress? And then we've got another line here: Who or what would suppress being. Oh, well. Who or what would be suppressed by being?" And then, "Who or what would be suppressed by being – no, that's the same line. Who or what would get suppressed if you were? No, that isn't right. Who or what would be suppressed? Who or what would get suppressed if you be?"

And you finally make up your mind to what it is. See? You come along and the pc takes a look at this – he's already wogged; don't give him too much of a one to run into. And he: "Who or what would get suppressed by be?"

"By being," he'd say, "being is right."

"Who or what would get suppressed by being?" All right. All right. We'll answer it that way.

The funny part of it is, you're not going to go too far wrong. You're going to go much further wrong if you involve it in an argument. Got the idea? Make it so that you yourself can
think of an answer to it without self-auditing on the thing. And then if the pc says he can't answer it, then doctor it up so he can, but avoid arguments on the thing because this thing is listing in wealth of lines. You've got enough lines here so that you've got a wealth of lines. You've got lots of them. Unless, of course, you muck them all up with an argument and if you do that, then he'll never go Clear.

Now, if you want to know why some line isn't going clear – 113 lines are going clear but, "Who or what would worrying – who or what would worrying be?" – that line, he's always had trouble listing it. "Who or what would worrying be?" He always seems to have trouble listing it. The line isn't going clear; the line is stuck.

You'll finally find out that you don't have to clear that line. What you have to do is tiger drill it: "Who or what would worrying be? On this line has anything been suppressed?" See? Tiger drill it. All of a sudden the Tiger Drill comes out and the only thing that was holding the whole line in was not the items left on it because they evaporated out from under it on other fronts. Yeah, the only thing you had left on it was a stuck line.

Now, at the end of listing, what happens? It's just lines, one after the other, go free.

What do you do with a free line? Well, for the sake of formality, you can ask them to give you a single item as you go by them or you can say, "Well I'm just testing this – see if it's free and if I get a reaction here you can give me an item. Is that all right?" And you read the line, but you don't press this on past a free needle.

And when they're all nice and free, when all the lines are free on the thing, another phenomenon should take – took place and that is, the goal should kind of go "pop." Pc will have some cognitions concerning the goal. If these cognitions concerning the goal never occur, the goal is still in.

"I thought it blew today." You will get so tired of hearing this from pcs, you could spit. They come into session every morning and say, "I thought of a couple of items last night myself. I put them down here on a piece of paper and I know it blew the goal. I felt it go."

You put him on the meter. The tone arm is at 7, you see. [laughter] They're always feeling it blow. Well, when it really does go, then they don't feel that it went – they don't. They'll say, "Well, when I was there – oh, I won't give you the cognition. Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh. I won't give you the cognition. You'll have to find that out for yourself."

Now anyway, there's the extent – the extent of listing and I've tried to give you the conditions under which listing should be done; what you're supposed to do and the purposes of it.

If you find out that trying to get the goal to fire at end of the session is too confoundedly difficult and that sort of thing, well for heaven's sakes, the next time you tiger drill it, take it before the date of the session. See? Take it since Wednesday if your session that you couldn't – didn't have time to finish really getting it to fire at the end of session – that was on Thursday. Well, the next time you tiger drill it on Friday, take it from Wednesday. See? "Since last Wednesday, on the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?" In other
words, clue the other session in that you didn't get it to firing and you'll have very little trouble if you keep this going.

Now, all the preventions I can think of are in this, all of the actions. The goal itself is very meaningful to the pc, very precious to the pc. The pc figures the wording of it and so forth has got to be very exact. But in the truth of the matter you can almost have 20 percent of these lines written wrong as long as they make some kind of sense and could get some kind of an answer and the pc will still go Clear.

Now, there's the Tiger Drill and tigers must be fed, so we have the rabbit effect. And the rabbit effect is, of course – the girls probably won't understand this too well, but the boys do – I mean, the rabbit effect, of course is – it's very suggestive because it breeds lines. See, that's why it's a rabbit effect. You got a rabbit. The pc is – he's had this minuteman – minuteman. You know? And does a minuteman fit here? No, it doesn't fit there. Now, a minuteman, a minuteman – he's always had this minuteman. He finally tells you that minutemen subvert. Oh well, give him a break, put subvert on the list. That's how you handle a rabbit effect.

Well, what would be the relationship of a minuteman to the goal so that you can't get it on the list?

Well, he'd subvert things. Wouldn't do anything else. He wouldn't damage and he wouldn't agree with and he wouldn't destroy and he wouldn't create and he wouldn't withdraw and he'd subvert.

Well, that's only when you get a spare item. Don't get inventive unless the pc gets in trouble. The rabbit effect will then take place and breed you out of existence, because it immediately and instantly gives you six more lines. One rabbit gives you six more lines.

You say, "Well, what does a minuteman do to beingness?"

"Well, he subverts beingness. That's the only thing there can be."

Now, I wish to call to your attention that a lot of old ghosts have arisen and that Routine 3 really is Routine 3. And this is all very amusing, but you're looking now at the reentrance of the Prehav Seale back into Routine 3. This is a bobtail version of the Prehav Scale and I studied the Prehav Scale for a long time to find out what buttons on it were important in goals. These buttons certainly are.

The most important buttons are, of course – are ordinary Tiger Drill button. But these buttons would be very important to run.

Now, you can change the sense of this by changing – by – well, take Agree with – Agree with: "Who or what would a rabbit agree with?" "To be a rabbit" is the goal. "Who or what would a rabbit agree with?"

And pc: "Got to get it off – got to get that – in other words, it's to – to – yeah, I can answer that. Who or what would a rabbit agree to?"

And you say, "All right. Well, give me a sample."

"Well, he'd agree to a rabbit feeder and he'd agree to this – he'd agree to various types of forms. To agree with – he wouldn't agree with anything at all. He'd only agree to."
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All right, use "agree to." See? Don't get involved in an argument on the thing – pc won't lead you too far astray.

Now, that's about the – that's actually – with the data that is in this bulletin, which hasn't been fully covered and the actual lines themselves, the actual buttons themselves, and a few other things such as your Model Session – just about wraps up how you do a listing session.

I have tried to give you the one thing the bulletin doesn't give you – that is, how you ask for them and what you do and how the Tiger Drill works and what – what you handle and then what's important about a listing session and so on.

There's only one thing I haven't said. I haven't said whether you bring the list into parity finally or not and somebody's going to be worrying about that. Well, if the pc goes free needle on all lists without you bringing them into parity, I am very happy. But your ticks will show you that a pc, if he's jamming, is probably jamming on these items that don't have any ticks on them at all. And the main ones that you've got to keep parity for are the first twelve. They've got to be in fair parity. They've got to be of somewhat equal length.

But you'll find out that he inevitably scouts "oppose" all the way through. And that line on final test on 114 lines for free needle, sticks. You can go through those cards and find out, well, of course it sticks. He never listed anything on it, so there's something wrong with it or he never gave you any items for it.

So you straighten out the line. "Is this line answerable?" you say to him.


Well, give him a clue. You know? You say, "Well, all right. I'll take that as an answer – nothing."

"Oh," he says, "that is an answer, isn't it?"

"All right. Let's give me some more," See? And coax him out and bzzzt and bow and bang and bang and bang and bang, and zooooom! And all of a sudden this hold-out line will go free – merely because you can see very clearly its wording and the fact that it wasn't listed very much, so there must have been something happen to it.

And at the end of clearing, which is the end that you'll be worried about, you'll find out those lines won't go free that haven't got anything on the cards. And there's something wrong with their wording, so a good auditor can take those cards and he can straighten those cards out and he can straighten those lines out and he can find anything and he can get the few items left on them. And he can actually take everything else out of the deck, except those few lines that didn't have very much on them; bring those things up to date and they'll go free needle, too. Savvy?

So you need that for your tally work. So that's the way that thing is put together. It's more complicated, perhaps, than you might have wished.
There have been people that since 1950 have been dreaming that they won't have to take any responsibility or have any auditing or get off any – I think it's to get off any with-holds – in order to get a Clear.

And somebody would walk in with a horse syringe and thrust it into the gluteus maximus, press the plunger authoritatively, and they would go "Whee!" and they would be Clear.

Well, I can call your attention to the fact that man has been trying to clear man in this way and with other things for a very long time and it has yet to be effective.

Now, even though this is a little more complicated than you would ordinarily look for, compared to a horse syringe and so forth, why, you aren't spared any of the difficulties that you would be spared with a horse syringe because the pc will scream on these lines, too.

Every once in a while the pc will let out a piercing little "Yeeeeeep" you know. And sometimes the pc falls out of the chair and writhes on the ground.

So what? You'll find out the pc will go Clear if listing sessions are done somewhat as I've told you tonight.

Thank you very much.
Well, this is the what?

_Audience_: _The 4th. October 4th._

Four Oct.?

_Audience_: Yes.

You fall into my bad habits. Four Oct. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

A footnote. No, I'll talk to you about it more than a footnote.

For a long, long time we've had dissensions and upsets and casualties and so forth over the past twelve years.

Dianetics and Scientology looked like a battlefield, you know. It's coming out of it. Things are much more even. Things are much more easily handled. Things are smoother, but we still have occasional upsets here and there.

I gave you an HCO Bulletin the other day that had to do with new Security Checks. I'd better talk to you about the use of that bulletin.

The bulletin, of course, is valuable in two directions. One, it points the way to a resolved case and that's the most valuable. And on the other fork of the road, points the way to peace and quiet while we get the cases cleared. And these two directions are highly desirable, but one complements the other.

Now, for a very long time we have tried to find out, very often in vain, what obsessed or ailed somebody or something – what was making them nervous and why they'd suddenly revolt and do things and cut their own throats and that sort of thing. And there are quite a few dead men on the backtrack, quite a few dead men on the backtrack – there really are.

And how'd they get that way? What had happened? Was there any international group that was closely and devotedly opposed to the advance of Dianetics or Scientology? And the answer is no. There are a few psychotic activities around on the planet that would be as antipathetic to the grocer's goodwill as to ours. There would be as many people affected adversely across the planet as ourselves if some of these happy philosophies were put into terrific use; political philosophies.

There's another one which says anything you have should be – if you are working hard – anything you have should be shared with somebody who won't help you. That's socialism.
That's a nutty philosophy. If you work real hard, then somebody else won't have to work. And of course, this is represented as "everybody will have leisure." Except those, of course, who are keeping the society going and keeping the leisure possible.

Well, this of course is dead in the teeth of even Pavlov. It's the non-reward philosophy, you see. If you work, you are fined and if you loaf, you are rewarded. Well, what will that turn mankind into but a bunch of loafers? You see? I mean if you – if you know Pavlov's philosophy of the reward theories and so forth – how to make the dog slaver at the right times – if man is an animal and if that works, why, this would be death in the teeth of it.

There are political philosophies about, of course, which are the extreme of this. And that is to say that one man should own everything and everybody else should be in total poverty. Now, that philosophy is highly antipathetic to the greater good of the people, too.

A capitalistic system where you have a group of fifteen or twenty people in a country… Well, Mexico: They're very rich in Mexico; they're extremely rich. But South American countries just love this philosophy – there's the ricos and the pobres – and boy, the ricos are really rico, and the pobres are mmmm – really pobre. And the gap is so tremendous. There's no middle class; there's no anything. And you're either a slave or a king with no gradient scale between them and of course that's a highly false philosophy, too.

And there are others. There's a philosophy of democracy, so that the mean opinion is valid. Oh, I don't know, you take a whole bunch of uninformed people and take the mean of their opinion and then say that that mean is valid and therefore disregard it and then do things and tell them it's their fault. That's democracy in actual practice, see.

It's the perfect mechanism to prevent revolt. No better one has ever been invented. It's a self-perpetuating machine that is pure idiocy – an American president – they put up two goons which you wouldn't let clean out your chicken coop – and you're told you're free because you can vote for one or the other of them. [laughter] And then if everything goes wrong it's your fault. See? It's a great philosophy.

Well frankly, all government, of course, is merely a substitute for the disability of a people. Government is a substitute for the disability of the individuals in the population.

In the absence of an understanding of the human mind, government becomes inevitable. If you don't understand what makes man tick, you inevitably have government. And you have as much government as there is crime, till the whole government is crime.

You see the logical arguments? They say, "Well, well, you need a government. Should have a police force. Should have this, should have that, should have the other things."

"What are you going to need a police force for?"

"Well, you need a police force because you got crooks."

"What you got crooks for?"

It's inevitable that if you have a police force you'll have crooks. That's been proved out time and time again.
A little town down in Texas proved this not too long ago. They had a jail and they had a deputy sheriff or two and they had crime. A little two-bit town – spit across the city limits from one to the other. By George, economics got so bad in that community or politics got so rampant or the town was so small, it was so unimportant, that they removed the police force. Well, they removed it on a gradient scale. I think they took off one cop and left one and they had half as much crime. Then they removed the other cop and they had no crime. There hasn't been any crime down there since.

This is an interesting look – because the game of cops and robbers…

Well, look what they do. They arrest a fellow, put him in with – association with a bunch of criminals that really teach him how in prison, and then after a few years release him, and on to the public again, you see. Now he's educated. See? Now he's got a motivator. Now he's really a good criminal. This is the way it goes.

And this is a – I'm not just being bitter about it – it's true. Police forces have nothing in common with public safety. Now, if you're going to have crime, you will eventually get some people together and they will say, "We will hire somebody to protect us against this crime."

And then you say, "Well, there's some enemies on the border." So a bunch of people will get together and say, "Well, let's have an army." Now they've got a police force; now they've got an army.

And somebody's house burns down and they say, "Well, let's have a fire department." And they go on like this very interestingly.

Funny part of it is, that police forces, armies, fire departments and so forth have, all of them at one time or another run on a completely private basis. There's nothing the government does that has not been done privately at one time or another.

Well of course, the more government you get, the less liberty you're going to have, inevitably, because it – they're not producing. The government is a non-producer and you get more and more government, you're going to get less and less liberty, because the laws they pass against crime apply to you, who in theory – honest – hired them, you see. The next thing you know, you haven't even got yourself anymore and you've gone the whole cycle of idiocy.

But there is no international group that faces Dianetics or Scientology except to the degree that aberration faces sanity. And you get an auditor in there and he's doing a mediumly good job of auditing. He'll still have a bit of trouble with a psycho; he'll still get clawed up. Now, he will eventually, also, come out on top even if he's just mediumly good. An excellent auditor of course never does get clawed up. And of course, as a group we are moving forward now toward a higher and higher level of excellence in technical application. We know more and more about it; we know more and more about the application of these things. You would be amazed how the principles of auditing work when used in life and so forth – if you yourself haven't had a recognition of that already.

Well, what's all this leading to? No, the only enemy of man is the aberration of man. There's no international group which faces Dianetics and Scientology and means to plow us under any more than any other international group would tend to rave at the auditor. It's like a
psycho pc. Probably one of their biggest objections is the fact that we aren't auditing them, something like that. Normally, by the way, you figure that with a pc and it'll be right.

Some fellow at a dinner party and he's clawing you up because you're one of them Scientologists and he had a psychiatrist once who he dearly loved or something. And therefore, you're a dog and so forth. Oh, the only thing this person is asking for is auditing. I always assume – well, he wants to be audited, you know. Chews me up one way or the other – well, he wants auditing. All right, wants auditing. Voilà. I'll give him auditing. And they always quiet right down, too.

The only thing they want is relief from their own misery and agony. Now, once you've embarked upon a course of doingness sort of thing, you're for it unless you do it. And in times past when we have not executed our commitments, we have been in trouble.

Now, there's somebody right in this room right now that was awful mad at us a very short time ago before some auditing was given. But the reason of the anger is the auditing wasn't given, although this was never stated by the person.

You see that? I mean, the person was upset really – they had a whole lot of representations – but was upset really because you didn't understand the person and weren't auditing the person; weren't relieving them from this misery and agony. Because they're miserable! There is no getting around that. They're in misery, man!

Oh, you've been there, sometime in the middle of a session you felt like you were stark staring mad. How would you like to feel like that all of the time – twenty-four hours a day? And not be able to sleep much on top of it? Well, anybody that could take you out of that, you would have kissed on both cheeks. But you would have shot, maimed and stamped on somebody who could have, but didn't. See, that is the thing that is never forgiven.

So once you're committed along the line of a service, you must execute it. It doesn't do any good to tell some pc who is clamoring around, trying to get some auditing that you haven't got time, that you don't want to. It doesn't do any good at all. You'll have to go ahead and make some kind of an arrangement whereby it gets done, not necessarily that you do it. See, you have to make some kind of a solution where auditing can occur.

And in handling any of these situations and any condition which I speak of tonight in this lecture are governed by that principle. If you do that – if you do that, you'll come out all right. You've got to make some kind of arrangements whereby auditing can occur.

It's very funny, but you would be amazed what a pc… Well, let's take it right close to home; very, very close to home – right in where you're operating right now.

You're aware of the fact that the pc is screaming. Oh my God, you're the worst person that ever lived. And you're the auditor, you see, and this pc is just screaming, throwing down the cans and now that's it – they're finished. You know?

Now, your automatic technical response is you got to pick up their missed withholds and that is very, very true! Don't think I'm saying it's not true. Yes, you got to pick up their missed withholds.
But, here is something that you may not have noticed: that if you just start auditing them well, the ARC break evaporates. Now, have you noticed that?

What they're protesting against is no auditing. Now, if you sit there playing it safe as an auditor and decide that you're going to prepcheck – even a case as advanced and as rather stable as having found his goal – if you sit there as an auditor and go into some long, involved Prepcheck that does no listing and you insist on this sort of thing and the goal is ticking – pc feels all right; everything's fine – but you insist on going through this long Prepcheck, which is going to take the next twenty-five hours... Oh man, I don't know how you're going to keep that pc in the chair. I don't know how you would do it, man. I don't know!

You might get away from it – away with it for two hours, you might get away with it for three, might get away with it for a session and a half. Then the pc's going to start nattering. Then the pc's going to start to get restive. And the needle is going to start to act up even though the pc is keeping himself well in trim, things are starting to go wrong. Along about the third session, ARC breaks are awfully easy to come by – very, very easy to come by. All you have to do is put your pencil down gently on the pad, you see, and the pc will scream like mad because you have slammed your pencil down on the bare table, see. This pcs going to make an ARC break or die trying. The next thing you know, you got the thrown-down cans, the rage, the yap and so forth and if still nothing happens, you are going to get just a silent pc.

But you don't recognize that at any time all you had to do was start auditing the pc because, of course, you were doing no auditing. You were doing an unnecessary, unneeded action. See, it's a no-auditing situation. If you want to know what makes ARC breaks, it's no auditing. It isn't bad auditing. It's no auditing. You see, auditing can be conducted in such a way as to be no auditing – as to amount to no auditing of any kind.

I'll give you an idea. The pc's got his item. See, you can do this in a Dynamic Assess... but I don't advise you to do this – but I can show you how to get into trouble, fast. Pc got his item, knows that you're going to go ahead and get his goal, tells you inadvertently that he has a pain in his hip. And you start running, "From where could you communicate to a hip?" See what I'm talking about? Pc would get pretty upset.

Now, look. Supposing you did that for three sessions? Oh, man, there'd just be no living with this pc. Don't you see?

And that will happen inevitably. You must recognize, whatever other factors seem to present themselves, whatever happens to be present, that there is something even more powerful than the missed withhold. See, you can put a pc back into session with the missed withhold. You can pull the missed withholds and it's a necessary action, and so forth, but there's something more powerful than that. And that is making auditing occur or making auditing possible. See, that is more powerful. That is a stronger action than pulling missed withholds. I'm not downgrading pulling missed withholds; I'm trying to show you how powerful this action is.

Oh, I've had a pc just say, "Awrr, awrr, awrr, rum, ruaung, rarwr, uruawr, and that goes down and it's just terrible and so on ouwr-ouwr-ouwr and you pompous ass. What the hell are you doing sitting there?" and so forth.
And just say to the pc, "All right, now, if you calm down now, we're going to go ahead now and we're going to run this process here and let's get the direction of your goal."

Not another word out of the pc and nothing showing on the meter.

I just want to show you you have in your hands pure magic. Audit. See, it is pure magic.

You also have something in your hands which is pure poison, which is a pretense of auditing, without auditing. Its actually quite dangerous to be almost an auditor. It would be better to be out there sweeping the streets any day. You'd live a much happier life.

The person who is almost an auditor, but who isn't and really doesn't audit, goes through the motions of auditing, see. Asks questions that sound like auditing, see. Get a meter in front of them and do things with it just as though they're auditing. Now, if – the pc will just go mad. Remember this.

Funny part of it is, the pc will put up with a relatively poor auditor who is auditing, but won't put up with an auditor who is going through the motions of auditing without auditing. So anything I'm saying is real auditing a person – real auditing. You would be amazed what a pc will sit through. I've skipped all rudiments on a pc that obviously had to have them run and gone straight into a Dynamic Assessment quite recently. Just – zip, bap, zoom. Smooth needle, pc answering up, everything fine – boom. You see. Auditing probably across the top of missed withholds, present time problems – see, everything.

The liability was, if I weren't me, see, if my auditing in that particular case hadn't been right straight down the groove and hadn't been completely effective, I would have come a cropper. See, the absence of the rudiments would have tripped me up. If I for a moment had looked like I wasn't auditing, these things would have all flown back in my face, see. Funny part of it is, is as long as an auditor is trying, a pc will put up with it – just trying.

But supposing you did something like this: you made a pretense of trying.

And the pc has gone wog, wog, row, row, row, and there's been a bad ARC break, the pc's havingness is way down, pc feels completely in apathy and this "pretended auditor" (the auditor who's pretending to audit but not auditing) says to the pc, "Ah, look around here and find something you can have." And the pc does. And, "Look around here and find something you can have." And the pc does. You notice the pc's doing the command. And then, "Look around here and find something you can have," and then walk out of the room.

My God, you see, it's like taking a man in the middle of the desert, you see – waterless wastes in all directions – and offer him a sip of water and he takes a sip of water and then you just pour the rest of it out on the sand. See?

Hell hath no fury like a pc not audited. You practically could dish a human being that way. See, if you're going to audit, you audit.

Now, all of these things, then, that I'm talking about and frankly all of the things you think you're having trouble with, are all resolvable by the delivery of auditing. Whether these things are political, no matter what dynamic they're on – doesn't matter – they're resolvable by auditing.
If there is a great Supreme Being sitting someplace, I imagine he'd be awful happy if you came up some day and put the cans in his hands. [laughter] Just think of what he's been going along with.

Now, therefore you mustn't fall short of being an auditor. Of course, the more technically perfect you are, the less mistakes you make, why, the better off you are.

You saw a pc last night – really got thrown a curve. I was really thrown a curve. I stepped on the edge of the E-Meter and the E-Meter was springing like it was about to leap off the stand and it was shaking on the screen. Did you see the E-Meter shake at the early part? It wasn't secured. It was secured so as to be sprung, you see. Well, now maybe you weren't aware of it, but it was the pc who made it that way. He'd set up an auditing room that couldn't be audited in. Don't you see?

Now stop and think about that for a minute. Think of what this was.

Here was the pc who had done it, had fuss ed up the auditor till the auditor gummed up the front of the session, see and starts asking for goals before he starts the session because this was quite surprising to have an E-Meter suddenly start jumping at you, see.

But look, the pc had an overt. Now, there was the liability in the session, not what happened to me, you see. See, the liability was the pc was starting the session with an overt. Well, did you see me clean that up straightaway before we did anything else? And it cleaned up, didn't it?

Well, what's the difference there? The difference is simply this: that pc has confidence in the auditor and also the auditor straightened it up. Don't you see? So there is actually no great liability to a technical flub if the fundamental underlying all of this is correct, which is: The auditor means to audit and is auditing. Do you see this?

I don't know. I think there are two or three here that if they'd been caught in that exact position with a bouncing E-Meter – the pc had placed it there; the pc now had an overt on the session – I think they would have wound up at the end of session with that needle still rough, rock slamming – everything gone to hell, unable to get in any of the end rudiments or anything else. Don't you see how that was, see?

But no, auditing demanded that it be straightened up before we did anything else, and of course, that was what occurred. I was rather, by the way, afterwards, glad it happened. You'll do the same thing some day. Just remember, though, don't… So you got flustered, so things went to hell, so you no more than sat down in the auditing room and the plate glass window of the room shattered itself in the windstorm and seven flying pieces hit the pc, you see. This isn't a good enough reason to have a bum auditing session, see.

The auditing comes above all that and beyond all that and no matter what happens you straighten it out and continue. And it all comes out all right, so long as you're auditing – so long as you really mean to audit.

That intention, by the way, is something that apparently can't be counterfeited. A pc can read it wrong sometimes. You'll sometimes see in some institution or another, some poor
devil cowering back against the edge of the padded cell screaming, screaming, you know, saying, "Don't come near me! Don't touch me. You're a leper!" And that sort of thing.

And you say, "Good God, what do I do now?" Well, maybe, perhaps these words will come back to you: You audit. That's all that's wrong with him.

You don't say, "No, I am not a leper."

Hell, the fellow's got some reality, even if it's a corny one. Don't Q-and-A with the no-auditing situation he's setting up. Put in your R-factor and your H-factor. Put them in. You know?

"I'm here to try to get you out of this and I think I can do so if you give me a little hand here and help me out. Now, touch the wall." He's already touching the wall. "Thank you. Touch the floor." He's already touching the floor. "Thank you. Touch the wall. Thank you. Touch the floor. Thank you. Touch the wall."

All of a sudden he says, "What the hell, I'm touching the wall. Hey, I'm touching the floor! Where am I?" He'll come out of it a little bit and look at you and say, "Who are you?"

You just tell him you're his auditor. Simple. Don't go into any vast explanation about it.

If you don't ever intend to see him again, don't tell him so. But if you intend to see him again, why say, "I'll be around sometime tomorrow. We'll do the same thing. We'll get you out of this if we can."

And the attendants of the place would be treated to some fantastic scene, such as: Nobody's ever been able to come near this person or talk to this person or do anything with this person – nobody ever has. Picks up the stool and tries to brain him. And next time you go, why, you're liable to see something like he opens the door a little bit wider and dusts the stool off for you. Never offers you the tiniest bit of violence. That's as long as auditing occurs. See, that's the magic. That's the magic that underlies all other magic.

Now, what interrupts this magic? And what basically causes the apparent revolt against Dianetics, Scientology, auditing and auditors? What does it? What mechanism of the mind is it? Is it missed withholds? Yes, but it's the biggest missed withhold of all. And it has to be a very special kind of missed withhold called a dynamic or an item or a goal. That's the missed withhold.

Now, the funny part of it is, that it doesn't matter what the person's goal is or his item or his dynamic. It doesn't matter what it is – remember that person is a thetan. And down underneath all of this, never lose sight of the fact. You can say that, well, "Ron's wrong. People are not basically good. Because look at that guy, see. Just look at him, see."

No, remember that word "basically" and an appeal to that person, directly, past all this wreckage that he's got strewn about, reaches and gets that thetan's cooperation. And when you can get that thetan's cooperation to his own salvation, you're in. But you can only get it so long as you sincerely are going to proceed along and actually audit that person. That's a necessary part of it.
Therefore, it really doesn't matter what a person's goal is or the person's item or the person's dynamic. You have there an individual. And the heartbreaking thing about all the crime, wars and upsets of the world is that they were not caused by that individual. They were caused by the misapprehensions of that individual.

And the most misapprehension of all misapprehensions is his considerations of the dynamic and item as a result of his carelessly postulated goal and that is the most there is.

Now, were dealing here with human behavior. I could lecture to you for weeks and actually say it no better than: "If an individual exists and can be reached, then anything he is doing wrong or does wrong thereafter is the result of his not being reached." And not being audited, in other words.

It doesn't matter what his goal is. It doesn't matter what his item is. It doesn't matter what his dynamic is and so forth. This person will cooperate. This person will cooperate. But the thing which makes it tough to reach him is, of course, his goal and the item which has grown up as his pet antipathy and then the dynamic in which he's included all the badness of existence. He's fighting against shadows. But these shadows are quite real to him.

So you're going to get into trouble, occasionally, with somebody, basically through a no-auditing situation, because of his goal. He has a goal which is antipathetic to Dianetics and Scientology, in his opinion. And the great oddity is, is you might sit around for some time and look at this goal that he considered – that committed us to being opptems and try to figure out how in the name of common sense it could include us.

You could see at once how Scientology would not make it impossible for him to attain this goal. You can see this at once. But he has never been able to. Through the various aberrations and difficulties and situations he has been in, in existence, it is borne home to him that you match up to his opptem.

His goal is maybe to audit people. So you're standing in his road. See?

Now, some other fellow has a goal to damn all practitioners and he doesn't consider us opptems. So it's actually on the pc's interpretation and his experience on the track which has determined the opptem more even than the goal. So you cannot predict, from having found the goal, whether or not you are an opptem or not. See, that's not predictable, given a known goal.

All right, let's take this goal: "To be happy."

This person can't be audited. Apparently you practically have to sit on their chest and feed the cans into their hands and tape them down because they're just all ARC breaky and nattery and the meter doesn't operate well and that sort of thing, any time auditing falls short of very effective auditing.

One day you come into session and you're a little bit tired and you're a little bit cranky yourself. You've been sent a lot of telexes or cables from a lot of madmen. Why, you flub, you know. You don't feel like going in today and doing too much along this line. You just don't feel like it, so you say, "Well, we'll take it easy today. And I think that – Ah, I think
we'd better run a little Prepcheck on the goal, make sure that it's right, and so on." You feel this would be pretty easy to do.

My God, you got this pc at your throat! See, it's just that much of a letdown of no auditing and the pc's at your throat, see.

You may even have done something that you couldn't even interpret as an action, but it was – if you'll go back and look at it, it was something that didn't add up to auditing – not in the pc's estimation; in your estimation, too. Now, you did something that wasn't auditing or that wasn't effective auditing. You did something wrong. You weren't – it wasn't that you made a technical flub, it's that you weren't trying in some direction or another.

You want to see a pc really get upset with you, get halfway through to finding their goal, consider it's too hard and sort of knock it off. Sort of try to patch the pc up so you can turn him loose.

Oh my God, don't let that ever happen to you! You'd be surprised. There was somebody here on staff finding some of the staff's goals. He actually made some progress. He was doing all right. What he did wrong was take on too many pcs. He should have taken one and carried through. Don't you see? And he dropped people with only a dynamic found or a de-tested person found or something like that and he ended off their auditing. And they all got mad at him. He actually wasn't very smart doing this, but there's what happened, see, and they were all kind of cross with this fellow.

No, a rock slamming case is one who would get a rock slam – this is a piece of slanguage that we have been using lately: rock slammers. What's a rock slammer? Well, a rock slammer isn't somebody you can get a rock slam on. It would be wrong if you assumed that. This piece of slanguage means that somebody who gets a rock slam when you ask them, "Consider overts against Scientology." And that broadens out, of course, against Ron, against the organization or against an auditor. And you ask those four things: Ron, Scientology organization, Scientology, an auditor and you get a rock slam.

Doesn't mean the person's unauditable. You'd be amazed. And yet they – such a person would consider you part of their most mortal enemies. You are an enemy. And their meter behaves weirdly when you try to audit them; you get a suppressed meter; you get a slamming meter. You'll probably misinterpret this, because you think that because you can turn slams on to everybody this makes every case one of these cases. It does not. This case would actually directly have to rock slam when you ask them one of those four items.

You just pick them up – I'll show you how you do it – you just pick them up, put them on the meter, turn your meter up and you don't open session or anything. You just say, "Consider committing overts against Scientology. Consider committing overts against Ron. Consider committing overts against the HASI. Consider committing overts against an auditor." Then on any one of those four, if this pc develops and picks up a rock slam, you got a security risk. It is that phenomenon which has made things unpeaceful for the last twelve years.

It was not any vast international organization. It wasn't even the poor old suck-chiatrist or the psycho-anal-ist or the psychologists. Wasn't any one of these boys – none of these boys – wasn't any government. Nobody was after you. It's just this phenomenon
amongst our midst that has given us a bad time, because this other phenomenon matches up with it. This – these people, by the way – I don't know, I can't give you a percentage figure, but certainly is never any more than 20 – usually in an organization would be around 10 or around 5 percent. It's some tiny figure. It's a very small figure.

And you'll be running a group someday; you'll want a "clearing co-audit." All right, let me show you how this works out. Clearing co-audit. You get everybody; everybody goes out and they find you people to be part of your clearing co-audit and you're enrolling people. You're going to teach them to co-audit and you're going to find all their goals and terminals. Everything's fine, you know, you're auditing and everything's going along dandy, but in a clearing co-audit there's ample opportunity for no-auditing to occur. Ample. Because you yourself are not auditing the cases all the time. So therefore, it sets up a little bit of nerviness on the part of the members of that co-audit. You're not doing 100 percent auditing on them personally.

We've just had a Central Organization go this way. I wondered what the trouble was in that area. All auditing was being reserved for a few members on staff and wasn't being given to the public.

Well, the place was caving in, man. The second I tried to salvage it, in the last twenty-four hours, to keep it from going bankrupt – and I do mean to keep it from going bankrupt – the most piercing screams you ever wanted to listen to and the darnedest lot of lies and balderdash you ever heard of blew off.

And do you know all it breaks down to? You're stopping our auditing schedule! Got that? That's all. They had it all stacked up.

You see, you get people figuring it out this way. They can figure it out so logically. They could say, "Let's see, there's only a couple of people here who can find goals, so therefore, the smart thing to do is to have a totally cleared Central Organization and then we can be an example to the whole public."

And the poor, lesser staff member, he isn't getting any of this. The doors are closed, see, on any of it coming into the HGC, see. Technology is going to pieces left and right.

I'm afraid society has to survive. I've had people in the past put up to me this: "Well, why don't you, Ron, take one person and clear that person and teach him how to do so. And then have that person clear another person and teach him how to do so," and so forth. Inevitably that person has been a rock slammer. That surprised you, didn't it?

I've unwittingly used this principle many times in the past – unwittingly.

I would occasionally put out a projected action and if certain people that I knew to be hostile to us immediately embraced the idea, I didn't do it. But if they fought the idea, I put it into effect at once.

It was a beautiful method of screening promotional and release ideas.

There were about a dozen of them in England and there are about a dozen of them in the US. And if you heard from those people that your action was bad, then you heard from all twelve. See? Then you knew you'd done right. I didn't know why this was.
Well, now get a little further on this. The American Psychological Association is only furious with us for one reason. I found this out. I found it out from a government-employed psychologist in Washington, DC, two or three or four years ago.

You realize we won't release our materials? Do you realize that they would hold on to them, too, if they had all our answers? That's the kind of remarks that were being made to me. Auditing would have solved the situation.

Now, we have several staunch enemies. By the way, what is auditing? Well, in this case it was just some information. All the information was available, but they evidently couldn't pick up pieces of paper; they were too heavy or something.

All they wanted me to do, actually, was publish some of our case histories in their national magazine in America. That's all we really had to do. I didn't care to make peace.

So in actual fact, it was I who kept the game going just by being so disgusted with them in the past. They would have taken these things. Maybe they would have written snapping, snapping comments about them. Who cares?

But they would have taken them and published them with the full graphs and everything else in their periodicals. They just looked idiotic to me and I was busy. But that was auditing.

Now, those people would undoubtedly rock slam on you or us, because those people are violently antipathetic to the principles in Scientology. Do you know what's basically wrong with them? Well, you get somebody out here trying to pass a bulletin and you've got them on the meter – you've been doing that – a lot of that lately. If you cared to follow back what their basic disagreement on this line of approach was, you would discover it was something terribly fundamental.

And you very often do this. And they pull up something fundamental – some basic disagreement they have with this line of reasoning – and the moment that that is pulled up, why, zzzip! And all of a sudden they can learn the bulletin and it's all all right. Have you seen this? All right.

Now, let's take this on a broader level. The psychologist has agreed 100 percent that man is an animal. That's inherent in the practice of psychology. That's Professor Wundt, 1879, Leipzig, Germany. It's not one of my gags.

Man is an animal. There is nothing – there's not even a nothing-nothing in his head, see. He's a collection of gray matter. And the gray matter squiggles this way and it makes him see and it squiggles that way and he hears, see. He's a meat-robot and there's nothing else present.

This is very interesting because there's an earlier fundamental, earlier than this, which makes a liar out of them. It's psyche-ology: study of the human psyche. And all of their textbooks start out by having to tell you they don't know anything about this and don't have anything to do with their definition of their own word.
You read their textbooks? "We have nothing to do with the psyche. And nobody
knows anything about it anyhow and so we take off – man is an animal!" – quick – like, you
know? And get in there.

You got an earlier agreement that makes Scientology acceptable to them. Argue with
them about the derivation of the word "psychology." Don't ever argue with them about
whether or not man is an animal.

You'll blow off their disagreement with us. They'll say, "Man is an animal. He is not a
spirit." When they say man is an animal, they mean a man has no spirit, so they have an awful
time trying to study what we're doing.

But that would be acceptable to them because it would be auditing. It would be clear-
ing up something which was definitely antipathetic and antisurvival to themselves.

The individual existed before the goal; just as the word "psychology" existed before
"man is an animal." See, the goal is later than the individual. The goal is less fundamental
than the individual.

Now, it is only the antipathetic goal and maybe you won't be able to see why, but the
person will have interpreted it this way, which gives you trouble in – organizationally and in
groups.

As I started to tell you a moment ago, there you'll be in this co-audit. Everything's go-
ing along fine. Everything is very smooth. You've got everybody auditing and all of a sudden
there's a complete mutiny. Everything goes bzzt-aauugh. And people are going to quit and
they're chopping each other up over in the corner and you can't… Where the hell did this
come from?

And you say, "Well, it's that Grace and Agnes over there. They're having a… And
Mabel, Becky and so forth. I'll just have to get ahold of them and pull their missed with-
holds."

Well, look, you can pull their missed withholds until you're black in the face, because
the biggest missed withhold is the goal. And one of the mad things you do is pull that person's
goal first, because that rewards the rebel. And you mustn't reward the rebel.

The thing you do is put them on a meter. And when you start enrolling a co-audit, you
put those people on the meter. And you ask those magic four questions.

And if you get somebody who slams on any one of those four questions, don't enroll
them in the co-audit. I don't care how scarce you are in numbers. Don't enroll them and also
don't throw them away. Now, you could convene a sub-co-audit if you wanted to. Supposing
you collected four such people out of a unit of fifty. Well, you've got a sub-co-audit. In other
words, hang the rock slam around their necks and they're not going to cause any trouble be-
cause you've as-ised it.

It isn't even that they won't stay with you. As a matter of fact they're much more likely
to stay with you than some people that don't rock slam against you. Of course, all the time
they're with you, they're trying to slit the tendon in the back of your ankle and so forth and
slip the ground glass into the cornflakes. They – somehow or other they'll get this emergency
call on the telephone – they happen to be the only one present – telephone rings, they get the emergency call. And it's a call that you'd better come down to the hospital at once because of… And then somehow or another – they're intentions always seem to be so good! See, they actually can't be detected, because a thetan is a clever beast. And they'll write you a note and they'll put it on the edge of the table closest to the sideboard. And then, as they walk out and put on their coat, it will brush off and fall down. And then they can show you that they did write you a note, but that it fell off.

You never can quite spot it. You're left with this odd feeling of "it isn't quite all right." And honest to Pete, you can go around getting ready to blow your brains out. As a matter of fact, you'll start shooting down good people after a while if this keeps on and that's just what they want. Now they've accomplished it – they've started dissent.

The rock slam. The rock slam will be dramatized by this person. If you slip up and aren't auditing this person very directly, then that rock slam is going to catch up with some part of your activity. You'll find out that all of the silly things you say you're going to do, they will agree with and make sure you do. And all of the smart things you were going to do that really should have been done, they'll somehow or another dissuade you from doing them. But you'll never quite be able to trace exactly how you were dissuaded or influenced. You'll probably think it's your own idea. These people are pretty weird.

Let's take a husband and a wife. The wife has always been good. She has always been perfectly good and she has gone along, she has done her job, she has done this and done that, and on the surface of the thing appears to be a little hero. And the husband, he's gotten so he drinks quite a bit and he stays out late at night and he isn't working. You get the two of them on an E-Meter and you say to the wife, "Consider committing your – overts against a husband," or John or Bill or whatever his name is, see, and see if she rock slams. And get a hold of the husband and put the husband on an E-Meter and say: "Consider committing overts against a wife," Mabel – whatever her name is.

I don't think anybody was ever as unlucky as to rock slam against his wife while his wife was also rock slamming against him. [laughter] That would be catastrophe, man. The marriage isn't likely to break up; they're stuck – but it would be pretty grim.

No, but one of those will rock slam against the other and the one who is rock slamming is the one who is doing the other one in. No matter how innocent it all looks, no matter how many motivators this person seems to have, that is the person. There's no question about it. That is the person.

You watch that. You'll be able – when you're called on for marriage consultation, things like that – you'll be able to use the principle there to great advantage. So she's insisting that he get audited. She probably rock slams against Scientology, too, see. That'll mess you both up.

Now, you can stay out of an awful lot of trouble if you know these principles. You can handle a tremendous number of situations having to do with groups if you know these principles. And you can understand human behavior, knowing these principles, better than you ever have before. If you haven't got your hands on the person's dynamic, item and goal, see – if
you haven't got your hands on it – you can at least say, "Okay, that person has got a goal which is antipathetic to this other activity."

Well, it doesn't mean that all activities are good and it doesn't mean that all the goals are bad, because goals are assistive in life as well as detrimental. They've given one an experiential track. They've done all kinds of wild things. Maybe a person can't operate very well these days in the sphere of his goal. Maybe he has an awful lot of hard luck, but delete that goal and you've given him back all the effectiveness in that zone. You've given him back his whole experiential track and that's not nothing. You've given him now the ability to carry it out.

Therefore, in an organization; in a clearing co-audit; in a marital situation or in any other group, you have a sure-fire way of testing the person who has to be straightened out or the person who is messing it up. It's the person who rock slams when that group is mentioned. That's the rock slammer. "Consider committing overts against." The magic words. You never saw this before, because we didn't have the magic words, "Consider committing overts against." We just said, "the group," you see; we just said, "the dynamic," we just said, "the item." We never saw the rock slam and didn't realize that the rock slam was a concatenation of accumulated overts.

Now, it isn't just one bad act that makes a rock slammer. It's trillions of years of bad acts that make a rock slam. So don't treat a rock slam as something that is light. A rock slam is very meaningful. It takes a long time to make rock slams so the person has had a long time to do suppressions. So somehow, sometimes, you have to tiger drill the thing that you were testing before it'll test. Yeah, you just give it an ordinary Tiger Drill, polish the thing up and say, "Consider committing overts against it," see.

Let's say we're trying to test for an aircraft company so we say, "aircraft company," you know. Then tiger drill aircraft company: "On this company, has there been – has anything been suppressed?" you see, just tiger drill. Clean it up and see if the person rock slams. But the action I'm trying to bring to your attention is, is we are without enemies – we are without enemies, basically. If we lose, everybody loses. And if we win, everybody wins. We're in that weird situation. A situation that nobody has ever been in before. Therefore it's a little bit hard to understand this situation. If someone were to cave us in and knock us out, they would lose. Well, isn't that weird? If someone is actually able to paralyze you as an auditor, then the person would lose. So let me give you the last one-two of the Security Check.

It's an overt act of an auditor not to pick up and pay attention to the rock slammer. Because he's letting the person lose and making it possible then for everybody to lose, don't you see? I'm not trying to hang you with an overt in that direction. But look at it that way rather than "This poor fellow is being victimized by us because he rock slams." No sir, he'll only win if you do something about it. He'll never win otherwise. Because he's rock slamming, as far as were concerned, in the wrong direction.

And that's what we have been facing and that's what we've been fighting for the last twelve years. The few isolated rock slammers that misguidedly wish to knock us off because they confuse us with their items, dynamics and so forth. And don't think that any amount of argument will make them go straight, nothing will make them go straight but finding the goal.
Wherever you see trouble in Scientology, you are looking at the action of a rock slammer. Wherever you see an organization creaking, wherever you see pcs being dispersed or co-audit being knocked to pieces – somewhere, mixed up in that, there was a rock slammer.

The way to straighten it up is to isolate the rock slammers. Don't refuse them auditing. Put them over in a little group, over to the side. Say, "Now, we're going to take care of you, going to fix you up." Give them some hope, because they're alive, too, but don't let them mess up the rest of it because then they never will get Clear.

Now, there's a sensible program for handling it. A sensible pattern as I think you will agree. That's what's been giving us our trouble. That's the only thing that's going to give you trouble. There you are. Of course, the greatest enemy of man is not man. The greatest enemy of man, of course, are goals which tend to condemn man and everybody – when straightened out – won't.

That's a very interesting view and vista, isn't it? So no matter how troublesome a situation looks, you look into it, you'll find the rock slammer. You solve the situation by removing them, talk to the rest of it, bring in peace to the area. That is the formula and there's something more powerful than any aberration and that's auditing. And you've always got that as a weapon.

Thank you.
Okay. This is – what's the date? The 4th of October, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number two.

Okay. Pursuant to what I was just telling you a few minutes ago, we had a little bit of trouble recently in California. Poor Chuck was feeling rather sad, so we chased him into the HCO for a check and sure enough... [laughter] – we slam.

Yeap. He slams on me and the oppterm is someone who won't duplicate me. And Ava slams on "Scientology" and "Ron." The dynamic is "people with a cause," and the item is "someone willing to wipe out victims." Now you see?

Audience: Oooh. Yes.

All right. Well, that's nothing particularly discreditable; it's all within the realm of salvage. You see, it must be well within the realm of salvage with Julia sitting on top of it. Because they already – they already got the dynamics and items. They're just within a few inches of goal. See, that's easy to do.

And down in Johannesburg, we'll have that situation well under control. But undoubtedly there was somebody rock slamming down there madly, and they let the organization go down and down and down and down. And all of a sudden I found out quite by accident that they were facing almost immediate wipeout financially, because the Saint Hillers that were there – there were only two – were doing all outside private pcs for themselves and were doing none for the HGC, so no clearing was taking place. And there was just a little bit of staff clearing going on and clearing was being relegated for the chosen few. So we're having to remedy this situation.

Right now there are heads flying. And it was very upsetting; it made me late for supper and I couldn't give the children their movie. But I'm afraid that's all the damage it will do. When you're sitting with a fistful of answers you don't worry much because you can straighten things out. But it looked grim there for a little while, man; it looked grim.

Boy, I walked in there this afternoon and you should have seen my desk – it was stacked high. Somebody has been very busy sending telegrams to practically everybody in the world to send telegrams to me, see, protesting any action I was taking to set the organization back together again. And my action was simply to put the Saint Hill graduates in the HGC and start clearing people for the organization, not privately, just to salvage the organization. And this is the action being protested. There it is. Not a very survival activity, huh? We fix. We fix. We fix.
But life can get trying. And the breakdown at that particular point was no auditor in the vicinity was alert to this Sec Check bulletin. And nobody had suddenly walked in and started putting people on the meter and say, "All right. Consider committing overts against HASI Joburg." You know? And they would have picked up two or three slammers in key positions and that would have been that.

Auditors don't realize that they live by the meter and that their problems are solved by the meter and their problems aren't solved any other way. There was a member on our staff in there, this afternoon, was telling me about solving problems but said he'd left his meter home! Well now, how could he leave his meter home? That seems adventurous, because he has callers all the time and some of those callers are all ARC broke. The proper action is not to sit there and smooth something out. But this staff member is learning and advancing and I'm very proud of him, because he did some auditing on the person, not argue with him. But he should have had a meter because I know there was another withhold. See?

You have every right to put people on a meter. Don't get driven off of a meter. And as far as arguments are concerned, there's no sense in having arguments. I told you that adventure I had in Washington. Well, they all work out like that. Well, what's the idea of talking to somebody for five hours trying to argue into them. Because look, I can tell you by experience you'll never argue them into anything. You cannot argue them into anything, except auditing. They'll accept that, bang!

You ever try to educate a pc over the top of his aberrations? Well, why argue with a pc? Now, I don't mean to give anybody any black eyes, because all we're trying to do is keep the show on the road and keep things together and keep things rolling and we will, because mostly right is on our side. We're not trying anything horrible to anybody.

You only start breaking down when right is no longer on your side; when you are no longer a companion of truth. And that is when your light starts to dim. And alter-is sets in and there goes the GPM, and it gets bigger and it gets bigger and it gets bigger, and there you are. And it's not always true on all planets that I come along at the opportune moment, [laughs] so I'll give you a little piece of advice for the future: Live with truth and thy light will always shine bright.

Now, the subject I should be talking to you about is listing and goals finding and all that sort of thing. But the thing I'm going to talk to you about right now is how to make a goal fire. And that is the subject of this lecture, whatever preamble it had: How to make a goal fire; how to find the goal that's the goal; when is a goal is a goal is a goal? Subject of this lecture.

A goal is a goal when it fires. Well, how do you get a goal to fire?

By finding it. And by grooming it up, and with good auditing. There is nothing as sacred to a pc as the arrow lodged in his heart. That is a jewel beyond price. It must be handled with a maximum of sacreodity. You just make a comment on some pc's goal sometime and it'll take the auditor half an hour to clean it off. It's peculiarly vulnerable to invalidation, suppression and other buttons.
Now, I had a big problem up to the demonstration you saw last night and that was that some pcs are more suppressive than others. And there are some people whose goals are very, very hard to fire and I thought it was a special button and it's not; it's a special action. We got the buttons. What we need is a special action. And what you saw last night on the TV demonstration of October the 3rd was a routine Goals Prepcheck on an item and on a goal. That was routine.

And I went off the TV demonstration, turned around to another pc, audited the other pc about an hour and a half, an hour and thirty-five minutes and made a goal fire with the same action as I had used on TV. So that's that, because both these pcs have been worrying me about not being able to make the goal fire. It's obvious it was a goal, but I couldn't make it fire. I was looking for special buttons. It wasn't a case of special buttons, it was a case of special action. And that special action is this Goals Prepcheck. And I wish to recommend to you highly this Goals Prepcheck.

Now, I will tell you how you do a Goals Prepcheck. You find out when the goal you are prepchecking was found and you go a month earlier. Let us say it was found on the 2nd of September, 1961. Obviously, it only needs August in the auditing command. So you don't quibble about dates; it's the month before it was found. Even if it was the 1st of September, you use August. You understand? There's not any point in putting it earlier. You just want to get before it with the month. Because somebody might have been fooling around with it for several days, you see, before it was actually found or it might have been ticked. It might have been written down on a list. It might have been this, it might have been that. See? So you just try to scoop it in.

Then your actual action that you use on something like this is to put the date of the month before it was found in as a whole date. It's just the month, you see. And you say: Since (that month), on the goal, (whatever the goal is), has anything been (the seventeen, now eighteen, Prepcheck buttons of October 1st, AD 12, 3GA Listing by Tiger Buttons, 114 New Lines for Listing and it's the one on the bottom of the page of that bulletin).

These buttons are as follows: Suppress, Invalidate, Be careful of, Suggest things to, Withhold from, Protest about, Hide from, Reveal things to, Make a mistake about, Assert things to, Change (or alter), Damage, Withdraw from, Create, Destroy, Agree with, Ignore, and counter-button. That last one made you look up. Counter-button – what's the counter-button? It's the button you put on the counter, of course.

All right. Now, to this you could very easily add Decided. And you would have a – you would have a very complete area for Prepchecking. If you were to add that as a line button it'd have to be – "would decide" or something like that would have to be in there, see? Be "Decide." "Who or what would decide," you know, "to be something or other" – whatever the goal is. "Who or what would decide to catch catfish?" See?

The counter-button is the opposite button to the goal and you get this from the pc. The pc's goal is "to sniff," and you've got to get the counter-button. What's the counter-button? Well, you're not going to get it anyplace but off the pc. So you ask the pc what would be the opposite to his goal and he says, "'Not breathe,' of course." Well, you never would have
dreamed up that it was "not breathe." But, of course, it is. So your counter-button is "not breathe." It's just – be that silly, don't you see. You run it.

You say, "Since August, on the goal to know, has anything not been breathed?" Makes sense to him. Get the idea?

Supposing his goal was "to fly." You say, "All right, what's opposite 'to fly'? You know, what's the other side of 'to fly'?"

And he says, "to flop."

So your counter-button on this Prepcheck begins then, it starts in – just goes on down the line – and finally gets to the last one as the counter-button: "Since August, on the goal to know, has anything flopped?" It'll make beaucoup sense. That'll be very sensible to him. See? Got the idea? That's the counter-button. Because for sure that would be the greatest suppression on his goal.

Now, supposing his goal, or supposing her goal or something like that was "to be a lawyer." What's the counter-button to "be a lawyer"? Well, the pc could tell you. The counter-button is "to be illegal." Maybe this is what the pc says, see? So your counter-button would read, in the Prepcheck question, "Since August, on the goal to be a lawyer, has anything been illegal?"

And they will tell you, "Well yes, there were illegalities on the contracture of the goals on session number so-and-so that I had with my auditor. And actually he failed to live up to the contract, because at end of session, why, goal so-and-so had not been attained and therefore that was an illegal session." [laughter]

And you'd be surprised. This'll make big sense – makes big sense to the pc. See? Everyone who has a goal has a counter-goal of some kind or another. But you just don't – you don't try to assess this thing; you just ask them what it is and you've got the counter-button. Supposing the goal was "to be sane." What's the counter-button? Well, of course, it's "to be insane," the pc says or "to be crazy." "Since August, on the goal to be sane, has anything been crazy?" You see? Got the idea?

And they tell you, "Oh, yes! As a matter of fact the most psychotic actions ever heard of took place on the part – the night of so-and-so and so-and-so when I tried to tell my friend over the telephone that…" And my God, you never got this off as a Suppress, you never got it off as an Invalidate, you didn't get it off anywhere, you never heard of this phone call before; and there it is staring you in the face.

Now, the way you run this Prepcheck is elementary, my dear Watson. You saw me run two last night, one on an item, one on a goal. I think you thought that was pretty easy auditing. Didn't you think that was pretty easy to do? Well, actually it was. It was very easy on the auditor. You just cleaned it as though each question was a rudiment. Fast check – just a fast check rudiment.

You watch this thing and you say, "Since August, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" And you say, "That didn't read. Thank you very much." And you go
to the next one, "Since August, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been invalidated?"
And you get a read and you say, "All right. That read. What was that?"

Pc says, "Oh, that was so-and-so."

And you say, "All right." And you're watching the meter, see, always on the meter. Not your Prepcheck style of looking at the pc, asking it and then re-asking it on the meter. Nothing involved; it's just a fast check, see? And you say, "Since August, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been invalidated?" And you clean that.

And you go to the next one and you go to the next one, just in this sequence here. (You can add Decide if you want.) And you go right on through down the line, include the counter-button toward the end and read the goal. See, this is not Tiger Drilling. Tiger Drilling is a working back and forth. This is more of a Prepcheck or a fast check action. See? Probably technically it should be called a "fast check." It's a goals fast check, but it would be too misleading if you called it that. Now, we'll call it a Prepcheck.

So, you come on down to the end and you say the goal, "to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish." Now, actually, all the time without nerving up the pc, you have been watching the behavior of that goal because every time you said it, you could see it. You see? And you will see as you run one of these things – if you don't clean cleans and miss reads; everything applies to this that applies to rudiments – you get right on down to the end of this thing and you will notice that its read is improving, if it's the right goal. And you start right in at the beginning and you run Suppress again and you run Invalidate and you run the whole sequence all the way over again and you test the goal. And then you go back to the beginning and you clean them all the way over again. If that goal isn't firing by that time – phooey.

Now, that is an action which can be undertaken at the beginning of a listing session if a goal is not firing well. You understand that? Yet action will make it fire because if you try to tiger drill it on the pc, forever and hard, the pc gets nervy because you haven't any finite end. The pc sits in for the long haul. The pc's perfectly willing to do this with this goal because it's sort of a long haul. He's going over these things. And you tell the pc why you're doing it. And he knows it isn't going to be tested until you get clear down to the end, so he's not nervy about it. That's too far away to make him nervous. He goes on down to it and by the time he gets down to the end, he's forgotten why you were doing it. And he'll come back to the beginning of this thing and so forth.

Now, I'll give you the next little know-how on this. I'm going to tell you some more about goals here in a minute – how to find goals and what they are all about. But I wanted to tell you this "polishing goals," because it's quite an important piece of know-how.

This doesn't sound like much of a discovery because it sounds like much of what you've been doing. But I want to point out to you it isn't quite what you've been doing.

All right. Now, here's the next little piece of know-how: You get down to the end of the thing and you run the counter-button, and you come back to the beginning and you say, "On the – since August, on the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?"

And the pc says, "Oh my God, why are you going into that? You went through it once!"
Well now, look, look. The reason the pc sort of blows up at that point is because they consider the answers on Suppress they now have to have been missed withholds throughout the Prepcheck, even though they didn't know about them. And so you don't put in your random rudiment, you tiger drill the button the pc objects to. And anytime the pc objects to your going over a button, you tiger drill that button. You got it?

**Audience:** Yes. Mm-hm.

So they answered Suppress like a lamb on the second run through. They answer Invalidate like a lamb on the second run through. They answer Be careful of, and Suggest — "Oh, why are you going into this!" *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh.*

So you say, "On Suggest, has anything been suppressed? On Suggest, has anything been invalidated?" You treat it just like a goal. You could actually ordinary tiger drill it. You could say, "Suggest" — it'll fire. Therefore, it fired, so you go over into the right-hand buttons: "On Suggest, has anything been invalidated? On Suggest, has anything been suggested?" See? Wrack it back and forth, left- and right-hand button. Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow. It's a fast drill, see. Just ordinary Tiger Drill. Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow.

It's clean now. You test it again. You say, "Suggest" — doesn't fire; it doesn't read. You say, "Fine. Thank you very much."

Don't go into a lot of preparation. Don't get a French cooks approach to auditing. They have to have out the pastry, and they have to have the rabbit, and they have to have this, and they have to have a watercress, and they have to have the knives stacked up in exactly diminishing order on the board, you see, before they do anything, you know, and this drives the pc nuts. You know what I'm saying. You know, you don't go through a lot of ramifications about this thing. It's just you — so the pc says — you say, "All right, since Aug... (he's been going along like a lamb) — you say, "Since August, on the goal, to catch catfish, has anything been suggested?"

"Yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow:"

You say, "Thank you, thank you very much. Now, on Suggest, has anything been suggested?" — or suppressed or whatever it is. The thing's going to fire, don't you see? Get what I'm talking about?

**Audience:** Mm-hm.

Do you know how bad this button Invalidation and Suppression and so forth can get?

A pc, today in HASI London — and some of you are going to laugh (those that have been listed on lines) — refused to run the 114 new lines for listing beyond line twelve. Said it was impossible, you couldn't do it and it was no good and you couldn't do anything about it and the auditor went — almost went up in smoke. Why? That pc must have every Tiger Drill button all smoked up.

So you do the same action with this, see. If they get — their Tiger Drill buttons are all haywire, you're not going to be able to do a thing. The only reason they object to Tiger Drill buttons is when the button itself has got missed withholds on it. So you just straighten up the button. Don't pull missed withholds. You pull the missed withhold, but you pull them with the
Tiger Drill. See? See how you do that? So that ought to keep you out of more trouble than anything you ever heard of.

So you start down the line, so forth, the pc says, "Oh, I can't answer this line! I mean, this line is absolutely impossible! 'Who or what would catch catfish?' I can answer things like that – but 'Who or what would catching catfish suppose?' No! You can't do anything like that! You can't suppress fish. It's already under 'suppression.'"

Your answer to that is simply a smile and a pat on the back and you say, "On Suppress, has anything been suppressed?" Get the idea? You can just ordinary tiger drill it. You can even go in as elementally as saying – "Suppress" fired. "On Suppress, has anything been invalidated?" See? Bang, bang. Bang, bang, bang, bang. You get the answers that have been missed and away it goes. You got the idea?

See, you could do it on lines. You could do it on the Prepcheck or anything else. And you'll find, as time goes on, the Tiger Drill buttons will become mushy and invalidated and upset around. People use them kidding around and that sort of thing. You'll find out one of them will go out this way, you see? You have to know how to put them back together again. Well, you can put them back together again in a minute because you can put them back together with the rest of them.

Now, some pc says, "I can't stand Tiger Drilling because it wipes out all my goals."

"Tiger Drilling? It fired. Has anything been invalidated?" [laughter] And it isn't an invalidative action to do that, because you'll always find one sitting there.

Now, they can act, of course, ARC broken if they have missed withholds in the session. So you always want to put in your random rudiment now and then when you do this sort of thing. Got it?

There's the crux of this situation. You can thank your stars that just before the congress party in Washington, DC, I came out of my room at 1827, 19th Street, Northwest, Washington 9, DC and saw somebody crying in the hall. And they were very upset. And I was on my way to the party and should have been getting dressed. And Reg, of course, he was already dressed, and he was waiting there impatiently. (But I knew my responsibilities, you see. [laughs]) And I dragged this person into my room. And I think I did have a pair of pants on, but I was no more formally dressed than that. And I sat this character down and this character had been telling everybody everywhere that she had been PDHed.

So with a blinding flash of inspiration, I took the words pain and the word drug and the word hypnotism and I just tiger drilled them. And this poor character, after I got all the charge off of those she still said, "But if I admit that I haven't been PDHed, then everything I've done to people, thinking I had been PDHed, would be an overt."

So, I said, "If you have been PDHed, have you committed any overts? If you haven't been PDHed, have you committed any overts? If you have been PDHed, have you committed any overts?" and forced her to the final conclusion, which sort of – it wasn't evaluative, it was processing – but she finally – she finally had to conclude that if she was or was not PDHed she had committed overts [laughter] and she felt much better after that.
All right. But that was a – that was a lucky break. Because I was suddenly faced with having to do something rapidly in minimal time and still get to the party and so forth. And so I spent, I don't know – what? How much was it? Thirty-five, forty-five minutes, something like that. And had all of those – all of those buttons, all of those words tiger drilled. See? And I suddenly sat back afterwards, halfway to the party – Reg had been waiting rather impatiently for some time – I suddenly cognited when I was about halfway to the party: Hey, you can tiger drill any word, you can tiger drill Tiger Drill, you can tiger drill any button; in fact, you can tiger drill almost anything! And it's darn fast auditing and almost any level of ease can do it provided the words mean something.

And Virginia told me that she'd been auditing somebody and she'd been tiger drilling this girl. But the girl was about – oh, I don't know – must have been twelve or thirteen or fourteen or seventeen or nineteen, but didn't have too much education and didn't know what suppress meant and didn't know what invalidate meant. So Virginia would make her go to the dictionary and look it up, and then ran it and was getting – was being successful. If you can imagine such a thing. Well, the situation here, is that Tiger Drilling is very useful and you should know how to do it.

Now, there are two types of Tiger Drilling. There's Tiger Drilling to cancel out a goals list until you get to the goal, and that's just ordinary Tiger Drilling and you wind up those. You say, "To catch catfish." It fired – ticked a little bit – so you say, "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?" And that didn't read. So you say, "On this goal, has anything been suggested?" And that didn't read. And you say, "On this goal, has a mistake been made?" And that's – that read, so you clean that off and so forth and you say the goal again and it fires again one way or the other.

And you have to conclude then that one of the buttons you just went over has now just been invalidated or something of the sort. So you take a pass over them and then you take off your Suppress button – you can't find any action on that and it isn't firing – you can't find any action on the Suppress button so that's it. That's it – that isn't the goal, see?

All goals have a certain amount of charge in them. And the thing has to be charged up somewhat to have an invalidation register. It isn't the pc who is – you see, who is making all that read. See? It's the charge on the goal that makes Invalidate and so forth read.

Now, I give you this as a little test. Take a phony goal, like "to sing songs." See? It isn't the pc's goal and there's no charge on it. You say, "To sing songs." All right, we're going to – we're going to take this goal 'to sing songs.' You read, "To sing songs," and you get no reaction. You read, "To sing songs, has anything been suppressed?" You get no action. You say, "To sing songs, has anything on this goal been protested?", see?

What happened? Well, for the goal to read you had to have a charge. The subject has to be charged in order to read. You should learn that about an E-Meter. Pcs don't just make everything read. You got that? The read comes from the bank. You'll appreciate that more when you see a free needle and the pc is cussing and swearing like mad and the needle just
goes on floating. All right. So naturally you strike a goal and you give it an ordinary Tiger Drill, just coming down the list. And this goal is "to mend pants." "To mend pants" – it's got a tick on it. You say, "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?"

The pc, "Yeah, I saw it on the list before you came to it. Read it upside down. And I saw it on the list and I thought, gee, that couldn't be my goal. Because it sort of amused me, you know. 'To mend pants' – that's to use artificial respiration I thought." [laughter]

And you get that off. Of course, it had a little, tiny bit of charge in it.

See? So you say – to even fire that way it had a little bit of charge in it. So you say then, "All right, to mend pants," or you can say almost either "to mend pants," or "Has anything been invalidated?" Don't you see? Because if it's still got an invalidation on it then "to mend pants" is going to read again. Don't you see? You understand that?

So it's almost up to the auditor whether he double-cleans everything he gets or reads the goal again. He saves a little time sometimes when he just reads the goal again. You understand that about Tiger Drilling?

Well anyhow, so he reads "to mend pants," and it doesn't read. And "On the goal, to mend pants, has anything been suppressed?" And no, not pants – haven't been suppressed, so that's the end of that, see? Nothing reads. It's gone. Well, there's no sense in doing anything more than an ordinary Tiger Drill with this thing.

All right. Now, let's get to a different situation entirely. We say, "To catch catfish," and it goes tick – same tick as you saw before. "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?" – tick. You clean it. "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?" – no tick. You say, "To catch catfish" – tick. "On this goal, has anything been suggested?" You clean that. "To catch catfish" – tick. "On this goal, has anything been suggested?" That's clean. "On this goal, has a mistake been made?" – tick. You clean that. All right. "To catch catfish" – tick. "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?"

Now, you'll run into this sometimes when the goal is charged and the pc knows it isn't his goal and wishes to God he never put it on the list. You some... sometimes it takes you twelve, fifteen commands to clean one of those confounded things up. He unfortunately puts on the list: "to never have anything more to do with Tweetie Candies." He's thinking all this time, "My God, this can't be my goal." See? And you have to keep cleaning that off as invalidation. And you do – you better clean it off, man. You clean it up; maybe you're twelve or fifteen commands deep. You see? Well, that's still by ordinary Tiger Drill because it's obviously what the source of it is.

Well, let's say at the end of about twelve commands you're still doing this kind of thing: "To catch catfish." "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" – tick. "What was the suppression?"

"So-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. Good. To catch catfish," – no read. You say, "Aaah!" "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" – tick. [laughter]
Well, look, you're now in for the only zone where you use Big Tiger. You shift your gears at this point because ordinary Tiger is going to take you a long time. So you just shift into Big Tiger on this thing. Anything that you consider Big Tiger is at the moment it is. But it's at least three buttons on the left and three buttons on the right and any other button that seems to apply. Don't you see? You say, "Now..." You're not going to leave this thing until Careful of is clean. See? Big Tiger could be distinguished as multiple buttons. And you're not going to leave the goal until both Suppress and Careful of are clean. You're going to make sure Careful of is clean before you leave the goal; Suppress is clean before you leave the goal.

In other words, this thing is firing hard enough to warrant some attention, so you just shift into this a little bit upper gear. You make sure now, that you get this thing tiger drilled well. It fires and it doesn't fire, and it doesn't do this and it doesn't do that. And maybe you're going to go about a half an hour or so on this confounded goal to get the thing cleaned up and get out of there. Well, you'll get there much faster if you're doing a Big Tiger rather than ordinary Tiger; that's leaving too many things by the boards. You understand?

You could almost – you've almost got all the buttons. There's probably more buttons here than should be in Big Tiger, don't you see. But you could use just those buttons at the bottom of the October 1st bulletin and you wouldn't go astray.

You can clean this thing and you'll get charge of it off and you'll wipe it up and it'll come back in and you'll get it out and it'll come back in. Well, you'd better use quite a few buttons to clean it up. But they're all played back and forth.

You're going to leave this thing – was, "To catch catfish" – didn't read. "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" – didn't read. "On this goal, is there anything you've been careful off" – didn't read. You say, "Well, all right. We'll leave it." Get the idea? Now, it's perfectly safe. If you wonder, why, read the goal again – it'll probably be all right. You understand the use of this?

So you shift from an ordinary Tiger Drill to a more potent drill and it'll speed up the length of time it takes to clean up some of these rough, tough goals that go above a few commands. You see? Just shift your gears because there's more of a chance that is the goal and therefore you want to give it the treatment; you want to give it special treatment. Otherwise you can sweep these goals off at one every ten seconds. You know? They're going off of that list at a mad rate.

You say, "To mend pants" – no read. "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" You see? "To be a cowboy.' On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" See? Nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing. Tick. "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?" – tells you, you know, "to be a cowgirl" – no read. "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" Out of it.

You can get rid of a lot of goals. And then all of a sudden you hit "to catch catfish." You know? And it goes... See, they look so innocent at first and you tie into them and they go like mad. Well, you just shift into Big Tiger. Thing looks like it's full of beans and so forth, give it the business.
Otherwise you're liable to clean it up carelessly and leave the pc's goal behind you. So that's a prevention from leaving the pc's goal behind you.

Now I will tell you a few minor things – a little heart to heart talk.

By the way, the treatment of an old goal, or the Prepcheck of a goal ensues after you have found the goal by Big Tiger. See? You know, this goal was staying in so you shifted into Big Tiger and you drilled it and it fires and it doesn't fire and so forth.

Your next logical action for that goal is the Prepcheck which I described at the beginning of the lecture, not endless Big Tiger. You understand?

You finally got this goal so you can say, "To catch catfish" – fire. "To catch catfish" – tick. "To catch catfish" – no tick. "To catch catfish" – tick. See? You finally got it so it's saying that. "On this goal, has anything been invalidated?" No. "On this goal, has anything been suggested?" No. "On this goal, is there anything – any mistake been made?" No, nothing, nothing, no firing pin is firing. "To catch catfish" – tick. Oh, man – must be! You see, you've drilled it for a half an hour or so.

But it drives the pc out through the roof to have endless Tiger Drilling. Pcs don't like endless Tiger Drilling. Best thing to do is to shift, then, over to a Prepcheck. But that's when you've decided that it's pretty probable that that's the goal. It's pretty probable that that thing's the goal. It sure stayed with the pc. The pc sure is interested in it. Gave the pc some somatics and so forth. Ah, well, this looks interesting. Now, let's go over into the Prepcheck.

So there are three degrees of treatment of the goal: ordinary Tiger Drill, Big Tiger, and a Goals Prepcheck such as I just described to you. See? Those are the ordinary – that's routine on a goal.

Now, I'll let you in on some of the facts of life. These facts of life have been troubling you. Pc has goal found in upper south Amboy. Auditor somehow or another can't be identified. Nothing can be identified. But the pc can be identified. The pc floats into your vicinity and this goal has been found on the pc. You've already been auditing the pc four days before this fact was suddenly revealed: they had a Goals Assessment in upper south Amboy and the goal found was "to wrap around the flagpole and spit." [laughter] Now, you think that is a very silly goal, and so forth.

Well, it doesn't matter what you think of the goal. This is one of the goals found on the pc. This is something found on the pc. It doesn't matter what it is, how silly you think it is or how unlikely or how likely or anything else. The likeliness of the goal has very little to do with it, with this simple proviso: that on some of these goals, such as second dynamic goals which have been misassessed, you have to work harder than you ordinarily would otherwise. You just know, that if a second dynamic goal has been found on this pc of which they would normally be ashamed, that the thing is probably just reading on a "Failed to reveal." And my experience with those, see – "to go to bed with eight girls at once," or something, you know – my experience with these things is there's simply a "Failed to reveal" is the only thing that's making them read. Even those fall under this same heading.

Your first action with this pc – now, we're talking about finding or proving out old goals or finding new goals or what do you do at the end of a Dynamic Assessment? See? This
is actually all mentioned in the bulletin of October 1st – what I'm talking to you about here, right now.

Your first action on this is to corral (1) every goal found on the pc, and (2) every goal that went out hard.

You make a list of those goals in chronological order, against the time found, not the goal's occurrence on the track. That you couldn't find. You make your "goals found" in the order of their finding or their order of their giving the pc trouble. Pc suddenly remembers that they tiger drilled on a goal for nine and a half hours, called "to prove things." Nine and a half hours and it finally went out, see? All right. It was never announced as the pc's goal, see? Nothing like that. You put it down at the chronological order of its having been found.

Now, you just take those goals right from the beginning scratch and you don't tiger drill them – you just prepcheck every one of them, just like I've given you in the beginning of this lecture.

And if one is still firing when you've run through the first Prepcheck list, you go through it a second time.

And if it's still firing the second time, you better find out somebody goofed. Somebody's bypassed the goal. Because the probability is that in cases that have been assessed, that is what happens.

The test is this: If every now and then a goal goes out hard on a pc, the probability is the pc's goal has been found and abandoned. You get that little rule?

We have this pc – and we've got one right here. Every third goal found on this pc goes out – you practically have to shoot her down with a cannon barrage. It's "to mend pants." They go down the list, they get four goals below the last one that was tough and now they start tiger drilling "to mend pants." And it goes on, and it goes on, and it goes on, and it goes on. And finally the auditor just gets all worn out because it's taking – it takes two sessions to get rid of every fifth goal on this pc. Now, that is a sign that the pc's goal – I've learned this, just for you – that the pc's goal has been found and discarded. That is a sign of that.

Another sign of it is the pc was very ARC breaky while finding chronologically listed goals three, four, five, six, seven and eight. They haven't had smooth sessions. The very probable thing is that it was goal one or goal two. You got that?

But very often they smooth out and are perfectly happy, and they tell you they will surrender the goal and you've made them cheerful about it all – very often that's their mood. But every fifth or sixth goal, they stop you by requiring the next three or four hours of auditing to drill this goal out – the next goal. You get down the line; it's "to keep store." Here we go, see, at the end of an hour we will be prepchecking. And then for the next three hours we will be trying to do something with this goal "to keep store." And it finally disappears.

And we go down the list four more goals and we have another goal which is "to take a trip to the moon." And that takes three and a half hours to grind out. Got the idea?
No, that's a symptom of the goal is already behind you. The goal has been found; the goal is behind you. Get that? Just take that as an indicator. It's not necessarily always true, I don't think, because I haven't seen it on too many cases. But every case I have seen that on or have heard of that on, the goal has already been behind. They've already gone by the goal.

Now, you take this chronological list. What do you do with this chronological list? What do you do with it? That's interesting, because it has to have a Prepcheck. Each one of them have to have a Prepcheck. You'll find out a normal Prepcheck on these things will take you from one to two hours, and you're better off doing a Prepcheck than you are doing a Tiger Drill because it'll take you less time to do a Prepcheck than it will to do a Tiger Drill, and it's more likely that the goal will finish up firing having done this Goals Prepcheck, see? And you go over those things very carefully; you go over them very carefully.

Now, we're talking about somebody, of course, that you've found sitting on the front doorstep and they've turned up and so forth.

Now, you could go over these goals, each one of them, with a Prepcheck and find the right goal. You could do this. But do you know it might be more economical in terms of auditing to do a Dynamic Assessment on this pc. Do you see that?

Because if you didn't find the goal, there it is. And the goal has been unburdened and so it's more likely to fire. You see? And if you're good at doing Dynamic Assessments at all, it might be more economical to do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc and carry the pc through to the bitter end, because you'll probably have to do one anyhow because they best understand their goals when a Dynamic Assessment has been done. But I'm not making this mandatory, don't you see, because that would be silly.

Here's the way you test – and this is just a test – here's the way you test an old goal:

The pc says, "Well, there was a goal found on me in upper south Amboy at one time by somebody there and so forth, and the goal was 'to catch catfish.'"

And so you say, "Well, all right." And they want you to take a look at it. Well, of course you'd be wasting a lot of your time and their time and everybody else's time if you didn't take just a cursory look at the thing – just give it an Instructor's check. See?

But that it didn't fire means nothing! Got it? Even though somebody has checked this thing out with an Instructor's check – you know, just done that Instructor's check and gotten all the buttons rattled off and called the goals three times... You'd be surprised how often that will discover that the old goal was the right goal, see. Well, go ahead and list it – you know, checked out.

But if it didn't fire that doesn't mean anything. You don't discard that old goal just because it didn't fire.

Now, you're going to audit this pc for blood, see? You're going to get right in there and pitch. You're this pc's auditor. You had better collect all of these goals that went out hard and goals that have been found on the pc and you better make a chronological list of these things, see? And if this pc has had quite a bit of auditing on the subject of, and going up the track a ways, you're going to find a lot of pcs like this. Maybe this pc's even had a Dynamic
Assessment, something like that, see? You had better go over this list and prepcheck each one of those goals in rotation and see if you can't get one to show.

Now, what if some other auditor has already prepchecked them all? Well, your action is to prepcheck them all.

Now, it isn't because the other auditor was no good but because these things dive out and recharge and do various things. It isn't that goals can change or anything of that sort. It's just that this is an interesting fact about it is, I have seen goals missed and then somebody -- and last night was straightening out four or five cases that have been in the soup around here for some time. And I went down and the answers were there plain to see. They were contained in it. But in actual fact, one of these cases had several earlier-found goals.

Now, let me tell you something a pc will do. We can't get the old goal to fire. We're not going to waste a lot of time trying to get the old goal to fire; let's go ahead and do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc. You're not going to spend fifteen hours trying to get an old goal to fire, you understand? Let's do some auditing. This comes under the rule of giving the pc auditing, see? Let's say you checked it out; it didn't seem to check out. Instructor's type check, see -- it didn't seem to check out. Don't spend too much time on it because you may be grooming up this dead horse and polishing his shad -- his saddle, you know, and wiping out his mouth and combing his mane and so forth. But he's still dead, man. No matter what you do to him, he's still dead.

No, your proper action in this particular thing is you check out the goal the pc had, you check out -- or goals; maybe there's one or two -- and you don't get anything out of them: Let's do a Dynamic Assessment.

Now, that's going to make this pc shine. Because by doing a Dynamic Assessment, you tend to pull them out of the horrors and ARC breaks of having had their goal knocked in the head. You give them new hope. That old goal will now fire better because they can understand it -- they never did before -- it didn't have any item to fire against. Don't you see?

But you watch for this -- watch your pc like a hawk: When pc do List 1, when pc do List 6 or List 5 or any other list after a Dynamic Assessment and if pc slide old goal into list anywhere, you take old goal and you prepcheck and you find that pc's goal.

Got into an ARC break with a pc the other day. The pc -- oh, this was quite -- quite rowr-rowr, see. I did an assessment as to which list. I do things like this once in a while -- read off all the goal list lines and see which one assesses and do that one first. You know? That's only if List 6 didn't have the goal on it. List 6 didn't contain the goal so, I assessed -- found out it was List 2. Naah! Pc -- pc say List 5. Didn't say List 5 on that little assessment. Of course, that isn't a very valid assessment. Pc didn't say List 5. I get assessment for List 2. I try do List 2. Pc ARC break; Pc very upset. You think this is something intuitive, something deeply buried, something that was hidden from even the pc. Like hell it was!

Then it materializes that pc has slipped -- old goal has been passed over onto List 5. That's why pc want List 5 done. You get that? A thetan may look agreeable, but they never quit! [laughter]
So, I just took the old goal and tried to make it live again and it did and that was that. All right. So that should be very fascinating to you, that there are symptoms and signs here. Pc keeps trying to shove this goal at you; you may think, "Well, this person's just trying to sell this goal." That's right! [laughter]

But now, I tell you what makes some goals stay out. And this you must remember because there's a double Prepcheck on all likely goals.

There is another Prepcheck on likely goals, that is: "In self-auditing on the goal, to catch catfish, has anything been (listing buttons)?" That's the Prepcheck that has to precede your date Prepcheck, because any goal that's been around, for let us say, six months, five months, two months, something like that, and the pc has known that goal – they self-audit it. Now, they may not just sit down and try to run all the buttons on it and run a full Prepcheck, but they do that, too.

But they might self-audit it this way (and this is self-auditing although they don't recognize it as such): They're sitting out at a car stop. They're looking at all the people go by, you see. And the goal is "to catch catfish." And they say, "No wonder I'm always so bored sitting at a car stop, because naturally there are no catfish around here; there are just people. Oh, that explains, then..." (This is busy, busy, busy, you know?) "... that explains, then, why I've always been bored at sitting around car stops and why I've always thought there should be ponds on all properties." (Busy, busy, busy, busy, busy, busy, busy, busy.) "Well then, I mustn't think about that anymore because I'm liable to suppress it – Now, I'd better not suppress the goal. Now, there you are. Well, there I've probably suppressed it. I wonder what the suppression was." [laughter] (Busy, busy, busy, busy, busy.)

And sometimes they just simply knuckleheadedly sit down and try to prepcheck their own goal. And you can't ever tell it is, because the pc has tremendous interest on this channel – in fact, on no other channel. And they can't keep their attention off of it. And so you get this: "In self-auditing..."

Now, if you want to keep polishing goals up you can add other things. "In listing, on the goal to catch catfish," is another heading.

In other words, you've got several headings and approaches.

But the two that are absolutely vital to trim up an old goal and get the thing going well is "In self-auditing, on the goal ________" and the other is "Since_______ (month before goal was found), has anything – on the goal (so-and-so), has anything been suppressed?" You have to run those two Prepchecks. You got it?

Now, there's the essence of old goal finding. And you may beat your brains out – you may spend six, eight, ten hours trying to get some old goal to read, before you turn around and start doing a Dynamic Assessment. And then you do the Dynamic Assessment and then the old goal comes back in and reads. And you say, "Well, all I did was waste eight to ten hours of auditing."

And I have now got through doing this now, often enough, that I don't think it pays. I look back on the backtrack now and it's getting kind of strewn with dead horses. I've had to learn what are the effective actions with regard to a goal. See?
The actualities of existence with regard to goals is the goals are tricky, Dynamic Assessments are tricky, the auditor first and foremost has to be a good auditor, he has to be lucky and he has to be clever. But we've got ways and means of making goals read that we never had before. There's no excuse if you're listing a goal right at the beginning of a listing session that is going one tick out of six calls – there's no sense in that; you should know enough about auditing.

And just to do a formal check is sometimes not enough; you have to steer the pc's attention, which after all is the action of an auditor.

You say, "When was this goal found?" This is before you get it prepchecked, and so forth. "When was this goal found?"

"Oh, this goal was found in July – July of 1961."

"All right. All right, that goal was found then. Now, what session was it found in?"

"Gee, you know, I can't recall."

Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh-oh-oh! Right there, right there – there's a clue. That's why this goal doesn't – the principal reason why this goal doesn't read. There's something wrong with that session.

Let's go back and find that session. Well, how do we find that session? We can steer the pc's attention to it overtly and say, "In that session that found the goal, was anything suppressed?" See? And tiger drill it with that wording. Got it?

In other words, you can do almost anything with a Tiger Drill. You're only culpable and you're only in the soup if the goal isn't reading. And you're only ruining a pc if you utterly bury and lose his goal so it can never be found. So anything that recovers the goal is quite legal. Do you recognize that?

But I've been working for quite a while here, working on these drills. And I've given you the result of that work in tonight's lecture and it should give you a very good show.

One of the things I must tell you is, you must never, never, never leave a goal lying around, that has been found or the pc thought was their goal, on and on and on through auditing. Because it's like dragging buckets behind you when you're trying to go to sea.

Supposing, now, you had – the pc had six goals that were found on him or stayed in hard, see. And you found out it was goal number two that was the goal and you got it firing beautifully. Even though it's a little bit distractive to the pc – you've explained to the pc why you're doing this – you should also give a fast knockout to goal three, goal four, goal five and goal six. You understand? You should at least check those things out and get the principal dash and smash off of them. Because they're going to hold you up. The pc's going to be unable to do them well. Quite interesting.

A goal half-found and butchered up which isn't the pc's goal, stops the pc from having that ability. It slows him down.

Supposing the pc didn't have the goal "to take the air," and yet it appeared on his list, see - it was on his list and somebody – it had stayed in hard and somebody tiger drilled it half
out and then finally found out that it was "to be an aviator" that was his goal. And we just utterly neglected this goal "to take the air." Well, for quite a while the pc will not be – enjoy going for walks.

You'll have to get along and you'll have to give it a couple of cuffs and smashes and because it isn't his goal – and he knows it isn't his goal because he's got his goal – it goes out fairly rapidly, but it should elicit some of your attention. See? You'd say, "Well, let's get rid of these other goals so they don't hang up and hang us up." See? Just give them a box and – with Tiger Drill and they seem to be quite flat and everything's fine, just leave them. Got it?

All right. You're not going to have any trouble getting goals to fire providing you're willing to take the time to do so. But a one-minute cleanup to make the goal tick once out of five reads – that isn't good enough. And if you can't tiger drill this thing (in an ordinary Tiger Drill at the beginning of session) into reading, you can always prepcheck it into reading. And if you can't prepcheck it well into reading, then by George, you'd better change the wording of your Prepcheck to "In self-auditing on the goal," and so forth. And if that goal is reading a bit better then, then let's move it up into the next category and say, "In listing on the goal ___ (so-and-so)."

And you've got many ways that you can handle this particular type of action, depending to a large extent on how the pc has handled the goal and how long the goal's been found, and so forth.

But getting a goal to read – getting a goal to read – after the goal has been found or getting an old goal to read adequately requires very slippy auditing. In fact, probably requires better auditing than finding a goal in some cases. The refinding of a goal is sometimes much more rugged than just finding one fresh because now you have all the hurdles.

I find out almost uniformly that pcs know what their goal was and knew at some time in the past what their goal was and were very ARC broke when they lost that goal. And if you know how to put that goal back together again – of course with the Prepchecks and the stuff I've been giving you in this lecture – you'll find out your pc is very happy about the thing, and the goal will fire. People do know their own goals. I would never give a pc a goal who didn't cognite on the fact that it was his goal. A lot of symptoms go along with this. Don't you see?

I've revived now, a lot of old goals. I'm getting to be a specialist in it. I'm getting to be more of a specialist in the revivification of old goals than in the finding of new ones. Because people who come around to me – I busily work my brain to the bone, you see, finding the new goal, see. And I've just got my fingers on this new goal and we've just started to tiger drill it and boy, is it going out hard, when I look down the list four below it and I see the pc's old goal has been slipped back onto the list! So I tiger drill out the goal that I'm working on and then I start working on the old goal and now that the Dynamic Assessment has been done, it now fires like crazy.

This seems, in the last month, to have been my lot. Pc after pc: Do a masterly job, absolutely clever, lucky, everything – just beautiful, you know. All set up for a brand-new goal. Obviously goal number one on the list. Perfect! It fits the pc utterly and then the pc says to you, "Do you know that that first goal is the exact ending of my old goal?" [laughter] Well, that's fortune.
Well, there it is. There's a lot to know, about goals and their behavior. This is actually the first time I've talked to you about it. I'll be talking to you more about it but in actual fact I have given you in this lecture the bulk, if not all, the things known about it – this subject.

Thank you very much.
FUTURE ORG TRENDS

A lecture given on 9 October 1962

Well, what are we here? We've arrived at the what of what?

*Audience: October 9.*

Nine October AD 12. What planet is this?

*Audience: Earth.*

Oh, ho, Earth.

Anyway, the general situation is that I was going to give you an extra week of lecture here, and then skip two, and then give you an extra week on the other side of it so you don't lose out. And take Mary Sue down and show her the Mediterranean for a few days. She needs it. Me, I've been riding around, doing nothing, you know, and so on, but she's entitled to it.

I want to talk to you tonight about a very strange subject – a very, very strange subject: Scientology, its organizations. Now, this is a strange subject – Scientology organizations.

There comes a time in any activity when you have to look forward to the shape of things to come and what they will be. Now, let us envision this as an activity. We do nothing cohesive, everybody just goes his own way, we have no central control of any kind, and people just wander out and process people and so forth; and all of this has into its teeth the combined efforts of people with supervested interests in making slaves. And that supercombined vested interest then pick us up, one by one, and throw us on the nearest dung heap, and we thereafter find Scientology being practiced with electric shock by the governments.

Now, just look at that, not as necessarily an extreme picture, but one which very well might happen. Now, let's look at the other side of this picture. The other side of the picture consisting of a well-unified, a united Scientology with sufficient international esteem, force and wherewithal, that somebody suddenly decides to use Scientology exclusively to electric shock the Chinese to make them work on the farm and collectivize it all, and we sneeze and they fold up.

Now, Scientology would go the way of many other good things unless some thought is put upon its future. Buddhism went its way, collectively, and actually wound up enslaving people. Bum show. The East, the paralysis of the East, the fatalism of the East, and so forth, are as attributable to Buddhism as to any other single item. I don't know what Gautama Siddhartha said, but I sure know that people have been saying since, "If you just sat and regarded your navel for enough years and did nothing, you would become part of nirvana." And nirvana, as far as I can figure out, is the GPM. Well, just see a picture of it. It looks like a human
being surrounded with a lot of little valences. Nirvana. Look at pic – look at a Buddhist picture of nirvana sometime, and you got the GPM – bang.

So, they eventually found out how to put people into the GPM. And all kinds of squirrel, offbeat offshoots like Zen Buddhism – "If you know the answer, I hit you; if you don't know the answer, I hit you; because force is knowingness and never the twain shall be separated." Well, isn't that the way it must be? I don't know if you're acquainted with Zen Buddhism, but after you've done a tremendous amount of study on the subject, you finally can make up your mind that if you're hit, you know. That's the end product.

Now, Lamaism, with ghosts and devils and more GPMs, splintered off from Buddhism, everybody went into apathy, and there it went. Of course, they didn't have the technology. I just say that very advisably. The East has never known how to do it. That I can tell you out of the depths of my own experience.

I can show you an Indian rope trick, the small boy going up the pole. I can do it. Hypnotize the lot of you; you'd see most anything. Never did anybody any good. Anybody wants to dramatize Axiom 10, by all means dramatize Axiom 10. But there's a point where even that catches up with them. Indian rope trick is mass hypnotism.

The last fun I ever got out of mass hypnotism was hypnotizing the staff of Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington. I don't know if I ever told you that story. I needn't bother to now. But this, this is all nonsense. They didn't have the technology in the East, they have never had the technology. They knew a few answers. And they all wound up in the soup.

So this is the first time on this planet, certainly – and I think the first time in this universe – when there's ever been a kickback against the ignorance, when man's – or sentient beings were capable of bettering themselves without worsening somebody else. Scientology is peculiar and unique. It is the game in which everybody wins. That's very peculiar. That's very unique. If somebody were to fight Scientology, and win over Scientology, then everybody would lose, including that person.

Now, any time you ascend above the level of games condition and get out of that mire, this other thing takes place. And that's what we're looking at. We're looking at a tremendous amount of force, which is not the kind of force that you put behind bullets and in ballistics. It is the force of reason. It is the force of knowingness. You might say – to use a Scientology phrase – it's theta.

And you're used to seeing a man who was being good all of his life get sat on, hard, and squashed. You're used to seeing this example in this universe. This fellow was good, and he got clobbered. And this grasshopper was being a good grasshopper and somebody squashed him. And this bird was being a good bird, and somebody throttled him. And it begins to look after a while that goodness is not a force. It begins to look after a while that goodness is weak, and that evil is strong. And of course, that's the lesson which this universe would love to impart.

It doesn't happen to be a true lesson. Evil is not strong, it is weak.

Let me give you an example: Once upon a time there was a Central Organization. I saw that it was failing, financially, and realized suddenly that it was not giving service to the
public – not giving service to the public. It was using the technology of Scientology internally on a favored few. And not giving service to the public, of course, it was failing in all directions, because the one thing you daren't do is not audit. It must audit. This organization, if it's there, it must give service. It's its only reason for being. Everybody was about to get very mad at this organization if it had gone very much further. It would have probably gone bankrupt.

So I was apprised of this very suddenly and also apprised of the fact that this organization had failed to file certain papers with the government; there were a great many administrative omissions. And so I sent them a cable. And I put the Association Secretary of that organization into the HGC to find goals on HGC pcs because the HGC was all stacked up with people for their goals to be found, you see. Had long lists of people, but of course they couldn't do anything about it because there was nobody there to find goals. Took the staff clearing auditor, put that person into the HGC to find goals. (They were both Saint Hill graduates; that was all there was there.) Told them to start finding people's goals and turn in the proper reports into the government.

This happens to be the entire length and extent of the perception and the directions given to counteract it. Are those unwise orders? I don't think you would think so. Perfectly reasonable orders. "Just get busy and give some service, and you'll be solvent, and everything will be fine." See? But no, no. No, no. Evil must triumph.

Somebody there sent out a whole string of telegrams to everybody they could lay their hands on to cable me as to how these orders and directions were all bad and couldn't be obeyed, and that they were about to follow anything I told them to do, except what I directed them to do. Something like that. They're perfectly faithful to me and were perfectly willing to follow my orders, while not having followed any of my orders for some time.

Well, I know what I'm doing. That was a perfectly valid direction with a perfectly valid goal in the end in view. And exactly what happened? I'm not setting this up as anything in the way of anything that I personally can do it. Get off that line. I mean, I'm just talking about a theta communication, you see. They're told to start clearing the public – which is a very theta action, I think you would agree – and to straighten it out and turn in the accounts and things like that they were supposed to turn in. That's all they were told to do, you see?

And then somebody sends out telegrams in all directions, tries to get everybody excited as to how this is the most terrible and awful thing that could possibly happen to them, and drags somebody else into it – who wasn't even part of this picture, by the way, and who was going to stay down clear at the other end of the continent, just because you had to have somebody to wear that hat while this organization straightened itself out.

And honest to Pete, the explosion is something to behold! I every now and then... I got ahold of this in 1950. There was somebody cutting a line in the New Jersey organization. Somebody cutting a line. You can always derive power by taking a theta line and tapping it and holding it up, don't you see. There's always a certain amount of power residual in the line and can be transferred to the person, you see, by tapping this line and blocking it. But at that time, knowing pretty well the mechanics of this situation, I made a remark to some of the auditors around that, by golly, that was just about the most adventurous thing for anybody to do.
I had ever heard of. And I said the end product would be that the guy will explode and spatter all over the landscape.

I actually didn't take any action. Believe me, I took no action of any kind whatsoever. And a few weeks later this guy spattered all over the landscape. It was just a pale pink mist. Nobody did anything to him, you understand.

What I'm talking about is the mechanics of the situation. These have intrigued me for more than a dozen years. Somebody tries to stop a theta line, or buck a theta line, and the resultant explosion is something fantastic. Now, so far as anybody knows at this exact moment of reporting, all is in order down there, all these orders are being carried out – the exact orders which I gave you – everything is smoothing out like mad. But the jolt is what I'm talking about. Because of the slowness of surface and air mail, letters concerning this explosion are beginning to land in other places, and some people are quite sh... were quite shaken up getting reports of what happened, you see. But in actual fact, the explosion occurred. It wasn't that I said this line. You get the idea? I'm not telling you that. But those were just very valid actions. See, they're very valid actions: Clear the public, and file your account statements, see. Very valid orders.

And somebody tried to horse them up and throw red herrings around, and mess it up, and tried to stop those orders from occurring and, honest to Pete, the explosion was fantastic. Wasn't even an experiment on my part; it's something I count on. And it occurs. That if something like that, something very sensible, that somebody is asked to do – if they don't do it, something happens, something weird happens. There's a funny magic concerning this sort of thing.

Now, how would an organization get in that shape in the first place? By individuation. An organization pulls off a few overts, pulls off a few more overts – I don't mean pulls them off, I mean it commits them – commits a few more overts, and gets into a bit of a games condition with other organizations around, and the next thing you know, starts considering itself something strange and different. And it can't talk well anymore, and it can't communicate well anymore, and it can't function or perform anymore.

Now, this cycle of individuation by overt is a very interesting phenomenon. It is amongst you. You see this, you see this every day. On a casual walk through a town, you will see examples of individuation by overts. Overts, of course, are normally followed by withholds. That is the still after the confusion. All a withhold is, is the still after the confusion. There is the confusion, which is followed by the still. So you've got the stable datum is – very likely to be, much of the time, whatever somebody happened to think after the fighting was over, see. Not necessarily the thing that held it all straight at all. But it is – you get an apperancy that it is a stable datum.

Well, let's take this battle has been going on, and all of a sudden, accidentally, why, a cavalry horse rides across the scene and trips over into a machine gun nest and wipes it out. And the other side says, "You know," he says to the fellows around him – all the shooting's over, you see; it's awful qui – awful quiet all of a sudden, and he says, "By golly, you know, that must have been by divine intervention. Some hidden hand must have directed that cavalry
horse across the battlefield and dumped him into that machine gun nest, you see, to obliterate it all."

Now, if you look on this, it's a hell of an overt against the cavalry horse to go dropping him in on top of machine gun nests, and all sorts of things. How about the cavalry horse's rider? He must have gotten shot and messed up some place or other. We look around here, we find really nothing but overts, and we don't find any divine intervention involved with it. I don't think God would muddy his hands up with that kind of thing, see, if you subscribe to the Big Thetan theory.

But here's this point. The other fellows around this soldier, as the years go on, they look back at that battle and they're all at this still stuck point: See, "We won the battle by divine intervention." They can invent all kinds of fancy stories as to how divine intervention divined at that particular moment, you know. It materialized in the sky, forty feet tall, you see, and all kinds of odd things occurred right at that exact moment. And all these things happened. And we get stories coming out of wars, time after time after time, which are the most miraculous things you ever listened to.

Well, there's one fellow said that religion had saved him, and he had been saved utterly in the war, and he carried around with him a little YMCA Bible. And a slug had gone into it and torn halfway through it and had stopped just before it entered — or exited from the Bible, you see, and shot him in the heart. And obviously his life had been saved by the Bible, don't you see? You can see it now: This guy — big state of shock, he's in a state of withhold, he's in a state of "what happened?" And he reaches, you know, to feel the blood, and he pulls out the Bible, and he looks at it, and it — you know, there it is. This is the quiet moment. Well, that one will tend to stick, don't you see? That sticks the incident, right there nicely. Tsk!

Well, the story is perfectly all right except I knew a sailor one time who collected pornographic pictures, and he had a… [laughter] So you see his still after that! [laughter]

Ah, well, anyway. That's rather risque and bawdy and blasphemous and that sort of thing. Anyway, the only point I'm trying to bring in here is you get the overt followed by the withhold. And the withhold becomes an action. That is, it becomes dramatized. It becomes a source of action. That sounds very funny. But it's the withhold that becomes the source of action, not the overt. Very peculiar anatomy.

I'll show you how that happens: Bill shoots Joe, and then doesn't tell the police. Now, the way that happened was, is he fired the shot, Bill fell dead, and he thought immediately afterwards (his rage now evaporating, you see), he said, "My God, what have I done? I mustn't tell the police." So this becomes a monitoring datum. See, shooting Bill doesn't really become the monitoring datum, but not telling the police does. He doesn't necessarily dramatize, you see, the killing. What he does dramatize is not telling the police.

So now he's not sure what he mustn't tell the police as time goes on, and he begins to imagine that he's guilty of many things. And in order to get rid of the source of pronouncement of his guilt, he will then commit many more overts. And each time he commits one of these overts — do you see the substance of "I mustn't tell the police" — he might as well have said, "I am different than and distinct from the police." See, he's made a declaration of individuation.
Now, in actual fact, in the field of action, he mustn't be Bill. Bill is full of holes, bleeding and dead, and he is not a thing to be. So we get our individuation there in the field of action. Joe shoots Bill, and then has to realize also that he's different than Bill. So right on the same action we get a differentiation, an individuation of self from the shot person and an individuation of self from the society, all in one fell swoop. So actually here's two withholds, and one of those withholds is a sneaky one.

Now, he can possibly remember and give you the withhold "I mustn't tell the police." But this other is an action, unarticulated, low-level, low-consciousness sort of a withhold. And that is that he mustn't be Bill. See, that's by example he mustn't be Bill. Yet there's a sort of a low-order decision in that, too. So, here you get individuation. Do you see that?

By the commission of an overt, we get an individuation. That's the only point I'm trying to make. And the more different and the more separate we are, of course, the less we can communicate, and certainly the less we can understand.

If you want to see somebody really muy estupido, completely incapable of "what's the score?", find something, find anything, on which this person has a bunch of overts. And ask him to explain it to you. And that is just about the most hilarious activity you ever wanted to engage in.

And some mathematician with a very fancy eye for equations perhaps someday would like to do this. Well, I did it once. I never bothered to keep the notes. But I derived all mathematics from affinity, reality and communication. All mathematics can be derived, of whatever kind, from those three factors. It's really fantastic. Affinity, reality and communication. This – you're working in the field of symbolic logic, you see. You're using – instead of numbers, you're using meanings. You work these things out. But you can derive all mathematics from ARC. You can derive all parts of life from ARC, and therefore you can derive all understanding from ARC, and the complete complement of an understanding is ARC.

In the absence of ARC, there is no understanding. Of course, if you have – the reductio ad absurdum – no knowledge whatsoever of affinity, reality or communication; if there's no affinity, no reality, and no communication, there can be no knowledge. Do you see that? You get no knowledge as the end result of this. The fellow has never felt anything for it, he has never seen it, and he's never heard about it, that's sure he doesn't know a thing about it. Do you see that as a fact?

There's an iron bolt, let us say, buried twenty-five feet deep out in the field in front of the manor house, and for the last three hundred years nobody's felt anything about it, nobody's felt it, and nobody's seen it, and there isn't even a via on which these is done, such as disguised in old records or something like that – there's no bolt as far as you're concerned. You see?

So you have to have A, R and C to know anything.

Now, the lower one's A or the lower one's R, the lower one's C, the less one knows about anything. It's very, very remarkable.

People consider those things dangerous which they're afraid to communicate with. Well, what's their definition of dangerousness? Afraid to communicate with.
Now, you can make people... You can always reverse these decisions. This might be interesting to you. You can always make a person feel he has done something if he has a withhold about it. That's an interesting mechanic of the mind.

Now, let's say we tell this person we're going to burn him (which I think is the highest level of ARC achieved by governments), we're going to burn him in the electric chair, see, or something like that, and do you know this fellow will turn around and dream up who he's murdered? I tell you this is a fact. He'll come around on the other side of the thing and he'll dream up a crime to fit the punishment. He'll get delusions about it.

He'll keep protesting his innocence, but he'll go and sit down in quiet and wonder just who he did kill, see. This is quite remarkable. In other words, if the punishment exists, therefore the crime must have existed. You see that? We can work almost anything backwards this way, and a human being will begin to believe the other thing.

Let me give you an example: I tell all of you carefully, when you come up to the desk or come by the desk or during the daytime when you're in this room, to be very, very, very, very careful not to touch this black wire. Don't touch that black wire. I tell you this every lecture. Even though you knew it was a joke, do you know that sooner or later you'd begin to believe that wire was dangerous? You get th – this is the reverse action, don't you see? People's definition of dangerousness is something you don't want to communicate with very much, see. So you just turn it around and you say to them, "Don't communicate with this very much," and they'll believe it's dangerous. You see how you can reverse ends?

The mind is very funny. It normally operates on two-pole conclusions. In other words, there's – one conclusion's dependent on another conclusion. You see the crudest example of this: Somebody walks up to you and says – they say, "You're a Scientologist. What is that? Is it like... ?"

Well, of course, you're stuck at this point, to describe Scientology, because of course it isn't "like" anything. There's never before been Scientology. So therefore, there isn't another Scientology extant in the society to compare Scientology to, and therefore the logical pattern and the communication pattern breaks down at that point and leaves you stammering.

You say, "Well, no, it's not like Christian Science, and it's not like religion, it's really not like Buddhism, it's not like..." See, you can define it by negatives. And then they will begin to believe it isn't. And your combat – if you look back on some of the things you've done in the past – of assertions of this character is just to deny the similarity. You find yourself in a big argument of denying the similarity. Of course, all the time you were talking you were actually saying, "Scientology isn't" to the other person. That's the way the other person understood it.

You see, if there's – or they say, "Oh, it's like Christian Science."

And you say, "No, no, no, no, no, it's not like Christian Science. Christian Science believes that..." and we go on and on, and potter around about it and so forth. We all the time are saying that Scientology doesn't exist because it's not like anything. Then we wonder, mysteriously, why the other person isn't interested in what we've been talking about.
You must always dream up something Scientology is just like. You want to talk to people about Scientology, realize that logic is two-pole; there are two sides to an equation; there must be comparison; there's data of comparable magnitude to enter an understanding – all of these, oh, a whole stream of these things I could go into. There must be comparable data. They understand something about something and therefore Scientology must be compared to the something something. And then they understand Scientology because it's compared to, you see?

Well, this is quite an interesting, quite an interesting complication. Because you could get over it every time if you realized that you had to compare Scientology to something. The only thing you have to do is make up your mind of what you're going to compare Scientology to so the other person will understand it.

Well, the more agreement or the more familiarity or the more ARC which he has with the thing you're going to compare Scientology to, the better he is going to understand Scientology. So you always compare Scientology to himself.

This sounds idiotic, but let us say, "Oh," he says, "Scientology. What is that like? What – what is that like?" Well, he really means "What is that like?" He wants a datum of comparable magnitude.

And you would be amazed how often you would get away with this crude – unthinkably crude – rendition of this: "Well, it's like you." You'd just be amazed how often this would intrigue the person. It's almost an idiot's argument from that point thereon. You say, "Well, it's like you."

And he'd say, "Well, how is it like me?"

"Well, you want things better, don't you? Everybody does. I don't care what they're doing in life, man's basically good. And underneath all of this 'got to gyp 'em all' or something of this sort, why, you're going to find some impulse that..." so on.

The fellow says, "Oh, yes, I'm trying to make things better."

"All right, Scientology's trying to make things better."

You get that? You say, "All right, now, you probably have a lot of basic wisdom about life. Maybe a lot of it is out of sight; maybe it's buried and so forth. But nevertheless you have a lot of wisdom about life. You've been around. You've observed things. You – you know certain things."

Guy says, "That's right."

You say, "Well, Scientology's just like you in that respect. You'd like to be free. You'd like to be out of whatever mess you're in. Well, Scientology wants that." You get this? This sounds like a weird argument, but you would be surprised how much appeal even the argument rendered that blatantly and that nuttily – that crudely! – would appeal to the bank manager or the janitor.

Here – just – guy would say, "Yeah, that's right, I'm trying to make things better; Scientology's trying to make things better."
I had an uncle who was a thirty-third degree Mason and Scottish rite, and other odd things, and Dianetics and Scientology were never quite right with him, but he finally figured out that we were trying to do exactly what they were trying to do in the Scottish rite, and after that he's figured out it's all right. You couldn't now disabuse him of the fact that we'd do everything that is done in the Scottish rite. We don't. But that is his channel of understanding. And he'd have to be processed before he'd change his mind.

Now, I don't even think he knows what he means by this, but he's satisfied with it. Because he has a familiarity with A, therefore something is shown to him to be like A, then he understands this something that was like A. Except he didn't really understand it. But he has a tendency to understand it. In other words, ARC then monitors understanding to this degree.

Now, in the absence of any ARC you have no observation or no knowledge of. That's the unobtainable absolute, of course. But this is – the something exists but you have no affinity for it and no reality about it, and you've never communicated on the subject, so you don't know that it exists.

All right, let's take the next level of that. Something that you feel something about, and you have a tiny reality on (you have an idea it exists) and you've communicated to its vicinity, slightly – see, you won't have very much understanding of that thing. Understanding of it will be poor but you'll know it exists.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. I'm sure that you realize there is a British constitution, and probably a constitutional society of some kind or another. If there's a constitution, there's usually a constitutional society of some kind or another. That's a supposed existence. You could understand that. You got an idea that you might be capable of understanding that, but you don't know what you should understand about it. See, you don't really know it exists, but you think it probably exists, and therefore if it did exist, you could understand about it. Do you get how this works out?

Well, that's a very thin fringe into the range of understanding. Now, you go up through all of the – all of the misemotional buttons on the subject of understanding, and you get various understandings. There's an understanding goes along with each one of these things. Even if one only understands that it is bad, one understands something about it. And this moves up into a total understanding.

Now, if you have total ARC, you would have total understanding. And if you want to know the road to wisdom – the road to wisdom, of course, presupposes a situation which the Buddhist would interpret as a nirvana. That is part of everything. To understand everything you'd have to be part of everything. It's a marvelous booby trap, man, because that's the reverse of individuation: enforced association. So, just as an individual can back away and become individuated from something, he can also enforcedly move on into it and obsessively become it. So there's two sides to this pattern.

Now, oddly enough this follows a cycle. With an overt, with the first overt, usually quite unintentional, you begin the cycle of individuation from something, and then that individuation cycle winds up with a reverse. And a person obsessively becomes what he is fighting.
How many of you in auditing your pcs have run into your pc's oppterm?

Well, the PC associates himself with his own oppterm. And you'll find this in varying, degrees. Sometimes the pc believes absolutely he's his own oppterm. Sometimes the PC merely hates his own oppterm, see. There's varying attitudes. From PC to pc you do a Dynamic Assessment and you'll get a different degree of obsessed association or obsessed beingness of the oppterm, and individuation from the oppterm. You get this in varying degrees. It varies from PC to PC.

One PC is more his oppterm than another, and another pc is more individuated from his oppterm than others. Do you see? You'll see this phenomenon throughout existence.

Now, this fellow has been committing overts – you know, that one – the old one about "tend to become what you resist." Well, let's clarify that and put it with more truth. One certainly will become that eventually which he has overts on, if he obsessively continues overts against a certain target and goes the whole gamut. He's been shooting penguins. That's the only thing he really does well. He shoots penguins, he shoots penguins, and he shoots penguins. And one day you pick him up, and he says, "I'm a penguin."

Now, he actually hasn't just directly interiorized into the penguin by the overt. Actually he has, through overts, has individuated from (because of the withholds he has from them and so forth) he's individuated from the penguins and become more and more individual. He is himself and penguins are penguins, you see. And more and more, more and more individuated, and then his wheels start to skid. See, he's got this rubber band now stretched as far away from penguins as he can get it stretched, and his efforts now to stretch it actually contract it. And every time he tries harder not to be a penguin, he skids a little bit forward to become slightly more a penguin. You see that whole cycle? That's a very interesting cycle.

That's a cycle of beingness and overts: the relationship to the individual's beingness an overt act has. Yeah, you go out here and you shoot a sparrow; you don't become a sparrow. But let's say you just had a ball, and you got up to a point where you just had to. And all of this logic is backing it up, how you have to shoot sparrows. And you do shoot sparrows, and you go on shooting sparrows.

I almost died one time. I – you can't laugh in people's faces, directly. The most comical incident I think that's happened to me in many months – the most comical thing I have seen – many – long time ago I was up at Lowestoft (a little town up on the North Sea), and a couple of herring merchants were getting rid of some of their ships. So I wanted to buy one of these ships, you know. Their names didn't sound like herring.

But I met these fellows, the pair of them, and of course they have run since time immemorial a fleet of herring boats. And, man, this pair had everything but gills! [laughter] They – if herring ever talked, they would talk just like that, you know? Their whole facial structure was that of a herring! Who was it that illustrated Dickens, you know? That boy couldn't have done a better job of portraying a herring. It was interesting that their method of handling things were sort of herring methods. They were sort of resistive to being slaughtered but it was inevitable. I offered a small sum of money for the boat and sailed it away, and they knew they had to sell it. That was enough of a lose so they knew they had to sell it.
This is the result of something like that, you see. I don't know what they'll pick up in their next life, but sooner or later…

Anyway, to make a long story short, this is the cycle of individuation and obsessed beingness. And that cycle is very interesting to you, because you start picking up sight of it with the dynamic and you get a very clear view of it straight in the teeth when you get the item. And that is exactly how the person got there, and is exactly how the meter rock slams.

Now, let's go back and talk about organizations for a moment. Somewhere along the line there was an inadvertent overt by this organization. And that built up, and then they became more and more different, and they became more and more different, and they became more and more different. And if they'd been permitted to go on this, they would have become a sort of a lower-level – which I think they actually had become – a sort of a lower-level beingness. You see, they could go through a whole cycle and come back to becoming an appearance.

Do you know that a thetan will actually run a whole cycle on Clear this way? And you pick him up on the meter, he's sitting exactly at 2, dead thetan? Well, that's how he got there. He's run the whole cycle. Now, he's obsessively being what he started out to be. See, he's obsessively being what he once was part of. He's relatively unprocessable. You'll have more trouble with that character than with any other. I am intrigued by this, you see. He's now a fake thetan!

And so that organization would have become a fake organization. Fantastic. You come to think about it, would have been a lower-level Clear – mockery.

Now, I've looked over very carefully, this, and the organization plan that says that this Scientologist is a field auditor and that Scientologist is a staff member, and therefore of different breeds and areas, and that this Central Organization is Johannesburg's or Melbourne's or something; and I've picked up a very fruitful source of inadvertent withholds. If we're planning anything broad in the way of organizations, the first thing we have to take out of is the incipient individuation. Otherwise we're going to wind up with a fake Scientology which will enslave the multitudes.

The HCO 10 percent is, for instance, a bid for individuation. See, it says, "Well, 90 percent of this is ours and 10 percent of this is yours, so therefore you must be different than me." Doesn't that sort of get understood at this line?

I'm not at this moment wiping out that, and so forth, because we're dealing with the - we're dealing with 1970. What's it going to look like in 1970? Well, the first rule that one must apply to it is that all the way around this planet it's got to be just one organization and that is Scientology.

And you look at this, you find that every organization breaks down into individuations and messes up, and so forth; they have no strength, and they don't stand, but when they finally do stand, why, they're sort of a false mockery of what they started out to be. They say that an organization's ethic is never stronger than it is at its inception. That is a comment that is made very sadly by people – philosophers along this line. There's no reason why its ethic shouldn't be much higher than at its inception.
Therefore, I don't see that it's possible, looking out across the years, for organizations to be different than other organizations in Scientology, to be different than the Central Organization, to be different than the International Organization – to be different than other organizations in Scientology, to be different than the Central Organization, to be different than the International Organization – to be different *than*, don't you see. Because you've set up the incipiency of the inadvertent withhold, the inadvertent overt may follow, and then you get a cycle there which will follow on through and everybody will wind up under the sword, "Being the Scientology organization or get your head cut off" Inevitably that would occur. But nobody would be free, and you really wouldn't have Scientology.

And the way to set it up is set it up as close to the fact as that not happening, and then keep it picked up along the line. And you get an organization that looks something like this. Would you like to take a look at the future on that?

About 1970 – might look very much like this: The basic building block would be the district office. I don't care what that district office is called. Whether or not it's the "Suburban Center" or the this or the that – but the district office. And it covers only a few square miles of houses, if that. It is tiny. Its influence is in terms of, oh, ten thousand people – no greater than that. But that is your basic building block.

And it has a building which is provided for it, which has an assembly hall, and it has some offices, and it has a couple of individual processing rooms, and it has a reception area, and you know. It's a little hall, actually, with some offices attached to it. And that is a district organization.

In charge of it is an administrator, who is an administrative person, and who, although he may be a trained auditor, is – still belongs to the administrative side of the picture. So you have the administrative side of the picture and the technical side of the picture running throughout this. You get occasional swaps across from one to the other. But nevertheless, they are distinct branches of action. There's two distinct actions.

The administrator is to keep things there and keep it paid and keep the place clean, keep the people walking in and out, and handle the money and the mest, and that sort of thing. And the technical side of it is to keep them processed and keep them happy, and so forth. That's all the technology of Scientology.

So this little center is actually in the charge of an administrator, and he has a couple of receptionists. They relieve each other. And they sort of act as the mail clerk and the switchboard operator and his private secretary, and anything else you can think of. You see, this is all in vignette.

And alongside of this administrator, there's a secretary there and you call her the HCO Secretary. Actually, she's the librarian, and the – she handles all the book stocks, and she issues the publications, and she does checkouts and examinations. She's a very busy person. She wears all factors of an HCO, actually, all in her own vest pocket, you see. And she's there actually to make sure that the material is available and stays straight, and so forth. She's not even there to see that any money is collected or anything like that. She's just there to see that the material's right, and that the material has library materials, and, you know, that's it – you know, that you have adequate supplies of these things, and to be able to get on the telex and communicate with other organizational centers, and that sort of thing. Because these things
are all hooked up, one to the other, communicationwise. Well, of course, there's also a janitor and there's a maid.

And there's two technical crews. And these two crews consist of two HCAs or HPAs (depending on where you are), and a Saint Hill graduate. And one of these crews is senior to the other crew, depending on length of time that they've been auditing, and so forth. So, actually have two crews and it – each one is composed of one Saint Hill graduate and two HPA/HCA level people. And the senior technical member is the senior Saint Hill graduate. That is the senior technical member in this particular unit.

And what do they all do for a living? That's very simple. They engage in mass clearing. This is easy. This is the easiest one to do, so that's what they do. And they've got this little specially built building that's exactly tailormade to their exact requirements to handle this sort of thing.

And what odds and ends of things do they handle? Well, they don't handle many odds and ends of things, because that's all handled for them in the city office which is mainly an administrative center. Doesn't do anything else. It's got a big account system, and it pays all their bills and pays their salary and banks their money, and does everything for them.

You wonder how a little district office like that's going to make any money or get forward or handle anything. Well, there are several ways that this takes place and several ways they go about this. The main way they go about this is they have an afternoon co-audit and an evening co-audit, six nights a week. And one afternoon co-audit goes, of course, Monday-Wednesday-Friday; the other afternoon co-audit goes Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday. One evening co-audit goes on Monday-Wednesday-Friday, and the other evening co-audit goes Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday. And you have the Monday-Wednesday-Friday crew under one Saint Hill graduate and two HPAs and a receptionist, and you have the other Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday people under the other technical crew. In other words, stagger their week days.

Now, what happens? Well, if you look over the economics of this situation, it becomes rather interesting. Because at fifty people in each one of these co-audits, you have two hundred people in that center a week. This is not going to be very difficult to manage. There are various ways of recruitment. There are various other ways of going about this. But the truth of the matter is that at ten dollars a week this gets to be a rather staggering piece of income. That's a lot of money. Ten dollars per person per week. That's all you're charging them to go Clear. Well, of course, you'd never charge them ten dollars per person per week, the cost would undoubtedly be much higher than that.

But they enroll in the co-audit and they're fed on through. Doesn't cost them anything extra to have their goal found, and so forth. You just have this co-audit and you kick them out the other end Clear. It's just assembly line clearing. They do co-auditing in the meantime, and so forth. Technology's going to get even faster. You'll find goals faster. They found out eight goals, I think, in one week, down in Bulawayo – a couple of Saint Hill graduates working down there right now.

So, anyhow, you see how fast that assembly line could work? But the funny part of it is, it's a staggering amount of income. It makes a Saint Hill graduate capable, in a center, of earning 250 dollars a week, or maybe 100 quid a week. That would be looked on as rather
ordinary income. It means this is your Woolworth aspect. This clears everybody. And the funny part of it is the Woolworth aspect is where it makes the money, not taking a lot of money from one or two people.

And as far as I can see, that's the basic building block, and it goes into an administrative center in the middle of that city. And you've got an HCA or HPA Academy set up with the Central Organization. And you've got some hospitals around which give clinical processing. And your big Central Organizations or your Continental Organizations are mainly administrative aside from running this little Academy – this Academy that takes care of that continent. And then you have your International Organization. It runs a university and doesn't do any processing. And it all just feeds through. There aren't 10 percents and exchanges and what's mine and what's yours, and so forth. And somebody…

The biggest crime that has been – ever been pulled off, is an auditor gets an area all stirred up and interested and then he departs.

Well, so somebody in Scientology gets tired of being in lower South Amboy, well, they can always be transferred to Chicago. Oh, say, a guy says, "I'm awful tired of being here, I want to go to Chicago." And you say, "Well, all right, why don't you write Chicago?" And they write Chicago, and Chicago would say, "Yeah, we'd be happy to have you." And you go to Chicago.

Now, there'd be money all over the place, as far as I can see. And in the Central Organization – just looking a little bit further ahead than that – there'll be a political officer. You want to know what happens when you clear everybody in that neighborhood, the only thing that center can become used for is a political center. Because by the time you've done all this, you are the government and you'll never be able to refuse it.

Therefore, these things should be provided for, and this thing should be looked over. And everybody in Scientology should be cared for. And the idea of asking for somebody to go out and sweat it through and stumble and fall on his head and collect his funds and that sort of thing – that day should very soon come to an end. It hasn't come to an end yet.

I'm just giving you a little glimpse of 1970. And it looks to me like a world that someone could walk down the street in. The situation between us now and that then is far closer together than you might think at this present moment. It's just within an ace of coming true. Any comments you have upon what I've said, I would certainly like to hear, because this is your world, too.

Thank you.
INSTRUCTORS' BUGBEAR

A lecture given on 9 October 1962

Thank you.

This is 9 Oct. 62, lecture number two. I better talk to you about something that you're more interested in. [laughs]

Just a final comment on that: I haven't given you all the information I have on that, but the final question I was asked here was about the technical, "hope it'd be more simple." Yeah, your technical will be more simple, but remember there's two HPAs on the floor in any one of these co-audits. Listing will probably be meterless – most of their auditing will be meterless. And it'll be worked down to a point where if a guy can get into trouble with this – with experts watching the thing – why, he'd really be quite a guy.

There are several technical little bugs that have been worked out already.

You give a See Check as the person comes in and you have a dunce unit-the rock slammers. And because you'll have all kinds of people, why, you'd just better take the rock slammers and you'd better relegate them to a certain category and certain handling, you see. That immediately takes the sour apples out of your co-audit and they'd run fairly smoothly.

Now the technical aspects of this are either whipped or whippable. And they give me no qualms at all. If that's all I had to worry about, it'd be a long snore.

The various aspects of clearing ... This is about clearing. This is just a lecture on clearing. I'm very interested in this. I'd be very happy to go on talking about it the rest of the evening, don't you see? But I want to talk to you about some of the aspects of clearing as they are influenced by auditing quality: clearing and auditing quality. And these two things are extremely closely associated when done by the expert.

He clears as fast, in actuality, as he is bright and delivers good quality auditing. Now, that's as fast as he clears. He clears then as slowly as he flubs.

Well, you want to find out why somebody isn't getting Clear fast... You know, your – it's a hell of a criticism of the auditor when that tone arm goes up to 5 and sticks. It's already proven that it's the right goal and yet there's that tone arm up there at 5 and it's not now moving and it's not coming down and that is the right goal, and you're listing on 114 lines. And as far as you can tell it's all going off like hot butter and yet there is that tone arm at 5. Now, that is not criticizing the pc. Learn right here at the incept that it is a criticism which is leveled straight at the bosom of the auditor doing the auditing. Learn that and you will have learned a great deal.
When I say learn that and you will have learned a great deal, I know what I'm talking about, because there are some people who won't learn that. They will resist learning that for a while. You see, they'll keep looking for what is wrong with the pc. There's nothing wrong with pcs. There's a lot wrong with auditors.

Now, some pcs require more cleverness on the part of the auditor than others. Because they – apparently the individuality of life was all attained by goals. Now, that doesn't mean that people are individuals because of goals. It means that they are odd individuals because of goals. They were all different people, don't you see, and then they postulated themselves a great cracking, big goal and here we went.

Well, a goal is a symptom of individuation. And from that point on, this guy is going to act differently with a different set of overts. And therefore, each person acts slightly differently in processing.

But when you realize that you can pick up such a goal as "never to be detected" – well now, that's quite interesting. What does that speak of the technology? Well, this thing says it must never be detected and yet we detected it. That's quite interesting, isn't it? That speaks very well for the technology.

So, I can tell you right at the incept that there is no goal that is too difficult to be found and therefore no individuation that is too difficult for you to crack. You've got to do it by the book and you've got to be clever. And you've got to be able to audit smoothly – auditing quality.

Many a fellow has the idea, many a girl has the idea that auditing quality is associated with sternness or is associated with immovability or is associated with being able to repeat the auditing command or is associated with "the auditor must always be right," or some other quality that has nothing whatsoever to do, in actual fact, with auditing.

Some new individuation has moved into the sphere of auditing and whenever this new individuation is moved into the sphere of auditing, you get some new difficulties.

So to an Instructor watching a half a dozen auditors audit, he may think that he needs a half a dozen different sets of rules to overcome the peculiar difficulties which these students are experiencing and that is not true.

What he needs, as an Instructor, is a tremendous ability to detect variation from the standard rule. And man, this variation is sometimes so clever and is sometimes so adroit and is sometimes so well hidden, that one never does connect with it apparently.

I'll give you an example: This person is apparently unwilling to have the pc talk. Apparently this person has to stop the pc from talking if the pc talks. The pc must be stopped. You'd swear their goal was "nobody must talk." Pc says, "I have a pain in the head," and the auditor almost holds up stop lights and stop signs, and hands out speed tickets and breaks out a dog muzzle and so forth, you see, because the pc has said something, the auditor's upset.

So we work on it on a straight basis of communication and we tell this auditor that the auditor must let the pc talk. And by golly, we don't solve it. We just don't solve it.
These sessions this auditor is running continue to produce fantastic ARC breaks. And yet now the auditor is apparently letting the pc talk, to all intents and purposes. Then we come in one day and we find out the pc has been talking for an hour and a half in answer to one auditing command and is getting very ARC broke in the process. So we didn't spot that one. That was wrong. This auditor was not trying to stop the pc from talking.

The ARC breaks this auditor got stemmed from the unwillingness of the auditor to face any confusion of any kind in the session and went on giving the auditing command even faster the moment it appeared there was going to be a confusion in the session.

Now, that's an interesting point, isn't it? Some confusion arose. Did the auditor acknowledge it or did the pc answer it? And this auditor's answer is to get away from the confusion and so gives the auditing command five more times, even more rapidly, to get five commands away from that confusion. But, of course, they can never get away from the confusion.

Now, the pc is only interested in doing one thing: stopping the auditor to get back to the confusion to unravel it. Did he answer the question or didn't he? So they have the auditor trying to get on with the session and the pc trying to stop the session and then you'd think off-hand, well, there's something wrong with the pc. No there isn't. There must be something wrong with the auditor, if the auditor didn't take up something in the session that makes it necessary for the pc to stop the session to get it taken up. You see this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

It looks like the auditor's trying to keep the pc from talking. See, but that really wasn't what was happening at all. The auditor wants the pc to talk, but on some other subject, if you please, than a confusion.

One method an auditor uses to take off, then, is discoverable only in this zone: that an auditor can leave the session on the forward track, as well as walk out of the room. You follow that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The pc can be left at time-point A in the session, while the auditor is taking off and trying to get to time-point G, without ever paying any further attention to time-point A. The auditor is ignoring time-point A and is trying to leave the session by progressing forward to point G as rapidly as possible.

You'll find somebody is having difficulty reading his meter during the rudiments only because rudiments are something this auditor has had enough bad luck with that the auditor wants to get over them fast. And the auditor gets over these rudiments fast, while the pc gets stuck in rudiment one. And the auditor is clear up there to the body of the session, but the pc is left in rudiment one.

Now, in an effort to avoid giving a session, you see, in an effort to avoid facing the confusion in the session – let me put it that way – the auditor actually refuses to set up a session, unwittingly refuses to set up a session. Do you see how this could be?
The auditor knows he can't get in rudiment one – always had trouble getting it in – so he doesn't get it in. Gets a conviction that it can't be put in, don't you see, and therefore rapidly moves to two before one is in. Now, of course, two won't go in, because one is out. And then moves to three before the pc can stop him to get two in. And then goes into the body of the session with the pc madly out of session.

Now the pc, somewhere in his skull, unwittingly is trying to work out the session and get in-session while the auditor is running the session.

And most of the pcs that give you the most trouble are the pcs who do the least. They never explode in your face, they never walk out of session, they're not dramatic – they just aren't in-session. Auditing isn't biting. Auditing isn't biting at all, because they're not in-session. And they apparently are very easy to audit, except they never make any forward progress.

And the – it doesn't much matter what the auditor does. The auditor can go over and try to get all the rudiments in, and so forth, and they all kind of go in. "Meter isn't working," don't you see? They kind of get all the rudiments in and he gets into the body of the session, then he starts this and that, and doing this and that, and asking him some questions, and ...

The wonder of it is that anything happens at all. But you get about a quarter of an inch of gain out of that session – very undemonstrative session. It's just sort of sitting there, sawing wood, doing nothing, you know. Only get a quarter of an inch of gain out of that session and should have had five miles.

Your "good" pc is produced by an auditor who never gets the pc in-session in the first place. This pc isn't sufficiently in-session to ARC break. Pc is ARC broke.

Oh, it's a very funny thing. You could start sawing into a session of this particular character – somebody's running the session in this way – and you know, sort of getting it all in with a lick and a promise and it's sort of a tacit consent that very little auditing will occur and so forth.

You want long listing, you see, this is the way to get it. Everything is sort of shallow, nothing is very deep, nobody really inquires into anything very hard and we'll sort of sit here and get it all dusted off one way or the other, and when we finally wind up, why, we will not have had an ARC break, which is apparently the primary objective of the session. Well, of course, they didn't have an ARC break by having one the session's entire length. In other words, no communication, no understanding.

See, everything is just kind of out on the fringe and nothing is ever really introduced in. Don't you see this?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

You've stood alongside and watched a session run, I'm sure, whereby the pc is just "Yeah, birds swim? Yes. Yes, birds swim. Oh, yes, birds swim. Yes... yes, birds swim, yes. Yes, birds swim and so forth."

And the auditor is saying, "Do birds swim?"

"Yes."
"Do birds swim?"
"Yes."
"Do birds swim?"
"Yes."

And everything's going on, and they move through to the – they use up every bit of the auditing time. That's the one thing that you can say about that session, is it used up the entirety of the auditing period.

All right. You get somebody in there who isn't avoiding ARC breaks, who isn't avoiding upsets, who is trying to look good as an auditor, who's doing all kinds of additives. His slew of additives have been added to what he's supposed to be doing, you see.

You get somebody in on the same pc and the guy says, "All right, now." He says, "Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The pc says, "No. No, no, not me! No. No, no. No, uh-uh."

"All right. All right. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

Pc says, "Ooh, gee, I guess just about everything that's wrong. I mean ... " And all of a sudden starts opening up as a pc and suddenly you'll find that old tone arm just coming on down, just as nice as you please. What? With standard auditing.

But what is standard auditing? What is the standard from which we are departing? Well, it's this cycle: It's asking the auditing question of the pc who is sitting in that chair – see, not some synthetic pc – but of that pc that is sitting in that chair, getting a response or an answer from that pc, which is then understood by the auditor and is acknowledged by the auditor in such a way that the pc knows he said it. This pc knows he said the answer and did properly answer it. Now, that is the auditing cycle.

Now, when anything interferes with that auditing cycle or additives go in, you get one of these corny, weird, offbeat, god-'elp-us sessions. Do you see what runs it adrift?

Now, it's – this auditing cycle is a terribly simple cycle. And terribly simple people such as myself don't seem to have too much trouble with it. But more brilliant people figure their way through this thing and arrive at some kind of a mutated answer to it that produces a no-auditing situation. And how they've managed to do this is the subject of his Instructor's nightmares. That's what the Instructor is there for.

He's trying to find what else they are doing and point it out to them in such a way that they realize they are not doing what they should be doing. It is a terribly, idiotically simple thing. And of course, some very bright person could very easily miss it.

You would be amazed if you engaged in a catechism – Catholic church hasn't got any monopoly on the English language, we might as well take part of it – if you engaged in a catechism of an auditor who consistently was getting the TA swinging up high on the pc and asked that auditor searching, seeking questions regarding what was supposed to happen at these various parts of the auditing cycle – what a pc was supposed to think and what a pc was
supposed to do at various parts of it, and you will find something that is completely astray. Inevitably, you're going to find something that is really goofy.

I'll give you one, an actual one: "Well, so long as the pc refuses to make up his mind to be audited, there's nothing you can do about it." How do you like that one? In other words, all auditing is on automatic. It depends on the happy accident of a pc deciding to be in-session. And the auditor has nothing to do with getting the pc in-session. You understand that?

Now, why do these things exist? I'm not just being hard on people who have that sort of theory. I'm trying to make it easy for them to audit. Where do these things come from? They're all a bunch of oddball considerations that exceed this terrible simple simplicity. And when I say they're oddball, I mean!

But where do they come from? Now, it's all right for you to say, "Well, it stems from their goals." We know that and nobody need emphasize that piece of technology. Somebody who has the seventh dynamic, "thetans," as an oppterm or "an introverted person" as an opp-term or has "people interested in themselves" as an oppterm or "people who talk" as an opp-term are going to have a hard time with auditing.

Well, you can see that and I can see that and oddly enough we can surmount it fairly easily. Oddly enough, we do. It makes a tremendous change in one of these people when you get that item, and it adds up to something that interferes with auditing – makes a big change to them. Big change. There's hardly any substitute for it. When you find their goal, it makes a big change. When you get the goal listed out, that's a terrific change. See, so there are big changes along this line.

But if I were to tell you that because a person had an oppterm of such-and-such a characteristic, he then could not audit, we have entered upon a very dangerous piece of ground. We have said that no man can rise superior to his aberrations and that is not true.

A man can rise superior to his aberrations – as even some character who has some horrible oppterm that he just discovered has realized that somehow or another he was getting by and he was trying. And his oppterm and his goal are right in the teeth of his ever getting anything done about it, don't you see? And you is yet getting somewhere.

No, a man does not have to act his aberrations out to the full, that's for sure. Man can rise above them. He may not be able to stay above them, but a couple of hours of session, yeah, he can rise.

Now, when we get down to cases on the subject of auditing, then, it is not good enough to say that his item and his goal oppose his being a good auditor and therefore he can't do it. That is not good enough.

We know that his auditing will enormously improve. We know he'll probably never become a top-notch auditor until we've got these things wrapped up and he's Clear, but nevertheless he can audit.

So there is another channel which might – because this other one is so heroic – it rises up there like the Colossus of Rhodes, you know. It's completely visible, you know. It's his
item, it's his goal and so forth. And it's so visible you might never see this other one. You say, "Well, get him cleared and he'll be able to audit." Ha! Fine.

There's another one, even when you get him cleared, he might run into and that's the one the Instructor works with. That's the one you'll be working with when you're trying to make a co-audit function, when you're trying to make some HPA student toe the mark.

This one: He's got a hangover from some group or some philosophy or some activity – not necessarily associated with his goal line – as to what is supposed to happen, what he's supposed to do to make something happen and what's supposed to happen when he, the auditor, does it. And you will get things out of the pc – you'll get things out of the pc and then you do something with them and what does this indicate with the pc. You know? I mean, you ask him questions of this sort. "Now, you've asked the pc something, and he's responded such-and-such a way. Now, what does that mean?" See, this is a searching type of question, see. You actually can get – likely as not, get the auditor actually laughing at himself over some of the things he expects.

Let's say he was part of a society that preached only one philosophy – only one philosophy: that there was no reason why you couldn't decide to be anything you wanted to be and immediately become it. And all men were weak and evil and guilty and stupid simply because they couldn't do this. That, by the way, is a rather familiar one on the track.

"Well, why don't you decide to be Clear?" You know? "Go ahead. Go ahead, decide to be Clear. All right. Can't do it, huh? Hah! Shows what you're made of!" See, it's a sort of a weird way of making nothing out of thetans and so on.

Well, this person actually is operating in an auditing session on the basis "Well, if this person just made up their mind to be Clear, I wouldn't have to go to all this work." See, they think the other person is terribly weak because the other person just can't suddenly make up their mind to be Clear and they're having to audit the other person, don't you see, and they're auditing past this limitation.

They don't recognize they themselves are doing it. But an Instructor talking this little point over with them might discover a great deal concerning this, you see.

And they say, "Ah, well, if he'd just make up his mind to be Clear, I mean, there – I mean, I have to go through all these motions, you know, and ask him these questions and so forth. And actually there's no particular reason why I should, because all he's got to do is make up his mind – what am I saying? All he's got to do is – all he's got to is make up his – well, no, I couldn't do that."

See, he's got a terrifically fixed idea of what's supposed to happen, so therefore everything he is doing is being done in the realization – according to him, you see – is being done in the realization that it doesn't have to be done anyhow, so it doesn't matter what he does because the other person should simply be able to make up his mind to be Clear and then be Clear. So therefore, the other person is guilty of having a session. You see?

All right. That would be only one of thousands. See, only be one of thousands. "Why should you ask anybody a question?" Give you another one: "Why should you ask anybody a question?"
"Because, you see, they know the answer to everything and they know what you know, because they – what am I saying?" See, it comes to a dead end here. The guy all of a sudden realizes he's talking pure, unadulterated idiocy.

You know that people go around aware of the fact that everybody can read their minds? And so therefore there's no sense in anybody asking them questions, because everybody should know everything about them anyhow and every question is a complete insult.

Do you know that there are people around that every moment of the day is a missed withhold on the part of everybody? Do you know that people are a missed withhold? You know how you become a missed withhold to such a person? Do you know how you manage to become a missed withhold to them? You said, "How are you?" And you should have known! You should have known! You get the idea?

And because you didn't know how they are and therefore asked them a question how they are, why, this immediately indicates that they are a missed withhold. And they go around all ARC broke and upset twenty-four hours a day. You see? Because they're a missed withhold to everybody. Because people keep asking how are they: "Have you just been to class? What mark did you make?" Doesn't matter what question is asked them, they are sort of going on the basis of all the time everybody should know what they're thinking. Some kind of an obsessive idea. And they never inspect these things. So therefore the pc should know what they're thinking.

Do you see, that's very far-fetched and far afield. I'm – all I'm saying here – I'm not trying to give you a multiplicity of examples – it's just "What is this person doing when he is sitting there running this cycle of auditing?"

"Who makes the E-Meter read?" This is the type of question you would ask an auditor, see.

"Who makes the E-Meter read?"
"Well, the auditor does."
"All right. How does the auditor make it read?"
"By asking a question."
"All right." Now, the Instructor has to be a little slippier. "All right. If the auditor makes it read by asking a question, what does the needle fall on?"

The auditor says, "The question."

And the Instructor says, "That's right," and goes happily upon his way. And he missed the freight train, don't you see. It's way over there and over the horizon by this time. See, he's missed it.

Actually, this person is actually there and thinks that when he says, "Do fish swim?" that this action of his voice here makes the needle respond over there, although, he can observe that the pc has hold of the cans, that he himself doesn't have hold of the cans, and that there is no voice impact in this meter, he actually has always gone around believing... And the Instructor who didn't ask carefully, you see, would get an apparency of answer that sounded
very logical. It sounded quite correct. "Yes, the thing reacts to the question. Yeah, the needle reacts to the auditor's question."

Completely overlooks the fact the auditor in all sessions – and the auditor has overlooked it too – is actually sitting there in front of his meter and he asks the question which makes the meter read, and all the time sort of thinks it's silly that he's clearing these things, because he knows the answers to them. So therefore says, "Well, what's the use of a meter?" And he's never answered this question satisfactorily to himself.

In other words, these are things that the person has never revealed to himself. These are things that a little searching and look-over of just the auditing cycle, with or without a meter, would suddenly disclose to the auditor's own view because they look silly, even to him, you see. They look silly to the auditor.

This auditor all of a sudden says, "You know, I realize that there is no point in ever clearing up an ARC break, because the pc – reactivity is hate and the pc hates everybody, and you've got to as-is all this hate. And if you don't as-is all this hate, then the pc isn't going to get any better. So the best way to do is to get the pc into a level of hate and get the pc to hate you and then he'll be in ARC. So therefore, you should always ask your auditing command in such a way as to stir up the latent hate of the pc."

You start examining these – the rationale behind this and examine some of the other things that go into just this cycle, and repeated cycle of auditing and you're going to get astonished.

It's the auditor who makes the tone arm go up and hang at 5. Auditors should be in command of session. This is stable datum to this auditor. He hasn't got any other stable datum to go along with it, see. Auditor should be in command of this session. Auditor is in command of session. Therefore when pc suggest anything or pc say anything, then this means auditor no longer in command of session, so therefore pc must be suppressed. You get this?

_Audience: Mm-hm._

Now, people who that – who don't even have command or control in their goal, see. I mean, there's some side play or another. Do you get this?

You say, "Do fish swim?"

And the pc says, "You know, I've just had – well, I've had a whole avalanche of answers to that question 'Do fish swim?' and the answers could be yeah, no, and..."

"Ah! Now, now, now, that's enough. That's enough. Now, there's just one, just one, just one – just one answer. Now, that'll be quite plenty."

"Yeah, I know, but I have a little avalanche here."

"No, don't give me any more, now. That's it. That's it." "I guess I stayed in command of that session! See, I..." He's sitting there watching, you see, and he says, "I guess I stayed in command of that session!" You see?

"All right. Do fish swim now? Do fish swim?" Two hours later, "Do fish swim?" He's added the bank mass by suppress, see?
Now, his cycle of action, you see, is being just alter-ised to that degree. There's something awry in the cycle of – the auditing cycle of action. There's something missing here or there's too firm an adherence of some kind or another. There's too this or it's too that. There's something wrong with it.

And basically, you'll find that there is some misconception on the part of everybody who's having any trouble auditing. There's some misconception there someplace of what they're doing.

Now, you say to them, "All right, what happens if the pc makes a suggestion to you about the session that you examine the rudiment question again? Would you do it or not?"

Some fellow will say, "Absolutely not! Absolutely not. Not under any circumstances."

And we wonder why this is and then we discover something like whenever there's a confusion in the session, the auditor doesn't want to confront the confusion, and so the best way to get away from the confusion is to put time track between self and the moment of confusion, so therefore give eight or nine more auditing commands very rapidly, please. And that puts time track in between them and the confusion. And of course, the pc at that particular time can't leave that confused area, don't you see. Pc can't leave it because there's a confusion in it, and pc doesn't understand it. And then we come back and get the brass ring as the merry-go-round goes around and we find out that the auditor does not understand the pc a lot of the time and fakes understanding of pc. Does not know whether auditor understood or not. See?

And, we find out that the auditor has interpreted that he would look bad if he did not pretend to understand – when auditor does not understand. So there's the source of your confusion and it's right part of that auditing cycle.

Auditor asks the question of the pc and the pc hears this question, and the pc thinks of the answer to this question, and he says it to the auditor, and the auditor understands that answer, and acknowledges it, and the pc now knows that he has answered the auditing command. And all is as-ised and we go on along the track, see.

And this auditor is running his sessions this way: Ask the question of the pc, pc answers, auditor understands half of the answer, doesn't quite get the other half of the answer, decides that he'd better pretend that he understood it, acknowledges the pc's answer – which says that it's understood, don't you see – and the pc at this time gets a funny feeling about it – and all of a sudden there's a little confused area in the session and the auditor asks the auditing question again.

And the pc says, "I'm confused about the last answer."

And the auditor says, "Well, answer this question."

And the pc says, "I'm confused about the last question."

The auditor says, "Answer this question."

The pc says, "I'm confused about the last question."

"Answer this question."
"I'm confused about the last question."

"All right. Well, listen here, now, have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" That's another process, see. "All right. Let's have – have I missed a withhold on you? Missed a withhold?"

Pc says, "Well, I'm just confused. I – I don't know quite whether..."

"Missed a withhold? Missed a withhold? I know there's a withhold here, missed someplace. Yes, yes, that's right, that's right. All right, well, we can't get the withhold so let's run some O/W, O/W, O/W. Yeah. What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What... Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. See if we can get down the track, here, a distance from this." Because the auditor has committed a crime. He's lied to the pc. He has said, "Thank you." And that was a lie.

The auditing question was "Do fish swim?" and the pc said, "Well, often time, but not in hot bean soup."

And the auditor heard – the pc had said, "No." That's all the auditor got out of it, see, "No."

And the auditor says, "All right. Thank you."

Well, the pc knows very well that he didn't really put across this statement which was "Well, fish don't swim very well in hot bean soup." And the pc somehow or another knows the auditor never got that. And the pc doesn't know if he answered the question or not and it hangs right there. To some tiny little degree, the auditing cycle hung up right there.

And then the auditor, not wanting to take up the auditing cycle, can fly off down the track and do something else, but not take up what was really wrong. You see that?

So a simple study of the auditing cycle – or what is understood by the auditing cycle, or what the auditor is trying to accomplish in a session, or what the auditor thinks he should do in a session – just a simple take-up of this sort of thing produces sometimes the most revelatory results.

You say, "Well now, how does a pc..." You know, the Instructor has to be clever on these things. "How does a pc get over an ARC break? Hey, come on – how does a pc get over an ARC break?"

Auditor says, "Well, he uh – had a missed withhold, and so forth, and uh – you pick up the missed uh – withhold, and uh – well, I don't know how a pc gets over an ARC break."

And you say, "Well, why don't you figure out how a pc could get over an ARC break? What's an ARC break? How does a pc get over it?"

This auditor might have been telling you, "Pcs can never get over ARC breaks." But the pc [auditor] had not defined either the AR – what is an ARC break, or how you got a pc over an ARC break. And on the examination of this situation, was actually condemning the pc on the point of ARC breaks because "nice people never get angry." See, nice people never get
angry. So if nice people never get angry, of course, this is the answer. This is the idiot's answer, see.

Therefore, if the pc doesn't get over an ARC break, then the pc is not a nice person. Now, where the hell does that wind up a session? May I ask you that? Where's the session supposed to wind up?

Well, of course that doesn't solve it at all. But the person, in articulating this, has always thought that was a sort of a solution to the session, see. That sort of solved the whole thing.

No, it absolved them. And they mistook the absolution for the solution. They made themselves not guilty of putting the pc into an ARC break by adjudicating that the pc who had an ARC break was not a nice person.

I know, it sounds completely idiotic, but this has been sitting there as a substitute for not getting pcs out of ARC breaks. So therefore, they have never studied the thing any further. No further study has ever been given by this auditor on that subject. There wasn't another moment's study ever given to it. Why? Because he had a solution.

All right. Now let's get back to the Achilles heel of all training.

Psychiatrist has eighteen thousand electric shocks behind him, and you're going to teach him Scientology. You think he'll make it? The man's been in a university or a spinbin or something for twelve years.

You know, it's a good thing we don't recruit from people with the standard requirement that they be in a crazy-house for a half a dozen years, you know, like the psychiatrists do. I just thought of that one. I think that's delicious. [laughter]

Now he's been trained for a dozen years and he's all diplomaed up. And the state supports him, and the hospital supports him, and everything supports him but results – he hasn't time for those. And now you come along and you're going to try to teach him to be a Scientologist. Well, that's very interesting, because the one thing that stands in your road – there's one thing he doesn't know: he doesn't know that he doesn't know. See, that's the one thing he doesn't know.

Now, what makes it so apparent that he knows? Impacts of overts. I refer you to what I was saying about Zen Buddhism. You know, some people run a car into a brick wall sometime and come up with the idea that they know something.

You know, an impact is always substituted for a knowingness. They know.

Well, when you've committed a tremendous, fantastic number of overts against anything, you conceive that you know something about it. But it's an inverted knowingness. You see, it's the total cycle of individuation.

Individuated out, individuated out, out, out, out; knew absolutely nothing and then came back on the reverse curve and came back into the center of impact; so now one knows one knows.
Only, of course, you ask this psychiatrist what does he know – well, actually he can't tell you anything that he knows.

If you were to sit there and harp at him as to what he knew – I don't know, I think it might be an interesting thing for a Scientologist to do someday: go call on a psychiatrist and ask him what he knew. You're going to get some of the most brain-cracking responses, because you're going to de-individuate him out of an obsessed interiorization into whatever he's doing. Insanity. He'd be liable to start gibbering, you know that? He's liable to go mad! You know, maybe I've found a button here on how to drive a psychiatrist nuts. "What do you know?"

Now, you'd follow this cycle, you see: You'd try to teach him something to know. But, of course, that room has already been rented. It has occupants. So you can't, because he already knows. So, of course, there's no way to teach him anything that you know.

But at what level does he actually know? He knows at the level of impact. That is, he knows at the level of obsessive interiorization. This is how he (quote) knows (unquote). You got to reverse that cycle. See, the one thing he doesn't know is that he doesn't know. And you're – sometimes can be completely fooled, just flabbergasted in instruction in trying to teach somebody something. You can absolutely be flabbergasted. Stonied, I think is the better word.

You say to somebody, "All right. Now, this building is fifty-five feet long, fifty-seven feet long."

And they say, "All right. Good. I know."

"And it's twenty-two-and-a-half feet wide."

"Yes, I know."

You know, you'd fly in their face and say, "Well, how do you know? You never measured it."

The fellow will never tell you it's on the basis of "Well, I just looked and I'm good at estimating distances." You won't get that type of response out of that type of person, see. He will just say, "Yes, I know."

Well, if you're getting that type of response out of somebody, become a little bit puckish and a little bit adventurous about the thing and start skirting out, just a little bit further, to things that are more and more impossible that he knows. They're liable to do some of the weirdest reactions this way.

"Well, you know everybody in this block hates you, you know?"

"Yes, I know. Because – no! Wait a minute, wait a minute, what are you talking about?"

You say, "Well, I knew if I knocked long enough on that door, somebody would open it. Hello!" You get the unorthodox method of approach here.
You'd be fascinated about this cycle of the individuation, and the person tries harder and harder not to be part of it and finally becomes what he's trying not to be, all because of the overt and the withhold, and how that compares to knowingness.

And you've got this individual, then, that you're trying to teach something to and he already knows and doesn't know that he doesn't know.

Now, you try to attack this in many ways. You say, "Well, there's a great need for knowledge of the mind in your profession."

You know, a psychiatrist is liable to say, "Why?"

You're going to get the most – the most weird, erratic responses along this particular line. I'm just trying to give you a notion about it. And if you can keep up asking questions – this is a sort of coffee-shopping, on an unorthodox nonrepetitive command basis, you see – you keep asking questions, punching around one way or the other – all of a sudden the guy will realize that he's looking at complete idiocy. And you can spring him out of something like that.

We're not now talking about bad auditors or Scientologists or something like that, I'm talking about this on a much wider front: somebody who is absolutely fixated on the idea that he knows, but boy, he sure doesn't know what he knows.

You come along to somebody who is running an auditing session and you say to him, "Well, why are you asking the questions of the pc?" Well, you're going to get randomness. The answer is going to be this and the answer is going to be that. The answer may be sensible and the answer may not be sensible. But the end product of all this will be that the person either now knows he doesn't know or knows that he knows. And a new piece of certainty is added to his auditing.

As long as you leave all of these things uninspected by the auditor, as long as he thinks why he is doing it is something or other – it isn't a matter of criticizing him or showing he is wrong. Now, don't get the idea that that is what one is advocating. You're not really trying to disprove what he is saying, call him a liar or something like that. You're merely trying to get him to inspect something and what you do to furnish the inspection is the simplest possible cycle – the auditing cycle in the simplest form. Just ask him to inspect this.

"All right. Now, why do you ask the questions? Good. Good. Now, why do you think the pc answers in the first place? All right. Why does the pc keep on answering?" These, of course, are imponderables, man. These are braincrackers. These actually are considerable questions, you know.

All right. Why – but you're asking "Why do you think?" See. And "All right. Now, why do you think the pc requires an acknowledgment from you and feels lost if he doesn't get it?" And make him go over this cycle and ask it two or three times. He'll jog out all of his memorized reasons and he all of a sudden will take a look at "Well, why the hell? Why does he ask an auditing question? And why does it make any sense anyway to the pc?"

And you may do this to the auditor: you may cause him to – like the centipede, you know. You ask a centipede how he walks, you know. It's a fatal action, you know. Maybe this
auditor can't audit for a day or two but the truth of the matter is you've made him inspect the action. You've made him inspect the action. And in inspecting – well, he's asking a question: "Now, what does the pc do in an ARC break? What actually happens?"

Now, don't call him out, just accept whatever he says, don't you see. "Well, exactly why does a pc..." Now get very searching, you see. "Why does a pc recover from an ARC break?" Oh, buy any stock answer you've got, see, but come back and ask him again, maybe.

The guy finally says, "Why does he recover from an ARC break? Because he doesn't want to be mad at me anymore." And he sort of looks up and he says, "What do you mean, he doesn't want to be mad at ... What did I say?" you know. "He doesn't want to be mad at me anymore? Well, he didn't want to be mad at me in – well, yes he did. By George, you know, I think all pcs are just sitting there waiting for a chance to be mad at me." The guy's auditing will improve.

I'm giving you an idea about the – the fellow is inspecting what he is doing. This is a very crude rendition I'm giving you. But a fellow – get the fellow to inspect what he's doing and try to find out where those deviations are coming in from the ordinary auditing cycle. Because when he's got some cockeyed reason for it, there's going to be some cockeyed action following it.

It's the reason why he will never let the pc give the extra end items toward the end of session. Toward the end of session the pc is never permitted to give the additional items. Well, why? You could stand there and pound your brains out and guess and guess and guess. The thing to do is to ask – thing to do is to ask. Ask the fellow why he does that.

Only you don't even know what he's doing wrong if you just ask him to inspect the cycle of action. Ask him what he's puzzled about in auditing. "What puzzles you in an actual session?"

"Ohhwee!" And right away he's halfway to answering the question. He starts telling you what puzzles him in session; well, it's what he's having trouble with in session. And it usually isn't anything that he's being taught. It's something that he has added into the situation which doesn't exist there in the first place.

This is all off the cuff, but it comes on the basis of: All additives occur in the presence of misunderstanding – or in the absence of understanding, to state it the other way.

When you get an additive, you didn't have understanding – until you've got all additives and no understanding.

You want to see somebody doing something idiotic that he thinks is the exact, right way to go about it? Then obviously there was no understanding of how to do it in the first place. Don't you see?

But you don't look at it perhaps on this other very, very narrow view – very tiny view. You say the understanding is the reason for no additives and the misunderstanding is the reason for the additives, because it may look to you that the person understands what he's doing and yet you have these odd additives.
Well, when you see an additive you're looking at a misunderstanding. And this is picked up on meters as "disagreements with." Well, a disagreement simply registers as a no-comprehension-of.

And educating by disagreement is a fascinating activity. You simply get the fellow to pass over the thing while he's holding a meter – a pair of electrodes and every time it ticks you ask him what have you disagreed with. You wouldn't ask him, by the way, "What didn't you understand?" Now, I'm showing you there's a synonymous action here, see. You wouldn't ask him this, "What did you misunderstand there?" or "What didn't you understand?" This wouldn't bring anything out. You ask them for the symptom of the misunderstanding. It's the disagreement. They'll wrap with a disagreement.

Well, underlying that disagreement there's a misunderstanding.

Oh, I am sure some fellow has felt awfully silly. He has gone out and he has jousted windmills and he's torn things down, and he's busted up the millstones and he's just fixing the thing, you know, just fantastic, you know. And then he finds the fellow standing there was not a ghost but a miller. See, his whole destruction was based upon his misunderstanding of who was standing outside the mill.

That is the subject of comedy. That is also the abundant subject of tragedy in life. But in knowledge itself, which is the woof and warp that you deal of – with, and so forth, disagreement occurs after the misunderstanding.

And the way to set some auditor back to battery, of course, is get him to inspect the cycle of auditing and find out what's doing. But a much surer method you are using in your classes all the time right now: And that is simply that you are consistently – you're putting people on the meter; you ask him to read a bulletin while on the meter, you clarify the thing. Or ask them, "What – give me twelve things out of that bulletin that you can agree with." And you, of course, will inevitably have drop into the hamper the twelve things in the bulletin they disagree with, you see. Those can be clarified. You can trace it back to them.

Because a person cannot do what he does not understand.

He can give certain limitations to his understanding and do some small sphere of it. Like a girl running a computer does not have to build a computer, but let me point out to you that she is not building computers. She is running computers. Therefore, she understands the running of the computer and therefore she can understand the computer. If somebody were to ever come along and tell her why she was running the computer and enlarge her understanding of it, she would be a good – better computer operator, any day of the week.

You can always increase work output, you can always increase comfort and you can always make people more relaxed by letting them find out what they're doing and why they're doing it. This is inevitable, because you've increased the understanding. But people cannot do what they do not understand.

Those are two facts that I don't think any philosopher has ever joined up before. They are facts that stand very squarely in the road of good auditing. Listing will go badly, sessions go badly, Model Session falls apart and so forth.
There is some misunderstanding on the function of the auditor or the cycle of auditing action. It does not depend on the person being evil and therefore he's a bad auditor because he's basically an evil person, see. That is not the explanation. There is a misunderstanding of what he is doing or trying to do.

And sometimes as in your part on the subject of psychiatry – I no longer make this mistake – you can't dig psychiatry or understand psychiatry. That's truth. That's truth, you can't understand them. The reason you can't understand them is you really don't realize that they haven't any goals or aren't doing anything that you would think they should be doing. So therefore they're incomprehensible to you. They're perfectly comprehensible to themselves – perfectly comprehensible. They are not trying to cure anybody. They are not trying to make anybody well. They are not trying to make anybody sane. They don't have anything in common with any of those things. They no longer care for them or understand them or want to have anything to do with them.

You're trying to understand them on your own framework. You see, you'd like to make people well and you'd like to make them feel better and that sort of thing. And, of course, psychiatry is not understandable upon these basics. It's just not an understandable subject, then, because the basics by which it's being understood are incomprehensible.

Now, on a fantastically minor scale, some auditor isn't doing a good job because he just totally misunderstands what he should be doing as the auditor. Well, he doesn't have to have a very esoteric understanding of it. He doesn't have to be very informed as to what he is doing, but his misunderstanding will be so wild as to sometimes just make you feel like you've been snatched baldheaded. You'll say, "What? Not really!" See?

"I'm trying to straighten out this person's mind. I'm trying to straighten out this person's thinkingness. And therefore, the things they think, I've got to correct. Now, the only way you can straighten anything out is to correct it, isn't it? And the only way to correct anything is to change it, isn't it? So therefore, in order to change the pc you've got to correct the pc. So therefore, you have to tell the pc something different every time the pc says something." Of course, you're going to find far more idiotic responses to this in some kind of a co-audit than you'll ever find in any group of studying auditors. And there, it will become so ridiculous as to be fantastic.

But you can bet your bottom dollar that if you do not understand what is going on in a session that you won't be able to handle that session and at the bottom of all error is misunderstanding. That's not said on a think basis.

Some fellow's car, you know – this is an old problem of ours, is why does somebody's car go enmest? Why does this guy's car fall apart, and why does that bird's car stay together? See, what are these vast differences?

Well on the subject addressed, the person doing it has adequate understanding to the task.

See? This fellow's car that isn't going enmest, the best way of expressing it or a good translatable way of expressing it, is just to say, "Well, he understands cars." See?
This fellow who makes the good pie, well, he just understands pie, that's all. You'd find out that would follow through and be true. Now, this fellow who makes bad pie, you ask him about pie. And by golly, you're going to find out he doesn't understand pie.

You put him on a meter and ask him – now, this is the meter question that compares with this – you put him on the meter and you ask him what he disagrees with about pie. And you can run it down, pull it as a Prepcheck chain and after that you've severed his individuation channel, see. I mean, he's ceased to be – go this cycle of individuation on the subject of pie. All of a sudden he can understand pie and he can make one.

There is the whole subject of recovered abilities. There's how you recover any ability which you once had. You just restore your understanding of it. How do you restore your understanding of it? Well, it's unfortunately a very negative thing. You delete your disagreements with it. And if you can take your disagreements out with it, your understanding of it will restore. Then you can study it. You can look it over and familiarize yourself with it. And you can do it.

Well, in this lecture I've taken up some of the bugbears of an Instructor.

There are many ways you could go about the subject of instruction. But I think if you go too long and try to instruct too long without taking to heart the principles which I've just given you, I think you will come a cropper in a large percentage of cases. And they're the ones that'll break your heart.

A person can't audit – they don't understand what they're supposed to be doing. Why don't they understand what they're supposed to be doing. Because they disagree with certain things that they are doing.

If you wanted to follow it back down on an instruction-auditing back-check basis, pick up the disagreements. They could then familiarize themselves with what they are doing and then they could audit. Doesn't matter what their goal is – you'd still get by it.

Okay? All right.

Thank you and good night.
Good enough. What is this? This is the 11th Oct. AD 12, huh?

*Audience: Yes!*

The month of the octopus. And Ronnie needed eight hands to do everything he has to do.

We have some good news – some good news. And everybody around Sydney can be very happy with this. Of course, we're always very happy with this. Bill's just found Ian's goal.

*Audience: Great! [applause]*

There are probably some more, but due to the general breakdown in the auditing department, I haven't been informed.

We've stopped – we probably have found many dynamics and items and all that sort of thing, but we've gotten so we don't even announce those.

We have an interesting datum on this: It isn't necessarily true, according to the Auditing Section, and what has been coming through the Auditing Section, that the length of time taken to find the goal indicates the goodness or badness of the auditor. That is not what indicates the goodness or badness of the auditor. It is the fact that the auditor cannot find the detested person, dynamic or item.

Well, according to the statistics, if an auditor can't find somebody's detested person, dynamic and item in a fair hurry, there is something wrong with his auditing. See, if he then doesn't find the goal in a hurry, this doesn't indicate much. See, if it takes a long time to find the goal after you've got the item or something like that, we have no indication of this at all. But the speed of finding the detested person, the dynamic and the item is directly related to the smoothness of the auditor. Now, that's one to put in your kit as an indication of what's going on.

If the auditor can't find the detested person, the dynamic and the item in a fair hurry on the pc, then there's something fundamentally wrong with the auditing sessions. Wherever auditors have been changed on pcs here, why, we've gotten these first three things in a rush. Whereas before, we haven't gotten them in a rush. In other words, it wasn't the pc. Got that? It's the auditor. And this has just been sorted out by Mary Sue, and I think you might find it a useful datum.

Now, to give you some idea, Julia out there in California, is having a ball these days. This is getting ridiculous, you know? I – it is! It's ...
I told her that – to send me a cable – because they were – had a lot of offbeat goals being found out there and so forth, I told her to send me a cable on each one found. Julia's doing all the auditing and I'm getting a cable or two every day. And operating with terrific Saint Hill altitude, don't you see, and operating with the altitude of a good auditor anyhow, she's supposed to be running the show out there, but she's actually the California Goal Finder right now. And she's supposed to be checking out goals.

Something is going here whereby somebody sits down for a rock slam test, and they wind up with their detested person, their dynamic and their item, and then – and the length of time is spent checking out the goal. So they'll spend two hours finding the goal and two hours checking it out.

You're operating here, of course, without this tremendous altitude. You're just a student. [laughter] And you'll just be surprised how people stand and deliver on goals from the standpoint of altitude. You'll also be surprised occasionally as you're auditing along, how people can stand still and not deliver occasionally. But the general situation is that goals are tremendously variable in length of time to find, even in the hands of a good auditor.

Now, finding goals – this is a lecture on goals – finding goals is a science. It is not an art. It is a science. All of a sudden it's a science. But, like all sciences, it has a bit of luck connected with it.

I'll give you an idea. The pc puts his goal on the end of a two hundred goals list, and there are twelve goals on that list because it's going straight down the line of the proper lineup. Going straight down the line. These goals go out hard. You know, a bit hard. Just a bit hard to get rid of those two hundred goals, you see. And you're just taking them by routine, and the goal is a little bit offbeat from what both you and the pc thought it would be, you know?

And the item is "a target," to give you an idea – so, of course, "to be a projectile," you'd say, "Boy that must be the goal, you know?" And you and the pc are both convinced it's "to be a projectile," you know. And you get down to the two hundredth goal and it's "to be a little flower." See, you know – a curve in it.

Well, that's why the speed in – with which you find the goal is not necessarily an indicator. But getting up to the goals-finding step, getting the detested person, the dynamic and the item, apparently contains less luck and more meter reading and attention and smooth auditing. These are the factors there. You get over into the goal, and there you are.

Now, sometimes you get unlucky with your detested person. Somebody gives you a list of 420 detested people. Oooh! That's an awful lot, you know, to say, "Consider committing overts against_____. Consider committing overts against_____. Consider committing overts against_____. Consider committing overts against_____. Four hundred and some odd times, see.

Well, that's merely time-consuming because there was a lot on the list. And then this person's apparently a well of dynamics. And we get the detested person, we find out what this represents to the pc, and it represents 610 dynamics. And that's, "Consider committing overts
against_____." And, "Consider committing overts against_____." you see. It's just – it's just hard slug, and so on.

And then we find the dynamic, and we get one thousand items listed from the dynamic, and that's, "Consider committing overts against_____. "Consider committing overts against_____."

And the phrase is worn out by this time, so you say, "Well, think of committing trouble to_____." or something. You see, you – you've actually used repeater technique, and you've just actually worn out the whole English language on the subject of those words. They don't mean anything anymore. Anyway, you see that that is mainly a slugfest and requires good meter attention and requires alertness.

Now, the system is fairly infallible. In your hands I'm particularly proud of this system. It almost works better for you than it works for me. And that's really marvelous. Because on a couple of pcs I've had to take some wide tours. But I recall that this was before the system was perfected.

And then I have had bad luck recently with this system. I've been trying to find goals with it, and here's what keeps happening to me: After I get the detested person and the dynamic and the item, and get the goals listed very nicely – all of which proceeded with great speed – it turns up that the pc had an old goal and it is now alive.

You know, it's just been happening and happening, you know. Of course they got their goal, and that's fine, and it can read now and it never did before and all that sort of thing, but I haven't found a new goal with it, which I consider quite remarkable. Anyway – and then there are some other dodges I've been working on and so forth to speed up goals finding. I've been more interested in the research line than otherwise.

But you know, it's a sort of a disappointing thing, you know, you swear and spit after the session, you know. After you spent – you spent seven hours, you see. And you've just been working like mad, you know, and you've got it all up and it proves up beautifully, and then the pc says to you, "Well, I know you'll practically kill me for this but I think my original goal 'to catch catfish' should go on the front of List Six." Of course, you put it there, and that's it. You didn't find the goal with the system, you found the old goal.

You say, "Aw, nuts!"

But of course, the pcs got his goal, and it's all fine, and it's unburdened, and it's all to the good, and it's just your own professional feeling of pride that is hurt. You feel knuckle-headed, you know, because it was sitting there in the first place. You already knew about this goal, you know. You worked seven hours on a Dynamic Assessment, and of course the Dynamic Assessment is necessary to make the old goal read. See, it wouldn't have read without it. But anyhow, it feels sort of weird. I think I've done this too often now. And I want to see a brand-new, bright, shiny goal sitting there.

But my research auditing ... You saw a piece of research auditing last night. You didn't see a standard session. You saw a meterless Prepcheck to match up the goal, "to know." And the reason that was meterless is because actually using the meter on the pc to test out the goal,
I thought possibly was an invalidation of the goal, so the pc might prepcheck much more smoothly, you see, without the meter.

And I think you will notice that in each case the Suppress fell half a dial, when the pc said there was none. Did you notice that? I was quite interested in that and I thought you would be, too. And the pc is learning it for the first time.

Actually then, the meter knows more about suppress than the pc quite ordinarily. And the pc knows more about the other buttons probably. I'm sorry to have to reveal that. But did you notice that? Did you actually remark that fact? So, of course, there was a meterless check, and you had the pattern of the auditing and it all would have been the same, except I just wasn't using a meter. And we did get someplace with that. And the pc felt wonderful about it.

Ordinarily in another auditing session, not a TV demonstration session, I would have gone through that again. And at that time the pc probably would have fallen into some of these suppresses, see. And possibly would have cleaned it up. But that would have had to have been completed to make a positive statement concerning the fact. The pc thought the Suppress button was cool, and actually it was still hot.

Only for that reason would I be willing then to go on with doing anything with that goal, see. Suppress button's that hot; well, all right. Did you see it though? I mean, did you really see that? It was about a third-of-a-dial drop when he said, "Well, that's clear, and there's not any more answers there," and so on. Now I'll have to run it out of the pc!

But I thought that was interesting. The pc then does not necessarily have any alertness to the hotness of a Suppress button. You notice that none of the other buttons that I noticed, although it was pretty hard to keep the pc on the meter, did you notice that terrific amount of tone arm action? I was always going off the pin, of course, because I didn't want to keep watching the meter because that invalidated the pc. I wasn't able to put that needle back in the center of the dial as often as I wanted to. Did you notice that?

So therefore, you had a hard time following a meter on that at all. And I was trying to get it up to the middle as I said the goal, so that you could see whether or not the goal was firing or not firing. It was pretty hard to do, particularly on the askewness of that demonstration meter.

In view of the fact that in my own auditing these days, I'm beginning to audit only with the meter over on the left side of me, with a magnifying glass and straight on – auditing with a meter over here, askew with the other hand – getting so I'm ambidextrous. And the Mark V particularly – which I dropped and bunged up a bit last night, by the way – later on. It's all right. It still operates; it's a good test. These meters – the new meter is quite indestructible. There'll be Mark Vs available to you in about three to four weeks.

Audience: Good.

Anyway, let's hope they haven't altered the basic structure from the one you've been watching. It's almost identical face. Face is the same almost. The only thing we did was put "rise" in with the dashes.
Anyway, auditing with the thing over here on this side, and trying to follow that con-
founded thing through gives you less of a throw. Some of you, by the way, were being –
wondering about picking up latent reads – why I was picking up latent reads on this meter. 
The Mark V is slightly latent. I haven't bothered to inquire why, but the Mark V is slightly 
latent.

As you think you see an instant read on a Mark IV, on a Mark V you will begin to rea-
alyze that it is falling at some split second after what you thought it was falling on, on the Mark 
IV. And that is an instant read on a Mark V. That gives you one answer to it. And the other is, 
of course, that is what is known as a suppressed meter. And you will often have to do with 
suppressed meters.

Pc has very heavy suppression. Well, that's proven by the fact that when I asked him 
Suppress, you'd see your button go and so forth. But that is a suppressed meter. In other 
words, that meter isn't reading dead-on. A pc with terrifically heavy suppression on the goals 
line and so forth reads a little early, a little late and so on. This you will get used to. You have 
to know this.

And it breaks down the rule of the exact instant read. Whenever you have a pc who is 
under heavy suppression – this'd be a pc who rock slammed like mad, by the way, at half a 
chance – you'll notice that there's some – often something a little peculiar.

Now, at the time last week that you saw this meter, you mainly noticed the latent reads 
were being taken on the first rudiment. Did you no tice that? That's probably what first attrac-
ted your attention. And then it wasn't so latent on the other things.

Well, last night I straightened out the s uppressions on the first rudiment. In other 
words, this pc had several sessions jammed together on the first one, and we pulled those 
apart.

Now, you might have thought that was rather unusual to do, but remember it's the au-
ditor's job to get the rudiment in, not to sit there like a silly idiot and Simple-Simon the pc 
into the ground. You understand? So I was interested in getting the rudiment in, which I then 
proceeded to do. And traced the rudiment back to the first time he had trouble with it.

Well now, it was that rudiment – just to make  my point here – you saw last night that 
that rudiment was terrifically suppressed, and a week before, saw that it was reading latent 
and prior and every other confounded way except dead-on. You see that?

All right. Then last night, I cleaned it up. And I don't think you saw too much else, 
although there wasn't too much else in the session, because I was running a meterless test. I 
think you saw far less latent read, although occasionally you did possibly notice that 
hair-latency, but that hair-latency is the Mark V. And man, you'll have to get used to calling a 
real latent read, and what is an instant read, on a Mark V. And they're slightly different. It's 
different than a Mark IV.

There's just a little bit of white space, you might say, in – just a tiny bit of white space 
in to the end of your statement and the beginning of the read. I don't know why that is, I ha-
ven't bothered to inquire, but I have noticed it consistently and continuously. I'm the only one 
who has been operating with a Mark V. And when you start operating with a Mark V, you'll
first start noticing that it gives you a lot of trouble. That's your – be the first thing you'll notice, that this is a lot of trouble, man.

It's like you were running fan-job aircraft, you know, and they're with a fan, and they went like mad, 197 miles an hour, and they struggle into the air, and they fly through the air. And when you first got into one, having graduated from a Tiger Moth, you see, this thing really looked like it was going, you know. Tiger Moth going 60 miles an hour and this thing is going 197 miles an hour.

Well, you graduated from some old type of meter to the Mark IV, and you really thought you were flying, you know, this was really flying. (Probably at the moment perfectly happy with a Mark IV.) And then you start running a Mark V. Well, that's just graduating into jets. You just suddenly and inexplicably will find yourself in the world of jets.

As Mary Sue said the other day, she can't call them. Because it's gone, it's read, before she notices it. You know? The jet plane has gone by overhead and she wakes up to the fact that it has read, you see?

Now, the read is very positive. Its quite a persistent read and is actually much easier to sort out than that Mark IV, but you won't think so at first. I imagine you'll go on stumbling and blundering around for a week or so – I did – and educating your thumb all over again.

You just throw that tone arm up with your thumb a thousandth of an inch further than you intended to, and the Mark Vs needle goes over and hits the pin and lies there. Haah! And you've already started your sentence or something like this, you know, so therefore you have to stop your sentence and put the pc on wait, and adjust the thing, and you eventually will get your thumb educated to where you throw this thing, and it goes over and does a wobble. And you have to get so you can time the wobble.

There's no shunt. That's one of the reasons the Mark V is so terrific. On the actual meter in the Mark V there's no shunt. There is a small one in a Mark IV. And so there's nothing steadying the Mark V at all. And it goes over here and it wobbles. And then settles down and gives you the read.

Well, that is the education of your thumb is what that depends on.

Anyhow, that's beside the point, more or less. It has another characteristic: is that when you have a clean needle on it, it flows. That is the most flowing, smooth needle you ever wanted to see.

And let's say you had a flowing, smooth needle – this is another reason for the latency. You had a flowing smooth needle. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" See, it's flowing, it's smooth, it's nice. It just looks like honey. It's perfect, you know. I mean, it's – everything is just "Oh, my, that's very nice." And that's on its highest sensitivity or its lowest sensitivity.

You normally run this on its second sensitivity – a Mark V. You run a Mark V with the additional sensitivity knob straight up, which I think is sensitivity 64. And you're running right now at sensitivity 16. There actually is that difference of multiple in the sensitivities.
So anyhow, it runs best with that sensitivity knob straight up, and you get your best reads out of it. And only when you're trying to pick the pc to pieces do you shove it over to a 128, see. And there it is, flowing smooth, and you say, "Now, when was the last time I audited you? When was that session? How? Yes. Well, fine now. Thank you. And since the last...

and this needle goes krup-krup, tuk-tuk, prr-brr-brr-brr-brr-gone.

Now, it actually kind of doesn't matter if it reads or not. This is a bad thing to tell you. You know there's something on the question. In other words, you can use this flow factor on a Mark V. You no longer have a flowing needle. There is something wrong with the question you are asking. And when you clean it all up you'll have this beautiful flowing needle back. And it's very easy to get it back.

But you can almost tell what question is hot by the fact that the needle is doing something, or that you have missed something in the session. Something is missed in the session. You can tell it from the unflowingness of the needle. It's going up in jerks. It's going up, bup-tek, krrp-bump, dit-du-bop, zzt-zzt, trip, thud. You know? It actually is very commotional. In other words, the Mark V to some tiny degree registers the state of mind of the pc by its character of rise. See?

Now, the Mark V also picks off all analytical thoughts. There isn't anything left in the pc's skull when the Mark V is clean. See, we were with the Mark IV picking off reactive thoughts only, and the pc could think an analytical thought and you wouldn't see it on the meter. With a Mark V you see every analytical thought.

Pc says, "Well, I hope that doesn't read." The Mark V will go click! So therefore, you heard me asking, and have heard me asking while you've been watching me do this, if the pc thought of anything, if there are any afterthoughts in that particular case. And it wouldn't matter if the thing were very latent, I would still ask the pc what he thought of.

Why? Because I don't want my needle brr, brr, tick, tick, brr, thup, bup.

Now, actually every analytical thought is to some degree a missed withhold, if it is not uttered to the auditor. So if you want the pc – without pestering him to death – if you want the pc really sitting in-session gorgeously, so forth, why, you've just got to keep a clean flowing needle. So this gives you something new that a meter can do. Right?

Now, this is very pertinent to goals finding. Because you're not about to find any goals on any pc whose rudiments are out. You're just not about to find any goal on a pc with the out-rudiments; that's all, man. And the Mark V puts rudiments in the like of which you never heard of before. You really get them in. You get them in including the analytical thoughts.

In other words, you get it in reactively and analytically and physically and every other way. You've got these rudiments in. Of course, you won't get them in as well if you are suspicious of your meter. And if your meter is not quite registering everything that it might be registering, therefore you'll very often badger your pc and start cleaning cleans. And that throws the rudiments out.

I know I had a bad time in the session last night. I got into the rudiments, the pc was out of session, I couldn't get the rudiments in, and we had quite a ruckus. Quite a mess. Auditing table upset and everything. This was remarkable.
Now, when this type of thing occurs it is – something else has happened.

And obviously I just got through missing the pc's goal. I think that was what this was all about. I couldn't really trace it to anything else. I must have gone right over the top of the pc's goal. Needle was rough and registering on "halffluth." But I think it would have registered on "Have you eaten any apple pie?" There was a lot of figure-figure going on. There was a lot of this and that going on.

So the meter is actually more sensitive than – for everybody's good, occasionally. You see, it's – you could get along with less. Do you understand? But yet you actually can't get along with less.

So this meter delivers back to the auditor a tremendous amount of skill in the order of auditing. It delivers back to him a lot of judgment about the thing. Is this pc doing all right, and is this pc really in-session? Well, you've got a free-flowing needle.

Now, the only thing wrong with that is you also get a free-flowing needle on a totally ARC broke pc, whether you're using a Mark V or a Mark IV or any other thing. I saw that last night, too.

See now, what's the point here? Well, no meter is ever going to be made, ever, which lays aside the ability of the auditor to perceive the pc. The auditor must be able to see the pc. The auditor must be able to apprehend what the pc is doing. Because he could then have a free-flowing needle on a totally ARC break pc with nothing registering anywhere.

Now, that factor will always take place because it's a characteristic of a living being; it is not a characteristic of a meter. And there's no beating that factor. I assure you of this; there's no beating that factor.

So you always have two inspection systems at work. You have the auditor, and you have the meter. And if you delete either one totally, auditing doesn't become more difficult, it becomes impossible! That's with an exclamation and an underscore. You delete either one of these systems, and auditing becomes impossible.

Now, when I say "When you delete the meter," you of course couldn't find the pc's goal. I worked and worked to find a system which would meterlessly find the pc's goal, and I have never succeeded in doing that. I don't even have a clue as to how to go about it, because everything – and I mean that everything I have put together that pointed in that direction has flopped. In other words, there has not been one hopeful sign.

Now, how do you like that? Now, you know you get on some goals channel with the pc, and if you're on the goals channel, it – occasionally a goal will go $zzpp$! and occasionally it'll rock slam, and occasionally will go tap, tap and a rocket read, see, as you go over one goal or another. You know that's a hopeful channel. All right.

Now, how do you like that? Now, you know you get on some goals channel with the pc, and if you're on the goals channel, it – occasionally a goal will go $zzpp$! and occasionally it'll rock slam, and occasionally will go tap, tap and a rocket read, see, as you go over one goal or another. You know that's a hopeful channel. All right.

There's been no hopeful channels of any kind in the direction of... Well, for instance, writing up a list so that the pc would eventually write only his goal. You get the type of thing here? Writing up combinations of lists which would eventually get the pc to write his goal. Doing this or that, asking questions of, and so forth. And this has just uniformly laid an egg.
I don't say that it's an impossible trail, but I do say that in quite some period of time now, two years, I have occasionally moved into that field and worked in it. And every time I've come out with a total skunk, pockets empty and all shells intact – skunked.

I've thought of how about having a pc just write goals until the only goal he can think of is that. That doesn't work either. Pcs can evidently write eight million nine hundred and ninety-nine billion goals without ever only writing their own goal, you see. Well, a lot of – lot of things go into this.

So, goals finding begins with auditing. And it requires an auditor capable of inspecting the pc who is being audited – the auditor inspecting the pc and an instrument inspecting the pc. It takes both.

Now, sometimes you can lay the instrument aside but that's only when you're proving something up. You'll eventually have to bring that instrument back into your lap and say, "Does that goal read?" Do you see? You eventually have to resort to the meter, no matter how many other approaches you make visually with your naked eye.

Now, your meter is not going to detect the ARC break of the pc if it happens fast. That's interesting, isn't it? Only the auditor's going to detect that.

And after that, the meter says, "It's all clean, it's all clean, it's all clean." The pc is lying on the floor, writhing quietly, see. The meter says, "He's well." The meter says, "He's well and happy and in-session." You see, "Have I missed a withhold on you? Huh-huh, clean. Willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Clean. Do you have a present time problem? Clean." See? "You told me a half-truth? Clean." Everything clean, everything clean, everything clean. Pc's lying on the floor in total agony and total despair.

So therefore, not this instrument, but any mechanical observer I think that anybody ever cooks up will have some ceiling of limitation on its power of observation. There'll be some limitation upon its ability to observe, which a thetan can always better. Because remember, a thetan can look, but a machine can't look unless a thetan is looking at the machine to read the answer off of the machine. This is something that the scientist uniformly overlooks.

The psychologist's dissertation on how the eye works is one of the damnedest pieces of buffoonery which has ever been perpetrated as a hoax – I mean, as a fact. It is! It's a piece of buffoonery. According to this, the eye looks out here, it points in that direction, and by some focal system of images – which of course he gets out of the science of optics – there is some kind of a screen back here which registers the image. And then... we don't say any more about it.

But carrying through this, reductio ad absurdum, we get a screen looking at a screen and then we would get another screen looking at a screen.

And then we'd get another screen looking at that screen, and another screen looking at that screen. And at no time anywhere do we have an observer. In this whole system there is no observer. I think the reason for this is the psychologist has never been able to observe. So he just discounts this very necessary thing, an observer.
You know, I did this one time with a UNIVAC, ENIAC smick-smack thingamabob whatnot that was going round and round and its wheels were churning, and its valves were popping, and I think it had cooling systems and so forth to cool off its fevered brow. And it had all kinds of instrumentations which crossed instrumentations.

I busted the machine by the way. I did. I fed it "two times two equals..." and it was unable to solve this problem. That was the end of it. The things went round, and they went round, and there was no "4" to fall out, see?

It was set up to have a more complex equation. And that was too fundamental an equation. Now, it could have said, "Two times two equals four," if you had first said, "The derivative integral of Y in its ratio to X is the distance between G and its square root of Q. And if this were true, then two plus two or two times two equals what number?" See, the machine is set up to take that many.

This just left all the blank files over here, see. And the machine looked in vain, it couldn't find anything there, so it looked again. And couldn't find anything there. And it looked again, you see, and it never would pick up the "Two times two." The cams were going mad inside the thing. They had to shut the thing off.

Spoke to me rather crossly. And they said, "This machine was not designed to solve things of that character." It was an astronomical computational machine. It had the distances to the moon, and the lunar positions thereof, as expostulated from the eclipse of something or other, you know, and this was all fed in. And of course the cams couldn't "Two times two equals four."

"Well, let me point out something," I said. "Let me point out something here. The machine never has seen an answer."

"Ho-ho-ho-ho, nah-ha-ha-ha, nah-ha-ha-ha, nah-ha ... !"
I said, "Wait a minute now. That machine has never seen an answer."

"Well," they said, "seeing you're just using some offhanded trickery or ... It's your writing background showing up, you know, just using semantic trickery, or ..."

"No, no. It never has. Who reads the answer when given up by the machine?"

"Well," they said, "the operator."
I said, "Then the operator is part of the machine."

"No! No, no. No! No, no."

"All right, then if the operator isn't part of the machine, then the machine has never inspected the answer."

"No, that – couldn't be true."

You see, that just led up the garden path on this. You had – you put an observer into any of these systems and they go to pieces. You've got to have an observer. I mean, you take the observer out, you say to – here's this system. And it says, "Well this machine observes itself and therefore integrates what it does." Well, you can set up a machine as a servomecha-
nism which will find out that it's nine o'clock and shut the radio off or turn the percolator on or do all kinds of things like this. But its inspection is just that. And actually it rarely inspects that it's done it.

Now, some machines, much more complicated, will inspect to find out whether or not it has done this. And if it hasn't done this it will shut itself off. An automatic phonograph will do that. It'll inspect itself to find out whether or not it's playing a record and therefore... But its inspection is limited to that one sphere, see. It can observe no further than that.

Now, you can't expect a meter to observe a pc. It will not. An auditor has to be there to observe the meter. And I'm stressing this point not because it's just a piece of ridiculousness, but you're going to find people around who think that the machine observes the pc and if they simply sit there and let this machine operate, they're going to be all set. And furthermore, that a machine can be developed which will observe the pc 100 percent and do everything there that is present in an auditing session. So their total action will be to develop better and better and better meters. The auditor is totally unimportant. See, the auditor will have nothing to do with it at all. It's just whether or not you have a better machine.

No, sir! Although it's very laudable to develop better and better and better meters, don't develop in them the direction that they will eventually wind up with no auditor. Because that's the trouble with any auditing session that goes wrong: is no auditor. At some point in the auditing cycle there's no auditor.

You can actually have the commands come out of a tape recorder. See you could actually fill up a whole record – a whole tape full of "Do fish swim?" And then put it on with a foot pedal, and sit there and the tape will play and ask you the question, "Do fish swim?" and so forth, and then you get into an ARC break.

Well, maybe then you could have another tape recorder and if you had an ARC break you could take your other foot and push down on it and it would say, "Do you have an ARC break?" See? And maybe if that registered "yes," you could even link that in to another machine which now said, "All right, recall an ARC break" or something, you see, and it would go on and on and on in this particular fashion.

In other words, you could get a system of complexity operated out like this. But look, no matter how many systems you have, the only observer present is the pc. So you still have an auditor present. It's the pc auditing himself. Now the question is what is he auditing? And if your observer is the pc, then what's the pc auditing? Well, he must be auditing some valence. Well, we're not trying to clear valences. We're trying to clear pcs.

All right. Now, let's study this a little bit further in goals. It becomes much more pertinent to this than it appears at first glance. The pc must have another beingness. This is peculiar to goals. You realize you can sit there and chant to yourself, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude," and think of the problem of comparable magnitude to something or other, and solve something. You could even audit yourself through an engram. You can do all kinds of interesting things with self-auditing. Most of them wind you up in the soup, but the point I'm making out here is things can happen because of self-auditing, see? You can.
You're having an awful lot of trouble with some other human being; you can sit there and say, "Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to Bill." See, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to Joe. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to..." and get your answer each time, and first thing you know you feel better about it. See, that's possible. Of course, you'll probably have a headache and so forth. But it doesn't matter.

Now, it's possible. Now, because that's possible – because that is possible then you could extrapolate and move forward to believe that goals finding and auditing was possible. You see?

In research and so forth I've had to, and have inadvertently or on purpose, run dozens of processes on myself. It's inevitable. You say, "I wonder what would be the effect of..." See, that's all you have to say. You answer the question. It's obviously a self-audit, see?

You say, well, would these people get better if you did so-and-so? Supposing you asked them, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to this building." "Yeah, there's an answer. That's answerable."

Now, in actual fact, you, in dreaming up a PCs lines do a little bit of self-auditing. You say, "Well, let's see, is that answerable, or isn't that? Yes, you could say that'd be a clear sphere, or something like that. Yeah, there's an answer to that." You know? So, you get this kind of thing.

In other words it starts to be borne in upon you that auditing on self is possible. Well, it's possible to say, run a Touch Assist on your own leg. Yeah, you could probably cure up a scar.

Girl's got a scar or something like that, that she doesn't like, on her knee or something like that, why, she could probably do a Touch Assist on it ten minutes a day and at the end of a couple of months or something like that have no more scar. It's quite remarkable what can be done with a Touch Assist, see. And because that is successful, say, well, you could probably find and run a goal on yourself, see. Therefore goals running is possible.

Now, I collided with – on this on the Queen Elizabeth. And I've had a quite a go-around on this particular subject, and actually have let some people list their own goals. And this is what now materializes: Let me show you here: here's a person, see, and here's a valence. This flashlight, see. Now, here's the valence here. Now, this is the valence with the goal in it. Now, to find his own goal – see, you'd think it'd be like this, see – he said, "Let's see, 'to catch catfish.' I wonder if that is my goal. Let's see. Is that my goal? 'to catch catfish?'"

"Now," he says, "I don't know, that sort of made me feel dizzy. Let's see, 'to catch catfish'... How about, 'to be a game warden?'... Yeah, there's pain on that. That must be right." That's the oppgoal. See? That's the oppgoal. An individual has to be over here to look at the valence in which his goal exists. I'm making this point with you. And every time the individual thinks of inspecting his goal he exteriorizes from his valence into an opposition terminal. And an effort to run one's own goal or list one's own goal always finds one in the opposite lines.
Now, when one is listing opposition terminals, one of course is in one's own goal terminal. Here's the opposition terminal, see, and the thetan would come around here. Let's say these are terminals now. We'll take the terminal situation, see. And here's the thetan, see. Now, this one contains the opposition goal – the flashlight. And this little microphone here contains the person's own goal, see.

Now, person says, "To catch catfish. Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and inspects – goes over here to the opposition terminal, to inspect the terminal which contains the goal "to catch catfish." Savvy?

Now, to inspect the opposition, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish," the person goes into the terminal in which the goal exists to look at the opposition. Do you understand?

In other words, no matter what he looks at, he is always in the other side. Every time he looks at the goal or the Opposition to the goal – there's looking at the opposition – he's in the terminal with the goal. You got that? And while looking at the goal he goes into the terminal which is in Opposition to the goal. You see this?

So there he is, always on the wrong side of the fence, because – here's the trick: you can't as-is. You're always being the thing – you're always being the thing which doesn't have in it what you're trying to as-is. It's all exterior inspection, then. Everything is inspected exteriorly in the mind. A little bit hard to put this across.

But the point I'm trying to make simply is that the individual, the person, the thetan, in the bank stack-up, can never be in what he's trying to audit. And therefore never turns the sens or the pain on in the right places. It's always in the wrong place.

If it's lines two and four that are supposed to contain sensation, and lines one and three supposed to contain pain, why, in a self-audit, why, lines one and three will contain sensation and lines two and four will contain pain. This is real backwards, isn't it? And he can get so loused up, because he never is in what he is trying to as-is.

He star... he's going to check out his own goal. Let's say the goal is in this microphone, that's one valence, he's going to check out this goal. So he comes over here into the opposition to check out the goal. Now, he's being the opposition while he's checking out the goal, but this thing isn't here... He's not in it to find out how it thinks, so he only thinks over here in the opposition, you see what this... You get the idea?

Now, he's going to check out for the opposition goal; of course, he's in his own terminal and, you know, the one that does have the goal. No, it takes an auditor.

All right. Here's let us say is the auditor. And here are two terminals. Here's the auditor, and the auditor says, "to catch catfish," and the pc goes into the terminal of "catch catfish." And the auditor says, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish," and the pc goes into the terminal in opposition to catching catfish, see? In other words, he's in the right terminals for them to as-is. And so you get as-isingness. Then you get something as-ised and the bank starts caving in and he's always in the right viewpoint. But self-auditing he's always in the wrong viewpoint.
Because of this mechanic alone self-clearing becomes impossible. Also, after a great deal of testing and so forth, although a person could get away with it if his auditor was sufficiently powerful and stood over his head enough and had written the lines up and so forth, for a little while the person could self-list. But he's actually not self-listing; he's listing on a – he's just writing things on a list that was given to him by another person, don't you see? And even that one, as in the main, failed – self-listing.

I've just received a plea from Wing Angel who took somebody with self-listing, and he says, "Please, please, please, no more self-listing, please!" He had to mop up the pc, you see? The pc was going into the wrong terminals. And after a while the pc gets so confused they don't know whether they're coming or going. See what happens?

It's just the fact that a guy on a self-audit appears in the wrong places to self-audit on goals. I hope you understand that.

Audience: Yes.

You got to have an auditor out here. And the auditor asks the questions; the pc goes into the proper places to get the as-isness of the situation. Therefore, your auditing occurs. And he gets the pain in the right places and the sensations in the right places and his viewpoints in the correct spots, and it all starts going, and that's it.

Well now, he starts looking for the goal "to catch catfish," he at once will exteriorize from the terminal in which the goal "to catch catfish" is residual. And then thinking quietly to himself will realize that his goal is "to be a game warden." He'll pick for himself inevitably while he is looking for his goal, only opposition goals. This gets pretty fantastic.

If you inspect most terminals lists after you've... Let's say the first 850 goals list – which is still done, by the way – that list is quite remarkable for having on it so many opposition goals. It's got lots of them. Well, that's something that the pc listed himself.

Now, something that is listed on the pc by an auditor is less likely to have opposition terminals on it and contains a greater preponderance of his own terminals, see? This doesn't necessarily hold true because sometimes a pc is so spattered into his item that he can't tell the difference between the item's goal and his own goal. See, they're smashed so close together, you know?

Had an example of that the other day, you know. It's quite remarkable. The lack of criteria the pc had between his own goal and the goal that would belong to the item. You've noticed that in doing your lists sometimes, you know.

Let's say the goal was "to catch catfish," you know. "To catch catfish," "to bite hooks... to jump out of the water," see, "to eat well," "to never be scaly again." You know? You watch these lists and you will see that the pc is actually putting down opposition goals. But that's on the item. And of course, when you haven't got any item in sight the pc rackets around inside of his bank, and so on. He will put a large number of opposition goals.

That's perfectly all right, because they won't rocket read and everything is fine. You never find an opposition goal with rocket reads. Don't worry about that. Some of you've got it
tucked away in your head that some goal is firing, and it's the opposition goal, and you're now very worried.

Aw, stop worrying about it. Some goals will continue to fire for quite a while and then fold up, which aren't the pc's goal. You should be aware of that mechanism, but it isn't that they are opposition goals. And opposition goals won't keep on firing forever, see. That's very nice. You're saved by the bell. In the normal checkout period an opposition goal folds up, and it doesn't rocket read.

But sometimes you'll get other goals rocket reading when they're quite close to the real thing. And then it fades and the rocket reads fade. And apparently a rocket read can – the reason – any goal but the goal rocket reads is because the read can possibly – and this is just suppositional – transfer to another goal. And it'll stay transferred to the other goal for a short time.

That's a supposition drawn from the fact that the rocket read will transfer from the goal to the line. Just as you can get a line rocket reading, so you might be able to get a very closely associated goal rocket reading for a very short period of time. And that accounts for your occasional rocket reads.

You're going down the list, and you get this one, you saw one on TV one night. And it was something, I think, "to be dashing." And man, that thing really rocket read. You remember that? It's a long time ago. And it really rocket read. It rocket read, it rocket read, it didn't rocket read, and it didn't rocket read, and it didn't read at all, then that was it.

Now, where'd it get that rocket read? Actually it was a transfer to the goal momentarily, and the goal itself was in there someplace, see, and it was firing, and then this thing blew off the top of it and it wasn't the goal and so you no longer had a rocket read.

So, because your opposition is so close to the goal, occasionally opposition goals will rocket read momentarily. But not for hours, you know. And they don't check out. And they don't live up to anything. So you don't worry about opposition goals. It's not an obstacle.

The only thing I'm trying to tell you here is self-audit is impossible on goals. That's just it. I just have to come to that conclusion. There is no system by which you can self-audit into your goal.

Of course, you wake up some morning – you can wake up one morning and you can say, "My goal is ...!" Well, fine. Fine. My God, for all means, put it down on something even if the inside of a matchbox, and give it to your auditor. If you notice, as you tried to tiger drill it on the way to school or something – if you notice – it got only sen. And it got kind of unreal. And it got kind of fogged up, and so forth.

That's because, of course, you had to become the game warden, or you had to become something else, or you had to become the catfish, see, and then you're on the wrong side of it, and it's a valence problem, see? And you slide into the wrong valence and after that it doesn't work. And that's goals.

So it takes another observer. The machine cannot observe. It takes another observer in the session. And somebody who can sit there and issue the actual commands to a degree that a
person does not self-audit to find goals. Therefore, it takes very smooth, fine auditing to find goals. Your auditor has to have presence. The pc has to know there's an auditor there. Otherwise the pc is just mucking around from – in the wrong valences, and self-auditing into this and into that, as he would do on a machine.

So it takes a machine to do detection. The human being doesn't go that far. The thetan doesn't go that far on observation. But the machine will never be an observer. And as the machine cannot be observer, then a human being would never be in the right valence to find the goal. So that's why you have to have a fine auditor to find goals. And the more presence, and the more altitude, and the more certainty the pc has on the subject of that auditor, then the easier it is to find the goal. You follow that?

So the better the auditor, the easier it is to find the goal. And the weaker the auditor, the harder it is to find the goal. But the goal – the length of time of finding the goal, as I said, depends to a large degree on luck. But finding the item, finding the detested person, you know, finding the dynamic, finding that trio – of course, if the auditor has good presence, good skill, the pc's aware of him, they go into it, clank! and go outside of it, and say, "That is detested," go into the next item, bang! They say that is detested, go outside of it, go into the item, bang! That is detested, there it is, bong! And you've got it. You understand?

In other words, the auditor's presence is sufficient and adequate to putting the pc into the valence necessary to face the valence which is the opposition. See? So it takes an auditor. The auditor is necessary. The machine is necessary. We can make better auditors. We can make machines. But we can't, I don't think, make an auditor that will totally replace the machine. And I know that we can't make a machine that will ever replace the auditor. Do I make my point?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.
This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 11 Oct. Continuing on the subject of goals finding.

If you've got down the fundamental that it takes an auditor and it takes a meter, then you see on goals finding there's no substitute for being there as the auditor and being accurate on the meter. Therefore, goals finding will never become the subject of sloppy auditing or sloppy metering.

Now listing requires more auditor presence than – that is, the listing sessions – than Prepchecking. An auditor will be able to get things done in a Prepcheck session – "Since October, 1913, has anything been suppressed?" You see, an auditor can sit there and bat this stuff off, and get a result on his pc which will be a very interesting result.

He's sitting there practically without a meter. He simply stops asking the question, you see, when the pc doesn't want to give him any more answers, and so forth. Because he isn't being pressed, why, the pc has a tendency to be rather accommodating. And it all goes off rather smoothly, without too many ARC breaks.

But the moment that you start listing... You see we'll just skip goals finding; it's absolutely impossible to find a goal without a decent auditor and decent presence and good metering. I mean, that's a foregone conclusion.

It mainly requires auditor presence and auditor permissiveness. Now, the rule is a very simple one for you to lay down on anybody. Somehow or another, he has to continue his presence while never asking for more items than the pc has and never preventing the pc from giving him items.

Now, that's the happy balance which this listing auditor maintains. Now, if you also have a circumstance whereby the listing auditor is asking a question and not getting an answer, you'll get a jam-up on the lines.

So this is interesting, isn't it. There's a nice little compromise involved there. The person doesn't have any items for the line and the auditor has asked the auditing question and therefore must get an answer to it.

Well, now, this is – gets interesting, because you'll find out that this little factor all by itself will stack up a case – unanswered auditing questions.
So you've got an auditor who has to be smooth enough to say, "Well, just give me an old one offhand. Well, just give me any one so the question will be answered." Pc will deal him the same item that he's dealt before or something like that and you've got the auditing question answered.

But that must be done sufficiently smoothly so the pc is not ARC broke or being dragged at, don't you see. Then you've answered the auditing question and you've got the item, and that's all very slippery.

Now what, in essence here, is the thing that would happen? What is the thing that would go wrong in a listing session – is that the pc gets into a suppress or a protest, either one of which turns on sen. In other words, you ask the pc for more items than the pc has. You see, it's the pc has, you know. Auditors don't sometimes get that point, that the pc has them or he hasn't got them, see.

The weird part of it is, see, the pc isn't dreaming these things up. Now, this offhanded, "Well, give me one more, you know, an old one, or something, to keep the record straight," is asking the pc simply to give you one already dealt, which the pc can always do. But the pc's got them there, and if you realize that the GPM is stacked up like poker chips, you know, he's either got that many or he hasn't.

See, he isn't inventing them, thinking them up, creating them, or something like that. That is just the items he's got. See, that's the – that is pretty hard to realize.

The other auditing point that auditors – poor auditors even have a bunch of trouble with, and any auditor will have trouble with some time or another, quite frequently, is the pc has said something was wrong and it sounds horrible to the auditor and the auditor believes it is now wrong.

Well, no, the pc has said it and it's been acknowledged, so it's actually no longer wrong. But the auditor feels very downcast because the pc has said this was the condition, and then the auditor adjudicates that the pc couldn't possibly get well, because the condition, you see, was so bad. You got that?

The pc said, "Well, I thought, 'What a monster you are!'"

Well, the auditor says, "My God, I can't audit this pc because the pc thinks I'm a monster."

No, if the pc had thought that the auditor was a monster and hadn't told the auditor, yeah, auditing pretty impossible. But the fact that the statement has been made is the alleviation of the condition.

Now, when a pc – when a pc is – that's the – I just added that in as the other point they have trouble with. And once in a while you yourself will say, "Ohhh God!" you know, "Look at what I've been looking at here!" But you're looking at past history. If the pc has said it and it's been acknowledged, it's always past history.

Now, that's with these items. When the pc says them, they're past history, see. And they deal off, just bang, bang, one right after the other. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. And they deal off, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.
Now, if you demand that the pc give you more items than he has got, then the pc will have to protest what you are saying. He'll have to protest the demand, don't you see. So that's a protest which adds sen. Sensation is added then – dizziness, misemotion, so forth. And if the pc is prevented from giving items he has – it's the way this finally works out – then the pc will have to suppress those additional items, which gives you sensation.

Now, the symptom of a wrong goal is it starts out with pain and winds up with sen. Sometimes it just starts out with sen and winds up with sen. But sometimes early on in the run, you'll have pain on a wrong goal, which then develops into sen, regardless of how smooth the auditing is or anything else. That's a symptom of a wrong goal.

Now, you can make a right goal, of course, sound like a wrong goal, in a listing session – look like a wrong goal, you see – by making the pc suppress and protest. Pc says, "Well, I just haven't got any more items that – you know, that make a mistake, you know, make a mistake being a catfish. I just haven't got any more, you know?"

You say, "Well, come on, now, come on, now. This line is way behind. We only have a few strikes on this line. I'm sure you can think up some!"

Indeed he could! But we're dealing with just so many chips in the bank, you see. We're dealing with just so many things. These are quantitative items. See, he has so many thousand of this and so many hundred of that and so many dozen of something else.

Well, sometimes the stacks are wrong, don't you see, and you come around and ask for something he made a mistake about, and he hasn't got any mistake items right at that moment at all! He isn't even in that side of the deck! Hu-huh! He can't do a thing about it. He says, "Well, I just don't – I just don't have any."

You say, "Oh, come on now, come on now!"

Pc says, "But I don't have any more."

"Oh, come on, I'm sure you can give me a couple of more. I'm sure you can give me another ten or twelve. This line's way behind."

"But I haven't got them! But I haven't got them! But I haven't got them!"

You see – because that protest, protest, protest, sen, sen, sen, sen, sen, see.

All right. Now, let's take the reverse side of it. You say to the pc, "Well, this line is already overlisted. We've got too many on this line."

And the pc says, "And there's a – a game warden and catfish and there's fish hooks and there's – there's – streams and ponds and there's... "

And you say, "Well, there's too many on this, you know. I mean, you know, there's already – got a full card here, it's already full, you know. And uh – can't we get off onto some other side of this?"

And the pc has to go mvvrt – sen!

Well, now, with sen goes a climbing tone arm. Tone arm is a direct indicator of sensation. It's mass, but then of course sensation is symptomatic of built-up mass. The more he
chokes down and the more he protests, the more mass is going to get stacked up. So, of course, you've got the symptom of the climbing tone arm. Pc tone arm at 5; pc lots of sen – you can say this sort of thing has happened: that the auditor has demanded more items than the pc has, and the auditor has prevented the pc from giving items that pc has. That's your first adjudication.

So, to that degree, you're going to have trouble with listing sessions. But in view of the fact that it does not greatly depend upon metering – in other words accuracy of metering is of no account at all in the actual listing, except to watch the tone arm.

The only thing the meter is used for is to tiger drill in, but again, if he isn't tiger drilling – if he can't tiger drill, you can always have him give a rapid Prepcheck, and as you saw last night that can be done with no casualty at all – maybe not perfectly – can be done with no casualty at all, just on a straight Prepcheck.

So, your listing auditor doesn't even know how to tiger drill – doesn't even have to know how to tiger drill, do you see that? He could just give a Prepcheck round and do it once per session, see? Be interesting. You see what I'm driving at here?

So that's the main trouble there. Your main trouble is the lack of auditor presence – the auditor's getting in the road of the session. See, it's just the auditor won't permissively sit there and be an auditor. The auditor must be getting in the road of the session. The only thing you've got to do to remedy that is get the auditor out of the road of the session, either by making the auditor inspect the cycle of auditing or something like this, don't you see?

That's easy to remedy! You can handle that. And now, the goals finding – the goals finding here – that's something else. That's the combination of the observer and the meter. And the goals finder has got to be hotter than hot on a meter, and got to be accurate and not blurred up, and his auditing has got to be very smooth. Otherwise he'll cause sufficient suppresses to cause the items or dynamics or persons he's trying to find – he'll cause those things just to vanish. They just go!

They show up on the list, but there's so much suppress on the session, you can't get anything to fire. You see this? So if his auditing is rough, he's not going to get any of these things. In other words, they're suppressed before they occur.

Sometimes meters just stop slamming. And you work and you sweat and you slave and you eventually get the meter slamming again, you see, and it's always on the fact that it's a Suppress, Protest, Careful of, all these confounded things.

"Careful of," by the way, peculiarly enough, seems to be the brute that turns off slams. That seems to be far more pertinent on slam turnoff than any other button. Of course, the others turn off slams, too, but that one's peculiarly odd. Have you noticed that while running "Careful of," you'll very often get slams that you didn't suspect were there?

So therefore, the pc is too careful – he will turn off his slam. Now, the best way to get slams back on is with a goals Prepcheck using the eighteen buttons which of course includes the counter-button.
Now – you just take the item and you just, you know, give it a goals Prepcheck, you know. The item is "a candy bar," you know. And so you just say, "On the item 'candy bar,'" you see, "has anything been suppressed?" or, any way you want to run it, but you just run it that way, and you go on down through the end. You normally will get the slam back on without any extraordinary action – particularly if you're running it against the meter quite properly.

The best way I know to turn on goals and for you to turn on goals or items or dynamics that have turned off is just that round and round and round Prepcheck.

Actually, running it on the meter on the average pc shouldn't take more than an hour to go all the way through. But you get something that's really stacked up, you get one button per session, you know. I mean, vuuuh! It could be, almost, variable in time, but in ordinary course of auditing and so on, it's about an hour, hour and ten minutes, hour and fifteen minutes, to go all the way through that.

Now, the auditor – the auditor has got to be sharp. He's got to be – I gave you the characteristics most desirable in auditing, in another lecture – but that auditor has got to be a sharp auditor. That auditor has got to be a good observer, he's got to be a good meter operator and he's got to have good auditing presence. And his auditing's got to be very smooth. Given those things, why, man can he find goals! Take those things away and the goals just won't occur at all.

Now, oddly enough, the thing that's going to cause you the most trouble in any area you're operating in will be the lucky fluke – of course, causes you trouble occasionally. You do something that's a little bit off-line; you're being very clever, and you get a goal or you get an item, or you... Oh, you've had it! You know? It won't happen again in another thousand years. But you keep on trying it you know, and it's just a fluke.

Similarly, somebody is going to sit down in an auditing chair someday, as – he's just doing a Prepcheck, see, something like that – and all of a sudden the pc lays his goal on the line, you know, and says, "That's my goal." Or he's going over – he's listing the goals list and he's watching the meter, and all of a sudden one of those goals goes clank! brrrr! see, and he says it again and he says it again and he says it again and it checks right out, right away, see.

Ruins him! The rest of his natural career, he'll be sitting there, listing the first 850 goals, watching for that thing to go brrrr! See?

I think there's only one goal here for a long while that the first time it was read it rocket read three times in a row, there was no suppress on it, there was nothing on it, it was just clean as a wolf's tooth, and there it was sitting right out in the open. Trouble is I don't think it'd ever been on the pc's list before. See, the second they put it on the list it read perfectly. Of course, it checked out beautifully and that was it; and there wasn't any trouble with it, and so on.

The auditor that found it has been ruined, slightly. I mean, that auditor is liable to be – he'll just think back to that. Think back to the good old days, when he found that goal, you know. Next goal he finds, you know, he'll be sweating, sweat running down, and making his –
dropping onto the dial of the E-Meter, you know, and pencil's wearing out and pc's wearing out and everything, and...

Actually the reason he's having such a hard time is, of course, that he thinks a goal should do that. And of course, he's passed over the pc's goal and the pc's – this pc had a quarter of a rocket read and three suppresses. That was the extent this goal showed up, see. No somatics went with it to indicate it, either, you know. This should happen to him. You get how this is, see.

But he just doesn't think you should have to work that hard for a goal.

Well, an auditor has got to be variable and he realizes that his luck is variable, pc to pc. And sometimes he gets up on the right side of the bed, and he reaches over, and by golly, his shoes are right there, you know, and the laces are untied and he slides into them and there's nothing in them! [laughter] That's the day, see, that's the day!

Next morning he gets up, reaches to the same location – no shoes. Reaches under the bed – no shoes. Looks all over the house – no shoes. Sees his dog worrying something in the back yard! Well, that's the way it goes!

There's terrific variability in this situation. Therefore, pc to pc, an auditor has to learn to be variable in his attention to the situation. Just because he found the goal on the pc in this peculiar way and this peculiar fashion, is no reason he's going to find the goal on the next pc in exactly that way and that fashion. In other words, he's got to be variable.

Oddly enough, the variability of it is best covered by a very close adherence to the textbook solution. For the first time in the history of any race on any planet, our textbook solution is the best one. That's the first time this has ever happened.

Textbook solution. They had a song in the Marine Corps, about McBill McGin who died with a grin, because he had used the textbook solution, you know. They're usually quite fatal, in more subjects than one. I imagine in a physics or chemistry laboratory, or in the universities and so forth, the textbook solutions – I don't think you'd ever graduate if you used the textbook solution on the experiments. You just never would, that's all.

I used to look around me occasionally in a physics laboratory or measuring laboratory, and I'd find these students passing, you know, and everything panning out exactly, you know, and in the chemistry lab the precipitate always turned out to be pure potassium skoobfa, you know. I didn't realize they'd just gone over to the supply cabinet and got some potassium skoobfa, you know. [laughter] It's marvelous, marvelous! And the acceleration tests all work out on the physics bench, providing you put the answer down first and then work back to your experimental data.

No, the textbook solution is never very fortunate, which is liable to give many an auditor an idea that he ought to put a big curve into finding goals, see.

Well, now you take Model Session. Frankly, the more you vary Model Session the more trouble you're going to get into, because the first thing you do is throw out the predictability factor.
See, the pc considers you unpredictable, and the more unpredictable unpredicted things you do, why, the less predictable the pc thinks you are, so therefore becomes less and less certain of you as an auditor. And therefore you as the auditor deteriorate as the pc's observer. You see, by being unpredictable you destroy the reality of the auditor as an observer. You see that?

It might be very clever and it might be very necessary but remember that reality as the observer, from the viewpoint of the pc, is very often more valuable to maintain than to solve that particular little problem with that particular little piece of wit. See what I mean?

You say, "Well obviously, I ought to throw the random rudiment in on this pc after every other rudiment. See, I do a rudiment, then I'll throw in the random rudiment." And it might be very necessary, and it might be all right, eventually, with the pc if you did it every time.

But sooner or later you're going to conceive that it isn't necessary every rudiment to also throw in the random rudiment – you're going to leave it out here and there – then the pc doesn't know what's coming up next, and therefore doesn't consider that you are predictable, so therefore he's not so certain that he is being observed. Now, the more you use a standard Model Session, and use it every time, why, there you are.

Now, last night, you saw me throw an unpredictability. Well, this is only justified by the degree that the pc has had a wrestling match with this particular one, and it's a source of innumerable ARC breaks on the part of the pc. See?

All right, so we will take this rudiment up. Nevertheless it destroyed to some slight degree the predictability of the auditor – the pc's prediction of the auditor, see. You understand? I could get away with it that once, see, and that was fine. But let's say next time I take up the present time problem rudiment, and straighten it out the same way. And then I run perfect Model Session for the next two sessions and then suddenly take up the "Since the last time I audited you" rudiment and not clean this up but extend it into a full mid ruds. We would start getting an unreality on the part of the pc, on the auditor, don't you see? Well, to that degree you can get away with variability and variation.

Now, in view of the fact that you aren't going to always find detested persons and dynamics and items on this pc, this does not become a part of the picture of predictability. So you could do this different ways. As long as it was in Model Session, the pc would be perfectly happy about it.

You're only going to find the detested person once, you understand, and after that you're not going to find the detested person. But if you find this detested person and then you find the dynamic and then you find the item, all more or less in the same way, you'll find out the item becomes much more easy to find because, you see, the pc's now got a predictable pattern, see. He's more certain of what you're doing, so therefore he's quieted down. You understand that?

Now, he'll become – he'll think his certainty has been thrown out if you don't find the goal the same way. You understand that? Maybe you could swing in on the same system, "What goal does this represent to you?" and you might find more certainty in getting it. If you
could figure out how to get the goal with the same system by which you got the item, by the
same system by which you got the dynamic, by the same system in which you got the detested
person, see. You've set up a pattern of response here.

Well, the only virtue of the pattern of response – well, it has two virtues: (1) It's easier
to teach because it's a pattern, but that is not its main virtue. It is actually – makes the pc more
certain that he has an observer. The observer always does the same thing, so therefore there's
more of an observer there. See, the pc's certainty that somebody is there is compounded by
the fact that he can predict the actions of this person.

Now, I'll tell you how to make yourself very unpopular with a pc. Every time you
check the pc's goal, do it differently, and do it in such a way that the pc cannot predict what
you're going to do. Make it so that the pc can't predict when you are going to say the goal, if
you are going to say the goal, and then do it a different number of times, and all of a sudden
the goal won't read for you.

This is not a test which I advise you to make on somebody's goal. But you perhaps
have reality on it right this minute, which is why I'm saying it. If you said, "Now I am going
to test the goal 'to catch catfish' – to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish," and you
always tested it that way, it'd probably be all right – probably be all right.

But it's corny, already. Because you've said the goal before you've said the goal, and
therefore the pc suppresses the first saying of the goal, which registers then on the second
saying of the goal, which is really the first saying of the goal, you understand? You get the
unpredictability of this action?

So it's much better to say, "Now I'm going to say this goal." Oh, a pc knows what goal
you're talking about, and if you don't think the pc will know what goal you're talking about,
you just say, "Well, what's your thoughts on this goal 'to catch catfish'?" See?

The pc says, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "All right. Now I'm going to test this goal – to catch catfish, to catch cat-
fish, to catch catfish. Thank you very much."

However, if you did that too unpredictably, it'd startle the pc enough, so that by the
time you've said the second one, he'd squashed it.

Now, have you – I see that you have had a little experience in this! Supposing you had
always said it this way: "Now I'm going to test this goal. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To
catch catfish," and that's the way you've been saying the goal to the pc. You've said the goal
to the pc this way three, four times, at different times. And now, if you do this one: "Now, I'm
going to say this goal, 'to catch catfish' – to catch catfish! To catch catfish. To catch catfish."
You know, you're not going to get any reads. It's just splattered all over the landscape, see.

So you see that, if unpredictability can smash a goal out of read (although that's a
fairly delicate thing), you see that unpredictability can smash a session out of read, just draw-
ing a wider bow, and of course, a listing session can be "scrushed" out of existence the same
way. Do you see that? It's the predictability, predictability factor. Sometimes your cleverness
defeats itself, because you become unpredictable.
What are you going to do? Let's say, one day you get in the random rudiments right in the middle of trying to clean up, "In this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth, done something only to impr ... Well, I think I'll get in the middle rudiments." He – oh, you'd possibly get away with it. Probably nothing much happen to you if you did it.

How many sessions do you think you have to audit that rudiment perfectly, before the pc stops being the gopher effect, you know, sitting up on top of his hole, you know, looking around, looking around. You're coming to the first rud. "What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? Oh! He's going to read it straight!" See, some part of his mind is doing this, see. You're unpredictable to that degree.

Well, goals – goals finding can get very, very complicated. You could be so complicated and so nagging and so upsetting and so suppressive, and get a – such a protesty pc in goals finding that eventually you just never would find anything at all, just never find a thing.

If something is wrong with the cycle of an auditing question, yeah, something will happen to finding detested persons and dynamics – things will happen to these things. That's why one looks with horror on the untrained auditor or the lower-level trained auditor, finding goals. Because you know that his technology is just not up to it.

He's liable to find all kinds of wrong things. In the first place, he doesn't know what a goal read looks like. In the second place, he's insufficiently smooth to even read one off. He can take any goal under the sun, moon or stars, make a mistake on it and make it read.

He can take a goal that's very unpopular with the pc. Let's say he's one of these auditors – a sort of an amateur, book-type auditor – who is over on the overwhelm side of the picture, see. He's got a basic philosophy that it must be true if the pc doesn't like it. That's his basic test. See, if the pc protests, that's it.

And then let's say he gets on some kind of a – of a sexual goal of some kind or another that in this society somebody'd be very ashamed of, don't you see, and then reads this with a gleam in his eye. He makes a suggest on it, then tiger drills it wrongly, gets the pc to protest it, asserts then that it is the pc's goal, as the pc is saying that it is not, builds up a nice ridge, and you know that goal will read for years. Of course, it'll only read with a tick, but it'll read until somebody pulls both sides of that thing off and pulls it apart.

Well, that frightens you, when you come down to look at it. So, we're not really, though, talking about that crudity of operation. We're talking about just the smoothness of finding a goal.

So, there's no substitute for good auditing and finding a goal. There's just no substitute for it. Luck we can't count on – about the only thing that would cause a person who couldn't audit well to once in a blue moon find a right goal. It'd be his undoing, too!

The steps by which a goal is found today are very elementary, they're very simple and they all follow the same pattern. We just ask the person who or what has the pc detested. Make it who or what, because the pc is on a – is on a "things" type dynamic, here. A detested person, though we still call it, will sometimes go by the boards, don't you see? They might not
have any people they detest; they only detest things, you see, and on that pc you're liable to miss most gorgeously if you say, "What person have you detested?" You understand that?

On a large percentage of cases you're just going to get away with "Who have you detested," see. But there's that other case that comes along and you get a thing.

Now, you could make the mistake of thinking this was so marvelous – having gotten this item – that you'll list goals against it or something like that. Well, that hasn't proven out as a good action or a productive action over a period of time. Even though it gives you something that looks like an item if you get a thing. You know, "a burned-out radiator." You say, "Boy, that sure looks like an item," you know? Naw, it's not an item.

Now, your next action is always represent. Now, your action, then, is – starts out with "Who or what have you detested," you see; get your list; "Consider committing overts against _______ (items on the list)." And when you get that item, it's always followed with represent.

Don't try to use other things. I've gotten an awful lot of data on this. And I've come a cropper every time I've tried to use some other form of action.

The pc's substitutes is what we want, and we say, "What does a burned-out radiator represent to you?" So that's always your next action to get the next list. See? And now we've got our next list, and we consider committing overts against it, and we get that one off that list, and it's – a next step is always "represents." Don't you see? And we can actually go along this line until we run out of dwindling rock slams. We could actually continue this until we run out of dwindling rock slams, which is quite interesting.

Why it works, that we only get a couple of dwindling rock slams out of this, I'm not quite sure. There are probably more dwindling rock slams available in some cases. But this works out just fine the way it is laid out now.

Your dwindling – first dwindling slam is, by the way, not on the detested person point – person or item. See, that doesn't – when you list those, you get no dwindling slam, you understand. There's no dwindling slam there at all. And there may not be a dwindling slam from that ite... that detested person or item when found. That might not be a dwindling slam.

In fact it'd kind of surprise me at times if you did get a dwindling slam. Because, may – man, that one's far out. See, that's the far out bet.

But if you got a dwindling slam, nobody's going to argue with it. But if you didn't get a dwindling slam, nobody's going to argue with it. You see what stage of this operation I'm talking about?

You say, "Who or what have you detested?"

And they say, "Sam Jones! Yes sir! And you, and..."

You say, "You? How you want that written down?"

"Well, you! You, you know. Bill Smith! You!"

Well, you write it down as Bill Smith, not "you." And he gets down to the end of the list, and says, "myself." Well, you take these pronouns and you want to know how the pc wants them written down. You don't challenge them
"Oh," he says, "Myself! George Smith!"

You write down "George Smith," and also write down "myself," because by the time you're sorting this thing out you're going to get in trouble with pronouns. Cons... get the – get the auditor sitting there, see. The auditor says, "Consider committing overts against you." So this gives you the "myself." Do you get the tangle that comes out of this thing? "Consider committing overts against you." And you just never come off of it.

So you "Consider committing overts against _____. Consider committing overts against _____. Consider committing overts against _____." You go on down the list and by the process of elimination, wind up with something that slams.

Now, how big does a rock slam have to be? I'm going to – I'm going to – I'm going to put this in immortal fire, engraved and blazing upon the mountainside for the centuries and millennia to come, because I'm tired of answering the question! It gets asked to me almost on an average of twice a week – three times a week; this same question. How big is a rock slam? It's the same thing as: "How long is a piece of string?" How big is a rock slam? How high is the tide? You know? Popular song!

Now, I can tell you that a little dirty needle on the detested person, in spite of anything you have been told by anybody else is not enough to indicate the right one. And if you have bought the little dirty needle, you're probably in trouble.

Now, the possibility is that you can get the thing down to a little dirty needle, and by doing a rapid Tiger Drill on the item, see whether or not the dirty needle expands to a slam.

But nobody has done this and that is not what is indicated and it's a waste of time as far as I'm concerned. Do I make my point? We don't want a little dirty needle. We don't want a little dirty needle. You understand. We don't want one! It means an incomplete list! You hear me? It's an incomplete list!

And if nothing is left at the end of the trail, it's an incomplete list. And if nothing slammed nicely as you went by, it was an incomplete list. And if you didn't get anything, it's an incomplete list. And if your assessment didn't wind up with a proper dynamic or item, it was an incomplete list. Do you – do I make this point? See?

And if the pc is ARC broke or calm, or something, it's an incomplete list. And the pc didn't cognite and say, "Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! I knew it'd be a burned-out radiator! Ha, ha, ha! Yeah, burned-out radiators. Yeah, I never thought of that before. It's a very interesting thing. I had a burned-out radiator on a Ford one time. Aw, burned-out radiators. Pretty horrible!" Even if this pc is the Sphinx type – never says anything, never cognites – when you get that item, when you get that dynamic, when you get that detested person, dat pc gonna cognite. You hear me? Dat pc gonna cognite. He's gonna cognite with cogs flying!

You come on down the line and you say, "Consider committing overts against a game warden. Consider committing overts against cats. Consider committing overts... Consider committing overts against...". Consider committing overts against...". The pc sits there. And you finally say, "Game wardens." Pc says – you say, "The item – the detested person I got here was 'game wardens.'"
Just make up your mind it doesn't have anything to do with the pc, man. You got that? I mean, that's the simplest test I know of the rightness of all of this. If the pc is interested in it, it'll rock slam. If the pc isn't interested in it, it won't rock slam. If it doesn't rock slam, it isn't it.

Now, how wide is a rock slam and how high is the sky? Well, a rock slam isn't a dirty needle. It isn't a little bzzt, bzzt, bzzt. That's never enough.

When you go down that list the first time, you'll see about three items on it go blam! blam! blam! And you say, "Hey! What do you know! Ho-ho!" And when the second time you go down you will see those rock slams centralize on – onto only one item. They're differentiated now and you've got it on one item. And you go by that thing and it goes blam! And you say, "Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, ha!" See.

And you go on down to the end of the list. You go over the list again; it goes blam! You go over the list again, and it goes blam! Same item. Go over the list again; it goes blam! In the event you ARC break the pc and upset it, why, of course it won't go blam anymore.

Well, I catch these things very easily as a bra... with the brass-ring tactic. If I go over it enough to have only one item going blam with a rock slam, and dat's da brass ring. And I put it right in the pc's nose right there. And I say, "That's it, son," and lead him right on down the track. You got it? And you do it by elimination.

By the time you go over that list the second time you ought to have that thing, man. You ought to have a rope dropped right around its neck. And if you haven't got it, you haven't got it! And you can unsaddle the horse, you can polish up the harness, you can fix up the brightwork, the brass, you can groom his coat, you can wash out of his mouth, you can brush his teeth and it still won't be the item. You understand?

And right away, as you go down the line, you'd ... I'd go down the thing the second time, I find there's only one thing slamming on the thing, I'd grab it right there. And I say, "This burned-out radiator, now, that seems to be it."

And the pc says, "Ha-ha! I knew that was it! Ha-ha-ha! Burned-out radiators. Yeah, God, I hate them, that's all. Been the cause of an awful lot of difficulty with me, never really looked at it before, but burned-out radiators ... Oh, heh-heh, I'm not at all surprised, you know. Ha-ha-ha! I'm not at all surprised. Burned-out radiators! Ha-ha-ha-ha! I wonder why that's why I'm always having trouble drinking rusty water." [laughter]

Pc's interest follows the rock slam, see. So it's inevitable that you – you're going to get – you get both. You got the item. But this pc that just wooden Indians on you to the bitter end, you got nothing. You can go on and on and on and on and on.

Now, how many lists of detested persons and things can you do before you finally get the item? You do the exact number necessary to find the detested person or thing. You got that? That's how many lists you do. That's a very simple answer to a very burning question. You do it till you get it.

Now, do you put on it the second time you do it, the things which it already ain't? No, you leave those off. You drop them in the spittoon or the cuspidor and let them splash gloom-
ily. Because if they weren't on it the first time – if they weren't it the first time, they're not going to be it the second time.

Of course, there's also no substitute for having the pc in session or for auditing or for watching the meter. There's no substitute for those things.

But the odd part of it is, the pc can be halfway ARC broke and you can still get this thing. It's almost impossible to keep him from being interested in it. It's almost impossible to keep him from slamming on it.

Later on, when you've bled everything down and so forth, you come back to this burned-out radiator – it may not slam. You may have to prepcheck the thing like mad and even then it doesn't slam; it just dirty needles. It's now past history, do you understand. It's past history. Who cares? Who's interested in it? There's no slam on it. Pc no longer interested in it. Pc no longer interested in it. Don't slam. Got that?

Now, we go through the same old routine from there on. Only we want to know what represents a burned-out radiator to the pc, or what a burned-out radiator represents – I just don't seem to care which – and we're going to get a list of that and we're going to get lists of that and we're going to list that. And that should or should not produce a dwindling slam. We don't much care whether it does or not. If it does, why you're in.

Something weird might have occurred. You might have hit the dynamic; you might have hit something or other, but such luck won't happen to you. You're going to find the dynamic now.

Now, "What part of existence does a burned-out radiator represent?" is the best one to find a dynamic with. That's a good one to find a dynamic with. "What part of existence – what larger part of existence does a burned-out radiator represent?" Well, "big burned-out radia-

tors" is liable to get a ...

Now, I give you a rule: Don't put "a burned-out radiator" on a list from which "a burned-out radiator" – don't – if you're making a list from burned-out radiators, don't put "a burned-out radiator" on that list, you hear me now. Don't put it on that list! I don't care if the pc gives it to you, thank him effusively and just leave it off the list! Because it's going to slam again and that's going to give you no item!

Knuckleheads. Several of you have done this, you know! And you wind up with the first dynamic as the detested person and the first dynamic as the dynamic and the first dy-
namic, you see, as the item, and you... Where have you progressed to? You have progressed to the detested person or thing. Now you list goals against it, you haven't got the dynamic, you haven't got the item, so of course you're never going to get the goal. You got it?

So, that's a rule, see. Never put what you're deriving from on the list you are deriving from it. See, if it's – "a burned-out radiator" is the detested thing, well then, don't put "a burned-out radiator" down as what "a burned-out radiator" represents, you hear. Don't do it. Just omit it.

Now, your dynamic list is assessed out, with "Consider committing overts against... Consider ..." The same rules apply. Go down – the second time you go down through the
thing, the thing ought to be slamming. If it isn't slamming, junk the whole thing, throw it away, get the pc in-session, do something, but get the item on the list. You see, it's again the incomplete list, is your main difficulty.

All right, and when you finally got that one sorted out, why the same rule of cognition applies. Only much more so now. The pc says, "Ho-ho-ho! Ho-ho-ho! Yo, yo! Sepulchers! Ho-ho-ho. Ho! Damp sepulchers, you know! I was always frightened of them when I was – children. Ho-ho! Yeah, yo, yo, yo, yo. With black interiors, yes, I was always frightened of them. You don't suppose that has something to do with the fact that I don't like to look in my hat?"

See, thing's slamming, pc's interest there, everything is fine. Pat him on the back and hurry on, man!

Now, you're going to list that thing. Now, by this time you ought to be producing dwindling slams, see. From the dynamic to the item, for sure, should produce a dwindling slam. I'm sure of my ground there. I know darn well that one will if it's the right dynamic, when you proceed from it to the item, it'll produce a dwindling slam.

And a dwindling slam starts wide and winds up and gets narrower and narrower. And every time they put one on the list, you have a narrower slam. And a lot of people think if it turns on on the fourth one and the eighth one and the twelfth one, and it's still slamming when they wound up, that's a dwindling slam. No, that's a wrong item – wrong; everything is wrong.

See, a dwindling slam starts wide and goes narrower for each item. And you say the next item and you got a narrower slam. You say the next item – if the pc gives you the next item – it's when the pc says it, by the way. And the next item and it's narrower. And the next item, it's narrower. And finally it's a little dirty needle, and finally you bleed it down and that's it, and that's all, that's a complete list, and by God, your item is always on that list – always. Now, it's "Consider committing overts," and that's done by "What represents_____," you know? "What does a black sepulcher represent to you?" see? And here we go, and it's done down to whatever the item is.

"Consider committing overts against_____ ." This next list that you derived from that – bang! One of them's live. The second time through, the rock slam has settled down. There it is, bang. And there you've the thing and you've got "a coffin nail." And you say, "There we go, man! We got 'a coffin nail' and that's it, and it slammed. And it's the only thing on the list that slammed." Well, it doesn't matter if that slam is an inch wide – quite ordinarily is only an inch wide – inch and a quarter wide, inch and a half wide, two inches wide, three inches wide, four inches wide, or a dial wide, or a quarter of a dial wide; but it's a slam. Doesn't matter how big it is.

And now, you take that thing, and that is the item. And the pc says, "Oh my God, coffin nails! You know. I've always associated it with cigarettes. And, by the way, all I remember is in 45 when I first heard them called that, is all of a sudden they give me a terrible cough. Cough! As a matter of fact, and so forth. Cough and – and cough-cough and – and so forth. And the coffin nails, cigarettes, and so on and uh – so on. I've thought about these coffins in China that they were taking tops off the coffins and so forth, and I thought that's a
pretty good idea, and so forth. They ought to leave the nails out because what if you got buried in this thing, and you couldn't get out of this thing, and so forth. And do you know that that very closely associates to the whole subject of necromancy? Do you know that necromancy's a very, very interesting subject. Have you ever been interested in necromancy? I myself have been very interested in necromancy from time to time. As a matter of fact my father one time or another... The last time I was audited at the HASI, I had an awful lot of things that had to do with necromancy. I remember now, and they now all fade together, and so forth, and that's just fine..."

You get the idea? See, the closer you get into that item, the more the pc is interested, man.

And he – then he says, "Well, us coffin nails are very often..." so forth.

He'll start to get oppterm trouble, you know. He's against coffin nails, he is coffin nails. Some of them are coffin nails, that's all – slam like mad against coffin nails, but they think of themselves as coffin nails, don't you see? And some of them: "Those damn coffin nails over there," and they never even come close to those coffin nails, you get the idea. Sometimes they're never close with the item.

All right. That's it. Now you list goal one – "What goal would be an overt against____.," and that's a dwindling slam, all the way down to dirty needle and so forth, and there it is. And very often you're lucky and the goal is on it. But the actual fact is the goal is most likely to be in the first few goals on list six. So, you do list one; you do list six. Fix up list six; you haven't got the goal. Dandy. Let's then write up list two, list three, list four, list five. Let's get some more goals written on these other lists, and then let's cross-index it, and so forth. And the pc very often, if you're lucky, will start putting his goal down on every one of those lists, that's it.

He says, "Well, I hate to, but you know I'm really – act like I'm trying to sell you this goal, but in the actual fact it does belong on that list, you know," and so on. And he puts it on down and you check it out and that's it.

Now, that's if you're lucky; if you're lucky, if you have altitude, if you are considered by the pc to be a good observer, if you have altitude with the pc, if you are the auditor, if you are in control of the session, if you can run a meter, if you are running very smooth Model Session, if you do this thing very flawlessly – if, if, if, if, if, if – and if that morning you got up and found your shoes in the exact right place and the laces were untied, and so forth, why, and there was nothing in them – you got the pc's goal. Got that? That's how you do it. That's a Dynamic Assessment.

Now, undoubtedly this can be groomed up. Undoubtedly there are various things we will learn. Undoubtedly this pattern can be expected at one time or another to change. But there are substitute patterns by which to do this already in existence which are not as good as the original pattern.

Now, if I can't find any of these items, why, I would write up a list, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" And then getting the pc oiled up, ask him, "What isn't part of existence?" Go on down the line, and treat that as an item.
Well, you should test out such a thing and try to list what represents what you found as "What wasn't part of existence?" Try to treat it as something else. If you get a dwindling slam as you list "What represents it?" why, dandy. Marvelous. You're going to wind up with a more pertinent item, don't you see.

Now, there's even another dodge which I have worked on recently, which is quite interesting, and is apparently quite good. It's not the one I've been telling you about, about the Tiger Drill button, "Would your goal...," something or other. It's possibly not as fruitful as the other one – although that has found goals. See, "Would your goal frarumph (item)?" See? "Would your goal suppress (item)? Would your goal not suppress (item)? Would your goal..." and a couple that you've thrown in, see. Whatever those buttons are, "the item," see.

Now that'd give us a list of goals that would do that, see. It'll rock slam, by the way, when you find it – give us a list of goals that will do that – and you're liable to find the pc's goal.

The more a pc rock slams, the harder and more frequent the rock slams, the harder the rock slam is to turn off, the harder it is going to be to find the goal. That has been turning out to be true. If the pc is a rock slammer from away back, that darn goal has got to be exactly on the button; it's being avoided by the pc and it's rather rough to get there.

So anyhow, as far as rock slams go, there is the – there's the criteria. It doesn't necessarily hold true that you won't be lucky and the pc won't be lucky and won't get it on the list earlier, because you very often may. But nevertheless that sort of holds true.

Now, the other thing is – the one I've been working on is – "Who or what would oppose (item)?" Just do a list of who or what would oppose item.

Go over the list, you're is going to get one that slams, and that is the opposition terminal to the item, and ask the pc what goals that opposition terminal has, because that opposition terminal is the pc's terminal.

Sneaky, and it apparently, at first glance, has as much validity as the item. Interesting, huh? It's "Who or what would oppose (item)?" That's how you list it and then you assess it by "Would (it) commit overts against_________(item)?" And it's going to slam – one of them is going to slam; follows the same rule – and you wind up with an additional item, and you can ask "Who or what – what would be its goals?" or "What goal?" and then also "What goal would make it become what it is?"

In other words, there's a new way of stripping goals out. I'm still working on that end of the line. That's the latest work I've done on it and it seems to be very, very productive. Okay?

It doesn't change anything else you're doing. It's just an additional step that if you're having a rough time, why, try that one and that's marvelous. Okay?

All right, I brought you up to date on this subject. And there's no substitute for two things – no substitute for two things: There's no substitute for finding goals and there's no substitute for your being a good auditor.

Thank you very much.
3GA CRISSE CROSS

A lecture given on 23 October 1962

Well, here we are at what day?

Audience: Twenty-third.

Twenty-third of October...

Audience: AD 12.

... AD 12. Hoped I hadn't lost a year here since the last time I lectured to you.

Well, if you're afraid of getting restimulated, you can leave now. [laughter] Now, I'm going to talk about the 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, I want you to carefully notice I haven't any notes and this is not a – this is just off the cuff, because in the past many, many weeks I've been auditing like mad myself on research auditing trying to pick up all of the data necessary to make it easy for you to crack cases.

You should realize, at first glance and at – immediately, that 3GA in its original form will find goals and has made first-goal Clears. You should recognize that, that we are going beyond a point of success.

The problem which reaches us, however, is that some cases do not respond easily to the original 3GA. It goes up into the thousands of goals on these cases. And if you had unlimited time, you could probably, undoubtedly, using no more than these techniques contained in the original 3GA – find the pc's goal.

But in view of the fact that we are few and the preclears are many and because of the peculiar position of the Saint Hill graduate today – in that he is looked upon to find a great many goals and do a great deal for a great many people in the field of Clearing – an endless procedure is therefore inadequate to our needs. Hence you get 3GA Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. That was the first upgrade and improvement of this.

Now, this saved time and this swept in the bulk of those cases that were very difficult. That is, it swept in the bulk of them. We were marching up now, higher in our percentage that could be done rapidly. And the technique, 3GA, with the Goals Assessment done by Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam (that particular technology and those bulletins) is still valid and is still workable and there's a lot of people sitting right in front of me whose goals were found with that particular technology.

But this again failed, on some cases, to attain the goal rapidly. Once more, a slowdown came about on some cases.
Having established all of this, we found then that the goals on some cases went out hard. It was all right; we could find the goal and all of that sort of thing, but goals went out hard. Now, what do I mean by "went out hard"? I mean, as long as nine hours to tiger drill out one goal which wasn't it. You see, goals were going out hard.

Now, you understand as you upgrade procedure, that you also sweep in the easy case and make it easier to do the easy case. You understand that? That is not an incidental benefit, but was not the primary target in the research which I've been engaged upon. Don't you see? So the easy case always benefits from a resolution of the more difficult case. You'll find this is very consistent in Scientology, that once you are able to do a very, very difficult case, then you can do more easily an easy case.

So, once more, we are not confronted with "You do 3GA ordinary – the old 3GA – on some cases and 3GA Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam on some other cases and then 3GA Criss Cross on just a few difficult cases."

No, you would find your goal by the highest, most sweeping procedure, which at this stage of development is 3GA Criss Cross. And you would find your easy case more rapidly with 3GA Criss Cross than you would be: "List me 850 goals and I'll tiger drill them." Don't you see?

But this requires facility and understanding on the part of the auditor.

And as we march forward into these more difficult cases, I have to tell you that I myself at the moment am slightly appalled by the fact that the technology is quite complex at this particular moment. And I – it was more complex Friday last than it was Monday. It was more complex the Wednesday before that Friday, don't you see, and so on. But it has now gotten to a point where I can give you answers which again speed up the time involved in finding somebody's goal.

Now, this is all in the direction of speedup. So when you go in the direction of speedup, you demand more accurate auditing that contains the element of luck less. That's swift auditing.

Now, as you understand by its title, 3GA Criss Cross is a direct grandchild of 3D Criss Cross. Old 3D Criss Cross was itself and had it been done by rock slam, well, people probably would have gone on running out items happily and gone to Clear on it. The only ingredient that old 3D Criss Cross needed was just those three words, "by rock slam," to make it a totally successful procedure.

Now, this doesn't mean that all of the rules of 3D Criss Cross apply to 3GA Criss Cross. So we might as well just start out with a brand-new set of rules and scrub those and I'll show you the old ones and I'll just show you, and you can recognize where these things fit in. Those of you who have been trained in 3D Criss Cross, you'll find this very much to your benefit.

Now when we were doing 3D Criss Cross, I was giving you a constant – the students who were here at that time – incidentally, there are – there are three students here right this minute, who have been beaten over the head on this and it must sound like old times. They've
just rejoined the class on a retread basis and it just must sound like just old times to them, you know, like the wheels haven't turned at all since they've been away.

But if they remember, the stress was on speed – speed. There are two things, speed and accuracy, which is involved here. And some auditor who takes one week of sessions, three hours each, to find an item on his pc isn't batting in any league that will give him any success with 3GA Criss Cross. In the first place, the pc's attention wears out by that time.

This is a rapid activity. If I find the item and it's totally successful, it's taking me one hour and ten minutes to adjudicate what is to be listed, list it and null it to a successful reliable item – one hour and ten minutes.

When I goof – and it's very possible for an auditor to goof on this; you take the wrong side of something or something goes wrong one way or the other – when I goof it's about two hours and a half. It takes longer to goof than to find a right one; takes longer to lay an egg than it does to come up with a reliable item. But two hours and a half, we are still talking in the framework of a three-hour session.

Now, I'm not holding one hour and ten minutes up to you as how good I am and how terrible you are. It's very far from this case. Because let me assure you that my research auditing during the past three or four – or worse than that – during the past two months have made a citizen out of me with exclamation points. You know? I'm batting right there in your league. I found out I can make mistakes, man. And it has been very annoying to me to discover that, for once in my life, I'm grappling with something where judgment is not infallible.

I look at this case and I say, "Well, that's what's to do," and I go ahead and do it and I'm finding that 50 percent of the time I am wrong. All right, if that's the way it's going with me, well, stop beating your brains out trying to be 100 percent right.

Now, those of you who have a goal "to be 100 percent right" [laughter] – this is no – this is no way to achieve that goal because a lot of the time you're going to be wrong. Now, even following all the rules, you're going to be wrong every now and then – even following all the rules. Because the nature of the beast that you're auditing contains several little excursions this way and that. And when you're following the rock slam, you have to follow the rock slam. And if the rule gets in the road of your following the rock slam, why then you follow the rock slam. You understand? The road is the road of the rock slam, not the road of the rule.

I can tell you how to find rock slams, how to trace them down and how to preserve them carefully, how to nurture them and derive items from them, left and right. But I am very sure at this stage of the game that I cannot tell you how to do it 100 percent of the time, always.

Now on any given pc, yes, you can find a rock slam, you can find the items. That's a forsworn, foregone conclusion. That part of it's licked. Yes, you can find a rock slam on a pc.

There are several ways of doing it. If you don't do it one way you can do it another way. What I'm talking about is on this one pc that you are auditing, if you expect to find an item every hour and ten minutes of auditing, you're going to be very badly disappointed, because you very often have a nerved-up pc and when you've missed the item you of course, then, have a missed withhold, don't you? So then you have to steady down the pc and you
have to do a lot of other things which are all very interesting and all very complicated and they all consume auditing time.

And then, after you've done it by the best traditions of auditing, after you have done it perfectly, you find yourself, all too often – but not more than 50 percent of the time, unless your luck is always bad – sitting there looking at a complete skunk – no item. Everything goes out. See, you do it all perfectly and then everything goes out.

Now I have been auditing very hard and very thoroughly, trying to whip the laws which underlie this and the laws which underlie it are quite interesting, extremely intelligible and very easily followed. And they will reduce, I am sure, the number of wrong turns that you make in following the rock slam – these various laws. But I know very well that they will not obviate them completely, because there are too many little lucky breaks and so forth, still contained in Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam as it is done with 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, with that preamble and prelude to the situation, you should understand this as a procedure which, guided by good textbook auditing – actually the kind which the better auditors here are doing at this moment – done with that type of auditing and not with something that the fellow read three books and then he read half of a bulletin and then he took his E-Meter in hand and he turned it on by twisting the needle and... He's not going to make it, see. He's not going to make it.

This is definitely an expert's activity, but that is not all bad. That is very far from all bad. Goals finding and goals running is so fraught with disaster for a pc that it shouldn't be done by anybody but an expert. And if that expert's expertness becomes as fantastically evident as it does in 3GA Criss Cross, well, that just builds up your altitude. I mean, let's be crude about the thing: It puts it out of reach.

This fellow's going to do this 3GA Criss Cross and he's read a book and he went halfway through the Academy before he blew. And now he's going to find a goal on somebody with 3GA Criss Cross and he sits there and he looks at the meter and for a fifteenth of a second he sees a rock slam and then he doesn't see any more rock slams and he can't find any more rock slams. And no matter what he does he can't find any more rock slams and the road is blocked. Because only good auditing presence will keep a rock slam on.

So actually, the road is booby-trapped by bad auditing presence.

Now, if you'll notice lately I've put several booby traps into clearing. I fixed it up so that it's very unlikely that a wrong goal would get listed. Why? Well, before, with all too much glee, people could list a wrong goal and practically spin somebody in. Well, how did we do this? Well, we say you tiger drill it the beginning of every session. Of course, that is necessary to get the items to blow but at the same time, recognize that as a prevention against auditing a wrong goal. After you've done just so many sessions on the thing, why, the goal's going to blow up. And then you're going to have to do something to remedy the goal.

Now, even when a pc's goal has been found, in many cases – this is uses of this procedure – even when a pc's goal has been found by some other method of assessment, it is all too likely – you know, no items have been found on this pc – that his bank will be too heavily charged to list easily.
So, with 3GA Criss Cross you don't have just a goal-finding procedure. You have a procedure which finds a goal, but also which unburdens the bank so a goal can be run. Also you have a procedure which, when the pc suddenly sticks on "cops..." You know, he said "cops," and that was the last you ever heard him say. Tone arm went up and he ducked and he babbled something or other, and so on. Well, you continue his item assessment and you will get him back in the running again.

You – all sorts of uses, don't you see, these variant uses. You heard him say "cops," and "cops" is something – or you see him sitting there – it just happened today – is somebody sitting there with a horrible ARC break and the auditor finally argues him out of an item and then the item is seen to rock slam, so the auditor, I think, opposed and represented it – did both to the thing, and it unburdened, the case started cogniting, and the fellow started running again. You see? There was an item which he hadn't even presented, but the auditor found it and did something with it, see. That was during listing.

So when do we use this procedure? Well, we use this procedure when clearing gets tough and when Prepchecking won't remedy it.

And when do we use Prepchecking. When tiger drilling won't do anything for us. See, that's when you use the procedure.

So you can use the procedure to find the goal, you can use the procedure to prove a goal that has been found, you can use the procedure to unburden the bank so as to make it easy to run the goal and you can use this procedure, in addition to that, to get the pc unstuck from some item he's collided with in listing which he can't or won't confront. So you see, it has many uses – becomes a skilled activity.

Now, completely aside from its uses in clearing, this quite incidentally adds up to the fastest gain process that we have ever developed. Now, that one sort of is likely to get overlooked. You find a couple of items on somebody – you find one item on somebody that is a real, honest-to-goodness rock slamming item and you've changed that case – and you've changed it observably. Now, nobody has been finding items against OCAs and IQ tests and that sort of thing, but I'm sure that you would see some rather startling changes occur in IQ and profile as a result of finding an item.

Now, look at what this puts in your hands. Supposing in a Problems Intensive, you could get twenty points of gain on an OCA or an APA. And that took twenty-five hours. Recognize that the same gain is probably obtainable – or a greater gain obtainable – in the finding of one item in a space of less than three hours, if you're lucky. Now, look at your case resurgence. Look at that in time.

Now, in view of the fact that we're using this to find goals and actually clear people, that little point is liable to be overlooked, because we're not using it to make a pc feel good. And yet they do; they do.

Now, let's tackle this thing from the beginning. I've given you its various uses and applications. Let's tackle it from the beginning on the subject of nomenclature. We're going to get our nomenclature all mixed up.
Well, why do we say Criss Cross? And that's just because you go from one channel to the other channel and then you go back to the other channel.

What do we mean by channels? Well, we mean what the pc's been and what the pc has opposed. By saying Criss Cross, well, we get the idea of a channel from A over to B and from B back over to A; and we're going back and forth between the pc (what he has been) and the pc's enemies (what they have been).

So we've got a game going here of the enemy and the pc.

Now, I refer you to the lectures on the GPM. It is vital to understand the composition of the GPM as contained in those lectures. I am not going to repeat them at this particular time. The composition of the GPM, then, has much greater scope and complexity than what I'm giving you right now. But essentially it's composed of them and us. That doesn't matter on what dynamics these occur; it's a game of them and us.

Now, our nomenclature gives us the them as "opposition to the terminal," actually not "opposition terminals." Let me show you the packaging of this word. It was originally "opposition to the pc's terminal," and then became "opposition terminal" (just because people got tired of saying the other words) and then became "opterm." And that's the word which you should know it by. That's them-an opterm.

That is what the pc is agin. It's seldom either grammatical or delicate enough to be "against." He's agin it – brutally, violently and directly. It ain't him. That he knows. He may not know much, but he knows he ain't it – that's down deep and reactively.

But analytically, because he's supposed to be a reasonable being in a reasonable world, he very often collides with it and finds himself playing footsies with being it. And this is a sickening experience to him the whole way.

Now, in view of the fact that he begins by – when you – when in life, after occlusions of the GPM have set in and he can't remember who he was and he thinks he's only lived one life and he thinks he's a – oh, I don't know – he thinks he's a Baptist, and a – he thinks he's a this and a that and he's some nationalist. He thinks he's essentially an Earthman. Oh, wow, you know. This guy's occluded.

Anyhow, there he is and he walks around in life and he gets this feeling, you know – he's got enemies. You know? He knows this. And he has various ways of handling this. One is to be them, another way is to be interesting to them, another way is to make everything peaceful so they won't jump him. And the reason he has to have all of these rationales, of which they are just infinite numbers, is because he can't identify what the enemy is. He merely knows that something in the environment is hostile. He can't say what it is. Well, I'll give you an example. The fellow thinks that all publishers are against him – all publishers. That means newspaper publishers, book publishers – everything and you know, they're all against him and that's for sure. And he's got an uneasy feeling, so he goes through life solving problems as to how to get along with publishing companies, publishers, you see. He tries to be a writer; he does this, he does that and he – this – he worries about it all the time and one day you give him 3GA Criss Cross and the item turns up, "school copybook." That's all he's against: school copybooks, see. They're a deadly enemy. And immediately the identification between school
copybooks and all books and all publications and all publishers ceases to exist. So he knows now, when you've found this item, that he's against school copybooks. That's what he's agin. He feels much more comfortable even though they still knock his head off. You understand?

He no longer identifies in this particular subject. So the world looks like a friendlier place to him. Well, so you get $A = A = A$; you get a whole unknown existence, eight dynamics' worth, piled on this one thetan's head, until you start separating it out. Because at the same time he didn't know what he was being that had to oppose or was threatened by school copybooks. And then he finally finds out what he is being. He's being a student. See, it's not his military career that is giving him pains and aches, you see; it's not his life as a writer that is giving him pains and aches, you see; it's not his life as this and lead as that and the sphere of influence here and there and all that sort of thing. No, it's just the fact that, as a student, he is agin copybooks.

Now 3GA Criss Cross would make it possible to sort out the oppterm: copybook and the terminal: student. So you've got these two things. These are terms. Terminal: that means the pc's experiential track, what he has been, his beingnesses. And the oppterm: what his beingnesses have opposed or the oppositions that have made him assume his beingnesses.

So we've got these two things. We've got the "them" and "us" reduced to "oppterm" and "terminal."

Now, these are distinctly different things and life is made – is usually very simple on this. The auditor sails along and everything is fine and so forth, and he's been finding terminals and he's been finding oppterms and everything is going according to Hoyle. And he knows which they are, even when the pc is confused about it, because the terminal invariably turns on pain and the oppterm invariably turns on sensation.

Sensation being motion, pressure, misemotion; and pain simply being the sharp impulse or dull impulse of heat, cold and electrical. Heat is pn, cold is pn and bzzzt is pn. That's all pain.

But the pc is getting dizzy and he's getting sensations, and he is crying and feels griefy about it all and anything on the emotional scale. Or there's effort, pushing his chest in and he's got pressure against his eyeballs, and so forth – that's all sensation – commonly called sen: s-e-n.

All right. Those are very easily identifiable. Oppterm equals sen; term equals pn. And that's all there is to it. There are just those two things and that's the way they are and you got it all sorted out, you got it all straight, and the last three pcs you audited, you didn't have any trouble with. And when you get to the fourth pc: while he has sen, he talks about "us," and while he has pn he talks about "them." And he doesn't know which is him and which is them and everything you find has some pn and some sen on it. This should happen to you, see, as the auditor.

You'll find his rock slam on "consider committing overts against copybooks." Slaaaaam! you know. "Ouch!" he says. Everything is fine. He's had pain, himself, while facing the copybook. But then, of course because you're dealing only with the copybook, you turn on sen. So you say, "Copybook, copybook, copybook," to him and he goes zzzzzz – he
gets dizzy and so forth, you see. You say to him, "What would commit overts on a copybook?" and he gets "Ouch!" See? You're all sorted out, you're all straight as the auditor, you know which side it is. And oddly enough you will never really make a mistake on it because you can sooner or later sort it out as to which it is.

But your fourth – every fourth pc or something like that is not going to be able to get this through his own thick skull – which is him and which is them. See, doubt remains in his mind. Because there's pain and there's sensation on a copybook, and there's pain and there's sensation on a student. And one day he starts talking about "us copybooks," and "those dirty students marking me all up."

Now, if you've got the nomenclature and the rules straight, why, you're all set, because you yourself won't get mixed up on it. The auditor is actually never mixed up on it because he can make some simple tests. The pc is busy talking about "us copybooks" and all you have to do is say to him, "Well, what would commit overts on a copybook?"

And he says, "Ouch!"

Well, you know "copybook" – you know at once that "copybook" is an oppterm, because committing overts against it can give him an ouch if he lists it. See? So the lists of things committing overts against copybooks – gives him pain. But listing copybooks and what they represent gives him sen and he goes buzzz, buzzz. Sensation. Get the idea?

And you say to him, forcefully, "Copybooks, copybooks, copybooks."

And he says, "Stop that, you're making me dizzy."

You see how this is sorted out? You say to him, "Student, student, student."

And he says, "Ouch! Stop that. You're giving me an awful pain in my head." See?

At once, you're advised. Well, don't blame him if out of his confusion in the GPM and so forth, he can't make it out. He doesn't know whether he's a copybook or a student and he gets all mixed up about it.

Why does he get so mixed up? Because when he says "copybook," he's liable to get pain. I remember that lecture I was telling you about it – he's in the wrong-terminal situation. And when he says "student," and so forth, he's liable to get sensation. Why? Because he has to be outside of the beingness of student to gaze at a student in his bank which of course puts him into the copybook. You understand?

So the pc trying to sort this out for himself gets all mixed up, because sometimes he doesn't exteriorize from student while saying "student" and gets pain and sometimes he exteriorizes from student, you see, when he's saying "student," and gets sen; and sometimes when he is saying "student," he backs into "copybook," don't you see; and then when he says "copybook," he backs into "student" and gets pain. You see? And he just gets terribly confused about all of this.

So realize that the pc can get confused about what all these things are, quite often. He's usually straight about it, but don't expect him to be very reliable as to which is which. You're the person who knows, as the auditor. The auditor knows.
The auditor can make a simple test. He can – he's got two or three items there and he wants to know which side these items are on – he just says them to the pc, and one will produce pain and one will produce sen. And then he knows which side of the fence he's on, because, of course, he's an exterior source of command, so he tends to push the student [pc] back into the valence that he is calling. So the student [pc] experiences that valence.

Well, this is not something that has to be overstressed too hard, but becomes very important to the auditor when he starts to list goals – this becomes extremely important to the auditor. Because if you're trying to list goals against an oppterm, you use the lists 1 to 10 that were contained in the original Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam bulletins. See? "If you were an (oppterm), what goal would be impossible to achieve?" You know, that kind of a thing. That's listing goals against an oppterm.

Listing goals against a terminal is quite different. The basic rule there is this: "What would be the goals of a student?" You see, terminal – student. You say, "What would be the goals of a student? Give me twenty, thirty, forty, fifty goals of a student." Pc's goal is likely to be in that list if you carried this far enough.

So you see, you ask different ways to get a goal, but you could use either a terminal or an oppterm to get a goals list from. You see that? So you have to know which it is. And you don't take the pc's say-so, because he's liable to say, "us copybooks." You follow that?

You've got to make a test. Well, the test is the pain or sensation. You say what it is or you write a list representing it; and the pc gets pain, you know you're handling a terminal; and you write what it is, and write a list concep... breaking it down, representing it; and the pc gets sen, you know you've got a list of oppterms and that that item, being part of that list, of course, is an oppterm. You understand that?

Pcs will throw you a curve every once in a while by turning on fifty-fifty of each on everything. That's the original mixed-up kid from Suppressville. See?

So there's your – those are the trials of an auditor.

You say "copybook," and the left side of his body gets under tremendous pressure while the right-hand side gets burning hot. And you say, "student," and they reverse. Which side of it is him?

Well, oddly enough, you could say, "Well, you find more items, it will eventually work itself out." Well, that proved here not to be the case about two or three days ago – proved not to be the case at all. We had terminal rocket reading, and pc didn't know whether it was pain or sensation. He had both. We had something rocket reading. Some item was rocket reading and so we had to list goals. So we just did both. We treated it as a terminal and we treated it as an oppterm and went over the whole thing and of course, it worked out in the final analysis, because only the goal stayed in. Got the idea?

In other words, we treated it as both. What goals would it have? We used it in a list of twenty goals all by itself – as the word – and then we did a list 1 I think, and a list 6. I don't even know if they got that far, but we were prepared to do it both as an oppterm and a terminal and sort the goals out of the total list remaining. Because, of course, you're only dealing with – well, you're dealing with less than a hundred goals. You see that?
In other words, you've got – even if you became totally unstuck and didn't know whether it was a terminal or an oppterm, you still have a remedy, which is just treat it as one and then treat it as the other. You're not dealing with vast quantities of material.

Now, more terminology:

A rocket read: A rocket read doesn't have any definite size because of course, were dealing right now with two different Marks of E-Meters: the Mark IV and the Mark V. And you haven't seen a Mark V yet, but I think they'll be here in a couple of days. You've seen them on your TV demonstrations, so forth. And of course, it gives a liver, longer read. It gives the same kind of a read as the Mark IV, but it is a livelier, longer-looking read. But it looks otherwise exactly the same. You could say this: it's longer on a Mark V than on a Mark IV.

To tell you how long a rocket read is would be adventurous, because rocket reads have been half a dial. And I've never seen a rocket read that was valid, an eighth of an inch. You see some goal will dwindle down to about an eighth of an inch and it will kind of look it, but you can't tell if it's a rocket read or not. So I'll give you the two limits: The biggest one I've ever seen was half a dial and the smallest I have ever seen was greater than an eighth of an inch.

Now, what's a rocket read? If you take three coins – a big coin and two small coins – and put them on a roughed-up surface, in a row (small coin: 1, big coin: 2, small coin: 3) – all in a row – their rims are all touching, and you take small coin 1 and rap big coin 2 a sharp rap, you will see coin 3 do a rocket read.

In musical note, it would be a fast decay. Called a rocket read because it takes off like a rocket and slows down. It goes off the pad with a burst. Probably more like a catapult. It goes pssswww! And no other read looks like it. There isn't any other read like a rocket read.

I predicted that this thing would exist. We were fooling around with oscilloscopes. It was quite remarkable, because Tiger Drilling had not then been released. And we had only seen goals up to that time, tick and fall, you see. But when any goal was tiger drilled out, why, sure enough this predict... I said a goal, being the basis of a bank, would probably read differently, electronically, than any other read. I couldn't see how it could do otherwise. And we dreamed this up and saw it on an oscilloscope, and it looks very funny on an oscilloscope. It apparently goes way up and way up above the center line and then way down above the center line and then back to the center line again. It makes a very peculiar pattern: sort of a shortlegged Z stood on end. And this very peculiar thing was seen first on an oscilloscope.

Now, on a meter – it turned up on a meter and as soon as any goal was well-drilled, well tiger drilled and very smooth, and so forth, it would consistently and continuously rocket read. You'd say it and it'd give an instant rocket read. It looks quite different. It's an amazing phenomenon that it would read that way.

Now, it isn't a fall and the only time you can make a mistake with it is on the first leg of a rock slam. Now, once in a blue moon an unfinished rock slam will be at just at that triggered position, that when you say something, the first part of the rock slam will fire. Now that really isn't a rocket read because it doesn't go off with a spurt and do a fast decay, but it does
such an energetic flash that you can be taken by surprise by the thing. That's the first leg of a rock slam. The next time you say it, it probably does it in reverse.

Now, a rock slam very often looks like a reverse rocket read when it first starts out. But once more, that isn't really a rocket read because it doesn't give you the very rapid beginning and the very slow end. I know I every once in a while have been startled — or was before I got used to it — was startled occasionally; I'd see a rock slam start and think I was looking at a rocket read, you see? And then say the item again and then see the rock slam finish itself and say, "Ah, b... E-Meter."

Now, rocket read: You think, well, that's just — just some more slanguage to learn and so forth. Well, it isn't covered in E-Meter Essentials, because it was discovered after E-Meter Essentials was written and it's — it is itself. It is itself, definitely.

Now, rock slam: That's very interesting because the word dirty needle, here, gives you a curve. We have unfortunately developed, in our midst, a homonymic word. (Love that, don't you? Homonymic.) One explanatory double-word phrase that means two things and that's why you may have trouble with this thing called a dirty needle.

You'll find auditors trying to get over the heading of this saying, "Well, it was an instant dirty needle." Well, in actual fact, this is what a dirty needle really is, although I don't expect to stamp out its use with just a few words here because I've already defined it and had everybody fall from grace and I hear them using it and using it and I'm afraid it's gone too deep into the language now.

The original dirty needle was a bzzz, bzzz, bzz, bzz, bzzz, bzzz, that was happening with the needle sufficiently consistently that you couldn't pick a read out of the middle of this guys needle. In other words, it was a bad, small, sudden, continuous needle pattern that made it impossible to read the meter. And that was dirty needle. If I remember rightly, it had another name at that time, but I've forgotten what it was. It perished; nobody used it very much.

_Audience member: Scratchy needle._

Hmm?

_Audience member: Scratchy needle._

Oh, yeah, "scratchy needle" was being used at that time. Well, for some reason or other — for some reason or other, scratchy needle didn't survive, but dirty needle did.

And that really means a consistent pattern of little tiny bzzz and bzzzz and bzzz and bzzz — and up and down, up and down the needle face, you know, up and down the face of the dial. And just about the time your — you — well, it's laid off for a minute, you see. It's not doing that now, and you're going to say "to catch ca-" bzz, bzzz, bzzzz, bzz. You say, "All right, now, have I missed a with-" (Watch it carefully, watch it carefully. "Yeah, well, I see what its pattern is and now if I say anything that is meaningful, you say to yourself, it'll disturb the pattern I see in front of me.") "All right, Have I missed a with-" ("Oh well, that's doing something else now.") "Have I missed a withhold on you?" ("Oh, I'd say it read. I don't know.")

Well, that is the bane of 3GA, all through the line, has been the dirty needle. Because the confounded thing gives us everything but a read.
Now, it is actually a tiny rock slam and it is caused by – just as a rock slam is – by O/W. Only we call it "invalidate – failed to reveal." You see these little bzzzs and bzzs and bzzzzs and bzzzzs on the fellow's meter, he's invalidated something or he has failed to reveal something – one or the other. But the odd part of it is, he very often has invalidated something, he has failed to reveal it and he's now protesting your asking him about it. So very often Protest is the better entering button than either Fail to reveal or Invalidate, even though it is.

Now an auditor with lots of experience can take a look at this thing, knowing the pcs operating on it, of course and he can say, "Oh, this guy has just picked up a missed withhold." See, "I've just missed a withhold on this pc, because now here goes a – this needle was clean and everything was fine and now it's a dirty needle." Well, that's its usual use.

Now, he can say, "Well, have I missed a withhold on you?" or something like that and the pc gives it to him after some argument and after that, the needle's clean. Or it's an accumulation of these things, but you'll find out it's more often – when you can't clean it up at once – it's more often just protest, just common old garden-variety protest.

It also, by the way – if you missed and failed to complete a list and you've left a list all unfinished and you went on and you missed the item, and so forth; after that you get bzzz, bzz, bzzz, bzzz. Also wonderfully enough, you can sweat your head off trying to turn off one of these things on a pc. All during a Prepcheck it was always like this; you could never get the rudiments straight on this pc; it's always like this and, you know, it's sort of like, out in – out amongst Homo sapiens it's halitosis that loses you friends, see, and in Scientology it's having a dirty needle. You know, after a while nobody will audit you, you know? "He's got a dirty needle. To hell with him."

And oddly enough, on two occasions on chronically dirty needles, I have seen them turn off with the first item found by Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam and they just vanished and I see them only now when the pc really does have a withhold of magnitude or something like that. That's interesting, isn't it?

In other words, 3GA Criss Cross will blow up this dirty needle phenomena and you can expect the pc who has a dirty needle and is giving you a hard time, to keep on having it until you find the first reliable item.

All right, let's continue here with this rock slam.

Now, when you get an instant dirty needle – that means your instant read is bzzt! See, it's a bzzzz. Now, how big is that bzzz? And people are always coming up to me and expecting me to translate thought into mensuration, English type. And I will confess to you that every once in a while I get tired of being badgered and I will toss something off like "a half an inch" or "quarter of an inch," you know. But the truth of the matter is, it varies by the meter and it varies by the meter setting.

Now, a Mark V meter at 128 sensitivity – a dirty needle looks like the first cousin to a real rock slam, because it's pretty broad. And now you take it down to sensitivity 16 and it's this little eighth-of-an-inch bzzz, see, that you're used to on a Mark IV. But it's a tiny needle disturbance of great rapidity. Actually what it is, is a small rock slam.
Auditors are always saying to me, hopefully, "Well, I found a lot of little dirty needles on the list and can't I take those? Aren't they really a rock slam?" you know, "Please Ron? Please Ron? Say I've found an item." Well, I can't tell you you've found an item if you haven't. The answer is no! You see?

Well, how big is the smallest dirty needle? Well, how long is a short piece of string? This is one of those things. This is something that comes by experience and frankly, I have never taken a ruler and sat there over an E-Meter trying to measure the width of one. But I will tell you this: I have never seen one narrower than about an inch or an inch and a quarter, by my guess—see, I've never seen one smaller than that— that meant anything to a pc. Pc didn't cognite if your rock slams were smaller than that and did cognite if they were bigger than that. So— but what meter is this? Oh, I don't know, pick a meter!

Actually, it's not reducible to that degree. Don't you see? A rock slam then becomes a dirty needle when it ceases to carry with it a cognition on a found item. But it is a matter of size.

I'd say, if I finally assessed everything out to an eighth-of-an-inch rock slam, I think I would just tear the list—I would—even after I tiger drilled it and did everything I could do with it, and I'd polished it all up and I worked like mad; and working my brain to the bone trying to make this thing rock slam and it wouldn't do any more than an eighth-of-an-inch—I think I wouldn't have spent that much time on it. I think I would take the list and you—what you do is take the list and you fold it over once, you see and you tear it across the middle and then you put the two pieces together again and you tear them again.

Leave it in the guy's record to show that it didn't go anyplace is the proper professional thing to do, but my impulses are more savage than this sometimes. I seldom throw them in the pc's face now. [laughter, laughs] I mean, I've gotten myself under good control that way. Dump E-Meter tables on the pc sometimes but not often.

But it's got to be accompanied by the cognition, see? But a rock slam is a rock slam and I would say that the graduating point on a Mark IV is probably sensitivity 16, maybe plus or minus half an inch or something like that, as the smallest possible rock slam. But I've never seen one that small that meant anything. It's always been up there around an inch and a quarter.

Now, a rock slam is a nervous, agitated, flinging-to-and-fro of the needle and now I have been compounded with the felony of a slow rock slam. Well you could say a stage four needle is a very slow rock slam.

But, a slow rock slam—well, there are rock slams inside of rock slams That I've seen. I've seen a needle slamming while it was slamming. That's very interesting, because as it sweeps up the dial, it does three or four buzz slams of incredible speed and frequency as it's traveling an inch and a half very rapidly. That thing really looks savage. It looks like a thetan on an electric chair that he doesn't know whether to lean back or sit down. You can just see this guy bouncing out of his head and all over the universe.
This thing is a very frantic action. To say that some rock slams are slower than others is true, but that brings us up "how slow is a slow rock slam?" I don't know. That's something you'll have to answer by experience.

But a rock slam of the speed of a grandfather clock ticking from left to right would, in my opinion, be suspect. That's a too slow. There can't be such a thing as a too fast rock slam, however, because it just simply develops rock slams inside of rock slams. And it looks more and more frantic. But it is a frantic needle and sometimes thetans are more slowly frantic than other times. And once more the index is: Is it accompanied by cognition?

Now, those basically are your fundamental terms that you're using and doing business with 3GA Criss Cross. There really are no fancier terms of one kind or another than those things. Because all other terms are very, very explanatory; such as, "oppose" is simply you oppose it and "represent" is you simply represent it and so forth. And to go into that and call that a lot of terminology is practically a waste of time.

So, as all intents and purposes, I've given you the lexicon of 3GA Criss Cross and its various terms except one: item. Now, you've got "detested person" in 3GA – by Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. You have "detested person," you have "dynamic," and you have "item." And that's fine. And that belonged to that procedure. And I'm very happy to have it belong to that procedure, because in 3GA Criss Cross, they're all items.

If you wrote it on the list, it was an item. And if you found it, it was an item. It's still an item. And when it's obviously a provable item capable of delivering up further items, you call it a reliable item. See, you don't have to worry about detested persons and dynamics and items and all that sort of thing. You just call them items; just call anything an item.

Also in listing goals out, the pc is giving you items, don't you see? So it's just all items.

What do we mean by an item? We mean it's a terminal, whether a species or ally of oppterms or a species or ally of terminals. See, they're all items. And we needn't – we've got to have a word that embraces both. So a reliable item, then, is an item which the pc got after the list was nulled and that's – it's reliable and can be used to obtain further items. Well, that is a reliable item. It's also called – and you will call it, I am sure – the pc's item, even when it is an opterm. Go ahead and call it what you please but just recognize that there is a sloppy use of this word item and there's no reason for too many terms on top of item. You've passed into 3GA Criss Cross, call them all items. People know what you're talking about. You say, I found an item." Obviously, you have proven an item out on a pc, you see? You'd also say, "I wrote four hundred items on one list." See? It sort of differentiates itself.

There is no other terms to be defined in this except auditor.

And an auditor in 3GA Criss Cross is somebody who can find reliable items on the pc. Of course, that's a joke, but I make my point. It really takes an auditor to run this one.

Well, I will cover in the next lecture, now, the more amusing vagaries and departures from grace that we can have as we follow the rock slam.

Thank you.
3GA CRISS CROSS: FOLLOWING THE ROCK SLAM

A lecture given on 23 October 1962

Okay. Here we are. This is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 23 October AD 12.

And continuing 3GA Criss Cross, as she is cooked, and the recipe, and the subtitle of this lecture is: "Following the Rock Slam."

The tips which were put out on rock slams earlier apply in 3GA Criss Cross and you will find that the preclear interest follows the rock slam. If you can keep the rock slam you can keep the pc's interest. When you lose the rock slam you've lost the pc's interest.

Now, the cognitions follow the rock slam. We've often wondered, back through the antediluvian periods of Dianetics and Scientology, how come Mr. A cognited and Mr. B didn't cognite? And how come Mr. B sat there through 275 hours of auditing without a single cognition? Well, that's because you never came near any rock slams on him.

We used to try to get rid of rock slams, now we try to preserve them. In photography, if you will look at the modern manuals of photography put out as the great pictures of the year, you know, like the German annuals, and all that sort of thing, you will see in it that all of the bad features of the photography of ten years ago and the things that were condemned in the best photographic salons have now become – become the artistic thing to do today. In other words, they used to think grain was terrible and now grain is wonderful. And they used to think that out-of-focusness was awful and now they think it is just the cake.

Now, that is a process of being overwhelmed by that which you can't whip. [laughter] Now, you might say it's almost the same thing today with rock slams. Just a year ago, occasionally you would hear a half-angry, authoritative auditing voice in a session saying, "Floor! Floor! Floor! Floor!" trying to turn off the condemned rock slam so he could get on with the game, you see? Not any more. If I hear anybody using "floor, floor, floor" to turn off a dirty needle or a rock slam during an assessment and so forth, why, I will conclude that he doesn't know how to get in mid ruds and is trying to get the pc a loss. Because that's all that's going to happen.

Now, a rock slam, when it turns on suddenly and inexplicably in the middle of doing something else, is still a great embarrassment. But you had better find out what turned it on and why.

A pc on the rock slam channel, while he's following the rock slam very nicely and you're doing everything to get him to follow the rock slam, has a tiny withhold. The tiny
withhold, if it's in the direction of the rock slam object, of course is just the rock slam reacti-
vated by the withhold. And this makes life more complicated because it gives us this interesting
fact, that while you're doing a list and finding the last items on the list, the pc can have a
withhold on a certain item which will make it look like it is in when it is not. The rock slam is
occurring on the pc's withhold or invalidation or protest, and not on the item. Oh, isn't that grim!

Well, that's just – makes life more interesting, doesn't it? That's a hurdle.

This can actually occur, particularly on a pc who incipiently slams on auditors. He just
has this one little slight withhold: you're going down this list, everything is fine, and maybe
the list is a total blank. Maybe there's nothing on this list. Nothing. Nothing to be found any-
where. It's not going anyplace.

And you get down to the last three items and one of them is "a cadaver." And while
you read "cadaver" the last time through, the pc invalidated your auditing. Now, you read
"cadaver" again and it rock slams beautifully. Makes life more interesting, doesn't it?

Well, it merely gives us some of the reasons why you do what you do.

And the answer to that, of course, is you get a list down to the last three or four items
and then you take the remaining items out, not by elimination, but by Tiger Drill. You got
that? You don't eliminate the last three simply by calling them off with "commit overts" and
that sort of thing. You take the last three and you tiger drill them. And then you test them with
"would it commit overts against _____," or some such thing. And then you will see whether
or not it is actually rock slamming, not because the pc has a withhold on that item. Do you
understand that?

Now, because there are so many liabilities in this business, there are certain textbook
formulas. Now, these textbook formulas will prevent you from making 98 percent of your
mistakes. That's not choosing whether you oppterm or represent, they won't totally eliminate
that, but they'll eliminate 98 percent of your mistakes. Now, I said 98 percent. If you followed
them perfectly, they would eliminate 98 percent, and then the other 2 percent will just come
swinging in from Mars on an unpredicted wavelength. So you've still got to audit alertly.

In doing 3GA Criss Cross then, the byword and password is "be alert and be lucky." You're going to see some odd things happen to a pc and if you don't catch the brass ring when
you see them and do something about it you're going to be out of luck. So it's a very nervy
experience. And there's no substitute for experience. It's nerve-racking.

Therefore, there are certain textbook activities go on in this particular procedure, such
as – I got caught with this one the other night and ceased to be cocky about it 100 percent.
Took all the wind out of my sails. After all I've argued with people about not completing 3D
Criss Cross lists, after all of the enamel chipping and jaw chomping that I have done on the
subject, so help me, I didn't get a list complete. Isn't that – oowww. That should happen. And
I didn't get a list complete. And at the end of the session picked up the fact as a missed with-
hold. And having worked all that session to undo all of the mess which was constantly occur-
rning, see – dirty needle and everything else occurring on this thing – I finally find out where it
comes from: list wasn't complete.
Well, I hadn't even really been careful to complete that list. So I actually earned exactly what I got. It looked complete, it was apparently complete by test, but I didn't test it very hard. So I sighed and I said, "The next time I do this I will be guided by 3D Criss Cross rules of complete list."

Now, we can actually increase and improve those rules today. So the rules of listing actually go as follows: You list everything the pc can give you easily and when he tells you that's it on a list, you don't keep chanting the auditing command at him because some pcs will go on an automatic, you know, of answering the auditing command every time it's asked. Did you realize that? You see, you're not doing Prepchecking.

Now, that's the first habit you've got to get out of in listing. You're not prepchecking. You're not sitting there waiting for the pc to say, "No, that's the last one." You understand? And if you ask the question every time, every time, every time, some pcs just go on an automaticity of answering the question. They haven't got any more items, but they just keep answering it because it's being asked. Do you see that?

So you will find yourself occasionally shutting the pc off, just letting him run down rather than get some overbearingly long and meaningless list. Some pcs want the list 495 items every time you ask them one question. Well, that is unbearably embarrassing. I consider a complete list in this business of somewhere around eighty, ninety items. But that – that won't hold good for all pcs. But I can tell when a pc is endlessly and arduously listing, and they're going to list it all and so forth. Well, in such a pc I would tend to repeat the command less often. I'd sort of start omitting the command. And the pc would eventually say, "What was the command?"

And I would say, "Well, all right. Good. Good. That's fine, that's fine. Now, let's make a test out of this." Just ignore the whole invitation to go on with this automaticity, don't you see?

But you've got to have a complete list. So there is a rule that you can underscore: You've got to complete the list. But that doesn't mean an endless list done by the pc, it simply means a list that has discharged the charge.

There's a phenomenon occurring here, that if you list anything, the pc will have less charge on it. Now, there is also a danger here: you cannot go ahead and just list at random. You can list on the rock slam or near the rock slam with complete impunity, because you're listing on the goals channel. You understand that? But just taking off from nowhere, or from an arbitrary point that has nothing to do with anything, and permitting the pc to list a long time on it, is exactly the same as wrong goal. And every phenomenon that occurs in listing a wrong goal is liable to occur in listing four or five hundred items with no rock slam from a no rock slam item, and then four or five hundred items from another rock slam item, you know, no – no rock slam, this – no rock slam item has occurred, you know? And the next thing you know, your pc star... going to start going sen and wog and that sort of thing.

So you have to keep some control of this listing. The whole operation consists of taking something on which the pc is likely to have overts against and making a list of it. And out of this developing a rock slam. And then taking that list by assessment and finding the one item on it which really contained the rock slam.
Now, the oddities are that you can make a list of things the pc is likely to have overts against. You can null that list and pick out the item and will find that the rock slam has settled on one thing, if it's complete. But if it's incomplete, of course the thing that's least likely to be on an incomplete list is the item. You understand? Because a list completes rapidly after the item is put on it. So an incomplete list is less likely to have the item. You understand that – why?

Now, finding this item we have something against which the pc has overts. Similarly, we could have something which was a terminal with which the pc has committed overts. Now, why overts? Well, the whole phenomena of rock slam and meter behavior is based on the overt-withhold sequence. And a rock slam is the result of – as a meter representation – is the result of innumerable committed overts in a certain direction. And when you've got that certain direction isolated, that is to say, the items against which the overts are committed isolated, you then have, of course, a rock slam. And there'll be one thing that he has more overts on than others.

Now, if he gave you a list of eighty, which is pretty close to right, if he gave you a list of eighty, he will actually have committed overts on all eighty. But the reason he's committed overts on all eighty is A=A=A. He's identified them with one thing that he really commits overts on. And these are all of its cousins and sisters and brothers and aunts, you see? The odd part of it is, is getting a list of that character at all. But he of course isn't inventing these things, he's just dealing them off the bank.

Now, this whole thing is an interesting activity of doing clearing – you should look at it as to what it is – it is clearing without having found the goal. Now, it'll take you an awful long time to do it, and it is not – it is not well located or well centered or anything else. But in theory you could go on finding these and finding these and finding these and finding these, and at the end of a few hundred hours you would have found all of them and your pc would have been sitting there Clear. And then he tells you what his goal is. You see?

So what you're doing is kind of a swindle here, you see. You're actually finding the items before you find the goal. See, now, in Routine 3, you're supposed to find the goal and then find the items. Well, why does this make such a difference to the pc? Actually, why doesn't he find his goal in the first place? That's because he's got so many overts and so many withholds that he himself doesn't know what it is, doesn't dare confront what it is, has lessened the overt so thoroughly, and has then withheld it even from himself to such an extent that he can't even tell you what his goal is.

So this is the basic mechanism of how the pc's goal gets obscured in the first place. It gets overlaid with heavily charged items that the pc has used to commit overts with and things on which the pc has committed overts. The symbol of the rock slam is overt.

Now of course, as every overt or confusion is followed by stills, so the overt is followed by the withhold. So you could actually do this by withholds. You could do a Dynamic Assessment by withholds. You understand? But stills don't run well out of the bank. This would be much less reliable. But it still furnishes you a test. After you've found the overt you can ask the pc what he wouldn't give it and you'll get the slam back. See, because the slam
was held in place by the overt. See, the slam is still residual as the withhold even though you've gotten rid of the overt. Don't you see?

So you can still pull this trick as a test trick, you understand? Let's say we've run all the slam off the bank against waterbucks, with overt, you know. "Consider committing overts against a waterbuck." Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam – proven, good reliable item. It all goes up in smoke, we don't know anything more about it, it's disappeared and that's that. We could still get it to slam again by saying, "What wouldn't you give a waterbuck?" And of course that's "what would you withhold from a waterbuck," you see. And it'll go slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. But if you ask it very much, of course, it all blows up in smoke because there's no powder under it now. See, that one will wear right out. But you can at least see that it did slam at some time or another on overts.

This will be useful to you some time when trying to recover from some HPA's attempt to do 3GA Criss Cross who has run off the slam. It gives you nightmares sometimes. It's very hard to recover the entrances to slams when they are discharged. All right – means someday we'll have a central division – a central division of some kind or another of "what was my item?" you know, and all goals and items and everything else when found are registered there at the central division, don't you see? And in extremis, why, you can always cable it and get the pc's reliable items. Anyway, such doesn't exist now, so you're left on your own.

Now, the mechanism here then, is the pc has lived, and being terminal A, has committed overts against oppterm B. The effort then merely consists of locating the cousins, sisters and aunts or character of oppterm B, then listing this thing down in order to recover a slam. Because of course, while being A, and committing overts on B, he will produce on the meter the rock slam. And oddly enough you can find A by just asking – that is, the terminal – by just asking if it would commit overts. And it will slam. You don't even really have to have "against" anything. See?

Now, "Would you commit overts ... " – let's say the terminal is waterbuck and the oppterm tiger – "Would you commit overts against a tiger?" Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam if the tiger's a reliable item, you see? "All right, that's fine, thank you. Now, would a waterbuck commit overts?" Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. You see? So therefore a terminal will slam, as well as an oppterm. It's just how you word it. You must realize that the terminal commits the overt and the oppterm receives them. Therefore, that will always give you the proper direction for your wording.

Now, this is an interesting action then. Because it goes down through some part of the GPM, actually, if carried on, to hundreds and hundreds of items. You recognize that, just speaking loosely, as far as items are concerned, that pcs list ten, fifteen thousand items to go Clear. You realize that. So supposing that every 100 of those 15,000 items contained a key item that was really built in, terminal or oppterm. See, that's 15,000 – that gives you 150 items to find on the pc to make him go Clear.

And in view of the fact that you're going to be wrong at least 25 percent of the time no matter how lucky you are, that means you will actually be running up the bank at something on the order of about 200 items, a lot of them meaningless, you see, and let's suppose you're an old slowpoke, and it takes you two hours. Why, your whole clearing activity then boils
down to something on the order of 400 hours. See, that's far too much. And it's only theoretical that you could go the whole way. You understand that? Because after the slam is gone you might not find yourself going anywhere at all. And then you'd have to shift gears and go by cognition and you'd have to go by needle manifestations and little tiny slams and you'd work your way through this thing most arduously.

So therefore you make far more mistakes in the last half of the clearing than in the first half, so I'd say maybe you got about five hundred, six hundred hours to Clear, going at it in this way. But recognize it as a clearing procedure.

Now, a guy got all messed up because he had a goal. See, he wanted to do something. Somebody has already written in and said to me, "Well now look, if the pc's goal is this important, shouldn't you look just a little bit earlier, Ron, and find the assertion? Now, I'll give you an idea of what I mean. 'To catch catfish.' Now, a little bit earlier he must have had to assume that there were catfish to be caught. And therefore you find the assertion that there are catfish, and therefore it would clear the pc much faster."

Well, that's perfectly valid thinking – as long as you just think about it. That's perfectly valid and I'm very glad that somebody was thinking about it at all. But of course that's the second goal he's talking about.

So he's asking me, "Why don't you find the second goal before you find the first goal?" Well, if he knew how much sweat it was on most pcs just to find the first goal, he wouldn't be worried about finding the second goal before you found the first one because that's impossible. The second goal is totally detached from the third goal, and the third goal totally detached from the fourth goal. But the truth of the matter is, they tend to be solutions, one to a next. It's quite interesting.

Second goal set up problems which the first goal – you know, I mean, we're speaking now of the first goal we find – is a solution to. "To catch catfish," well, it's some kind of a solution. A second goal is, "to make too much of everything." See, and it happens that its terminal, its chief terminal, is a catfish. So he gets down the track a while and he all of a sudden has this brilliant inspiration: The way to remedy it all is to catch catfish. Heh-heh! That will solve the problem set up, you see, on his earlier goal.

They aren't actually connected and they will blow separately, which is the most marvelous thing about clearing that I know of. They will take separate stance and they do blow separately and so forth. But nevertheless I have noticed that the second goal is solved by the first goal you'll find. And so on.

Now, this piece of bank started up by "to catch catfish," resulted in the fellow being something that would catch catfish, and having assumed that identity went about his business happily catching catfish until he ran into an oppterm which said, "Thou must not catch catfish." Of course you say, well, catfish is enough of an oppterm. No, that sort of generally runs through the whole thing. And catfish aren't going to be solved totally by that goal. But he gets to a game warden and the game warden says you mustn't catch catfish. See? So we've got pc – fisherman; game warden, see, is the oppterm. All right. Now, that's all dandy, but he goes into some kind of a – an avoidance there of game warden, so county commissioner appoints a game warden, don't you see, so he gets the idea that he had better be a politician, see, and that
sort of gets him around this oppterm. And you'll get by these devious things and so forth, and then he finds out that economics inhibit the catching of catfish because the tackle is very expensive. You know, I mean, all kinds of wild things happen.

So he picks up additional opptersms and additional terminals, and he's still going on this goals line, but he's becoming different things, opposing different things, and different things are opposing him, see? And so you get this horrible muddle of little black balls which you call the GPM.

All right. Now, as this dance continues, you recognize that it's full of overts. He's getting motivators like crazy as a terminal, you see, and he's passing out overts like mad while being this terminal, against other specialized and selected terminals. And the meter manifestation of all this activity is a rock slam. So all you've got to do is follow the rock slam, and you wind up with the later day things that – you know, you won't wind up with the fundamentals, you'll wind up with the later day things, you know, like "world conqueror," you see, that was the ultimate of politician. You know? And "nut house" is the oppterm, because every time he says he wants to conquer the world they tell him they're going to put him in the nut house, don't you see?

And it's very funny, you look back on the item track of the pc – after you have cleared him – and it all makes sense. Everything makes sense. It looks completely idiotic though, to you, perhaps, while you are finding items. But they all make sense and they are opptersms and they are terminals. Of course, the time we're doing this on most pcs we don't know what the pcs goal is. But these things are so stacked on it that we can't find the pc's goal easily.

The saving of time amounts to this: The pc's goal, we find it. Well, somebody sits down and he says, "What's your goal?" And he writes down five goals and one of them rocket reads and it goes bang, and he's got the pc's goal and it's all set, and so he gets a Prehav level and he's going to list the whole thing, and he gets down there and he says, "Now, who or what would want to catch catfish?"

And the pc says, "hrmmm" and it rock slams, "hrmmm" and so on, "I get a –so on," he says, "so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so," and rock slams pretty bad, tone arm starts up, and gets up, and gets up, and there it is – 5. It's just sitting at 5. You found his goal, but the tone arm is now sitting at 5.

What do you do about this? Just 3GA Criss Cross. You don't even have to find out, you see, what he's stuck on that made him go up to 5.0. You've just got to find an item that rock slams, don't you see? And then you will take the weight off the bank and then, because the weight is so great, his overts are so great in that direction, he dare not confront in that direction anymore. So he runs into this section of the bank and he says, "Oh, there's nothing there. Ha-ha-ha." Lessens the overt, see? "Aha, no game wardens. Ha-ha-ha-ha, oh, yeah. Game warden, well, they're pretty unreal to me. Actually game wardens really aren't part of existence and I prefer not to associate with a game warden anyway. And there's no sense in putting that down on the list."

So he starts dealing off old items. You know, it's a treadmill. He never deals you this item. And his tone arm responses go up to 4.5, 5, stick, everything looked very mucky and muddy. Well, he couldn't confront it.
See, you found his goal. But you've got a – such a thoroughly burdened bank that the pc can't run it. And you'll find that more than often is the case. So the safe way to do it is not to spend endless hours prepchecking goals, but find an item or two or three and then check the goal again. Find the goal any way you want to. Do you see how that would be? You can take enough weight off of this rock slam, you can take enough charge off of his overts so that he can confront what he has overts on, and then find out what he is while he's confronting overts against and therefore he can list. You see the track he's trying to list through, you see the game he's trying to list through? The complexities of it all?

All right. Now, as we enter the case, on some cases we'll find the goal more easily than we will find the item. When the goal isn't real, then neither are items. But that's beside the point. We arrive at the toughest end of 3GA Criss Cross, which is its beginning. Now, oddly enough the toughest end of every case is its beginning. And the toughest end of any procedure is its beginning. And this is very sad. Because at that end of the game we, of course, know the least about the pc. The toughest part of auditing should be down toward the end of the intensive, wouldn't you agree? It never is. It's right there in the first session. See, the pc has to be in the best possible condition to handle this, but we find him at this stage of the beginning, you see, in the worst possible condition, casewise, to handle it. And all this is very unfair because it makes the auditor's job much tougher. A case, of course, should always be Clear before you start auditing him.

Well, turning on the rock slam is the first difficulty that you will run into in 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, in some cases this is dead easy. You give them a Sec Check, a rock slamming Sec Check, and they just drop it in your laps. The thing is slamming like mad and one of the things you used on the Sec Check was it. Well, you've got your first item. And you just do what you do with it and carry on and there you are. That's easy. Some other case, you sit there and you try this and you try that and you try something else and there's no rock slams.

Now, there is a method which will undoubtedly be espoused by the American Psychiatric Association – if after it goes nuts and is dealing in one of its spinbins and trying to clear itself – will of course for the auditor to beat the pc often enough and long enough for the pc to develop a rock slam on the auditor. But this is not advised. Because all it's going to do is wind up as its basic-basic with the first session. And you were there anyway. So you might as well not take that excursion at all.

The thing to do is to get the pc in-session. That is your first action. Because if this pc is suppressing like mad and throwing his rudiments out like mad, you're never going to see a rock slam. It's going to start to turn on, it's going to turn off. The pc is going to suppress before anything occurs, because a rock slam can suppress out of existence, Careful of can turn off a rock slam, and particularly Protest. Protest, I have found, is a very hot button on rock slams. You get off the Protest and then you get off the Careful of and then you get off the Suppress and you usually have your rock slam back. But Protest is very vital in turning off rock slams.

Now, how do you turn it all on? Well, the first thing, get the pc in-session. The next thing, there could be many steps and there are several different methods. The easiest pc would
be one that you simply say, "List the dynamics or parts of existence," he does, you assess it and you've got your first rock slam.

Next type of pc, next grade up, "Who or what have you detested?" They give you a list, it rock slams, you've got one of the persons there, and you've simply got your first item and you go on and use it.

Another pc, not quite as easy as this, is – you sneak up on him by – get "What – what do you wish hadn't been part of existence?" or some such phrase and then get what isn't part of existence. And he gives you a long dissertation on what isn't part of existence, you get a long list, one of those items rock slams like crazy, you're in and you've got your first item.

Now, let's take a slightly upgraded pc from this and let's get "What would you prefer not to associate with?" or "What wouldn't you want to associate with?" That is another entrance point. And you make a list of these things the pc wouldn't care to associate with and you will find there your rock slam at the final end of this.

Now, there are undoubtedly other approaches to this. We do not know them at this particular time. There are undoubtedly gradients that carry us in further on this particular road. But those are the various approaches that you can use to turn on a rock slam on a pc straight from scratch.

Now, how do we write this list? That might take up a little bit of interest here. We sit down, we put the pc in-session, we've got the pc well in-session, well under the auditor's control. We take a piece of legal length paper – that's 13 inch by 8, or something like this, 13-inch-long paper, and we write the list in a single column, is usually best. Gives you lots of latitude. Some people who write very small can get two columns on the page with the greatest of ease. But if it gets too scrimpy and too small, why, the auditor starts having trouble and the next auditor that picks it up could shoot the last auditor that did it if he's having to renull something. So actually leave some space for things to happen.

All right, so you write it like this: You write the pc's name, you write the date and you write the question that you're asking the pc to get this list. Now, that is vital, because if anybody, including you, is ever going to make sense out of what's been going on with this pc, you're going to need those data. You're going to need the date, the pc's name. We don't care who the auditor is, we can't read it and we still know who you are. I mean, we're getting to be terrific deciphering calligraphers or something like that in Scientology. Man, you talk about cryptography! We'll be getting orders in here any minute from the Royal Navy to decipher the Japanese codes. We're getting good, you know, I mean, good. You'd think so if you could look at some of these lists. It's all written in Arabic.

Anyway, you write those data. Now, when you turn the page over, of course, to write on the back side of it – and it's perfectly good and you should use the back side of that page, it's of course pure idiocy to repeat the question and the pc's name and the date. But how about Page 3? So you don't write anything on the back of Page 1, but you do write the figure "3" and the question. That gives you a consecutive series for page 3, don't you see? And you – somebody can see that "3" and they know there's a missing first page. Then they can find all the brutal data from the first page, don't you see? Because in the speed of writing up things,
you don't want to delay too much, but it's very easy to write "3" and the question, isn't it? Then you can add it up, because you know there's a page there.

Well, supposing it goes over to another list, of course you go on the back of this list. You don't write anything on the back of this list. Now, you go to 5, don't you? And on 5 you'd better write the question again. That makes all these lists join up beautifully. You don't number 2, you don't number 4, don't you see; you don't date those things and so on, because that just holds up the pc. You get how that system works? I think you'll find that's very serviceable.

Your lists actually seldom go beyond page 5 if you're doing any kind of a job of watching what the score is at all, and you keep repeating the question to some pcs and the pcs will keep on giving it to you. And then on some pcs you will get a two or three hundred list to make it a complete list and all that sort of thing. All that's allowed for.

Now, when you null this list, your administration should actually, to keep you from making mistakes as you're flying along the line, your administration should be multiple color. And the best way to handle this is, the first time you go down the column, just to use the pen that you wrote the thing with. I've been using various versions of this and how easy it is or is not to spot. And this is the one I have been using lately and find it's working very well. I also have to work out administration while I'm doing these various things. Because you see, other people read these lists besides you. And if we don't standardize, then the next auditor can't make head nor tails out of what went on.

All right, now, you see, it's important that there be next auditors, particularly if you're finding goals and somebody else is listing the goal. This character will want to know what cooked here, because he may have to take off in the middle of something and do something about it, don't you see? Or some other goals finder may have to pick this thing up and he'll want to know what went on, see? And you may have left it at a dead end or something and then listed the goals against your last reliable item, but that wasn't good enough to carry the listing through. They want to find some more items. They've got the guys goal, but they've got to find some more items. Well, they'd certainly better know where it all ought to stop, don't you see?

Well you put slant marks, just the plain slant mark for everything that is in, in the color pencil that you wrote the list with, and then everything that is out you put an X. Your next time through, grab a red ballpoint. You actually could carry it on through with a red ballpoint. The second time through, if it's out, you put a full X. That leaves you there with things that are still in, glaringly apparent, don't you see? And it also, by the time you've got two or three slants or a cross, you've had some cases bog down in the past with 3D Criss Cross just because the auditor didn't follow this very stupid point.

They – there – there's two items in on this sheet! That are still in! And the auditor never nulled them and the whole thing went blooey and he couldn't find the goal and it all went up in smoke and then Mary Sue'd go over the thing again and there's two in. It was one of those. See, he just missed it, completely. It was sitting in the middle of the page. So this
color code system's pretty good. I haven't ever bothered to carry it on into a green flash system after it, but you could.

Now, how do you call a list? That's your most interesting thing. I've given you the headings of these lists – "Prefer not to associate with," all those these other headings of one kind or another. You ask the pc to list these things. Well you actually just ask the question and he gives you a flock of answers and you ask the question again. Or he wants you to ask the question again and you do, and he gives you some more answers, and then the needle – you're watching it all the time.

Now, the best way to handle this on a meter is to pull your sensitivity down. Pull your sensitivity down so that you don't have to be adjusting this tone arm all the time, you got the idea? You don't pull it down to one or anything crazy like that, but you just – you just bring it down. That'd be very important to you when you get to a Mark V. It just flies around so dog-gone much that you have to put it on a lower sensitivity than you would use to null, don't you see? And remember then your rock slam won't be so big. So you sit there with one thumb on the thing and your other hand wrapped around the pencil writing this list, keeping that thing in center, and watching the moment before the pc says it. Watching the meter the moment before the pc says it. See if there was a slam. You understand?

And every time you write down an item, you put after it, if it slammed, "R/S." And if it's just a little dirty needle turned on with it – just went bzz-bzz – you write "dn." And if the pc volunteers that he had some pain on it – you're not terribly interested in this, but if the pc volunteers he had some pain on an item or sensation on an item, why – you don't pester the pc for that data while he's listing, by the way. I see some of you have been. Just write it "pn" and "sen."

You're much more interested in the aggregate pain and sen of the whole list, or a sudden pain or sensation that turned on.

The pc all of a sudden is going "Whhhh!" and you say, "What's the matter?"

"Well, my legs, just from the waist down are – just went hot as fire."

You say, "Well, when did they go hot as fire?" and try to trace it back up the list to what item turned it on and then mark it over here as a very likely item because the somatic is one of your indicators. Got it?

Pc tells you they're – they're – they're uncomfortable – you ask the pc and they say they are... trace it back to where it turned on. That's good procedure.

You don't go nulling back there, you just say, all right, when, and the pc will eventually tell you. And remember, the pc nearly always tells you one or two late.

See, it's on – it's on item – it's on item 83 on your list – you don't number these items, by the way – and actually the pc says it turned on on item 83, that was when he noticed it. It might also have been 82 or 80, don't you see?

So you kind of watch that closely. He gives you an indicator.

Sometimes on a Dynamic Assessment, a somatic will turn on – or a sensation, more likely a sensation – will turn on so shatteringly when you hit the dynamic, that there isn't any
thought of going on with the session. The pc is practically booted out of his chair, don't you see? And you'd just better take care of that right now. You'd better listen to the pc about it and you'd better hear about this and you'd better hear how it turned on and you'd better mark it down very adequately on your report and you persuade the pc: "Now, without invalidating this item or abandoning it or anything like that, of course – have to null the rest of the list – is that all right with you?" and you go on and null the rest of the list and then cope with it afterwards, do you understand? But every once in a while, when you've got an item, bang, you – he thinks the roof fell in. And that's a terrific indicator, it almost always is the item.

All right. Now, just your administration of this should be fairly neat. And somebody should be able to read these lists. But how do you call this list off? All right, if it is an oppterm list, it's "Consider committing overts against_____." Or to shorten it up, "...overts on." Uh, "Consider committing overts on_____." Now, that's a mouthful, but you're not going to be able to get away with it. I made several tests of just calling it off all by itself and I found out that I missed the boat when I did that, on oppters, so oppters are always called with "Consider committing overts against_____." or "Think of doing bad things to_____." You could also say, "Would you do bad things to?" or "Would you commit overts on_____.?" or "Would you commit overts against_____?" It's what registers with this pc, what makes sense. So there's variations of this. But they all carry the connotation of "Consider committing overts against_____." Because it's the overts against that are going to turn on the slams.

Now, you've got a checkpoint, "Consider withholding things from_____.", and you're going to get the same responses on your assessment, but it's not going to discharge it as well. You understand? Once "Consider committing overts against_____" is all worn out on this item, you can always say, "Think of withholding things from_____.," and you'll get the slam back. See, they're both sides of the same coin. You see that?

All right. So an oppterm list is always called in this particular way. Now, a terminals list – a terminals list, can be called directly or very involvedly. It can simply – you just call it. You know, "Waterbuck, tiger, cat, dog, fire warden," see. And register the instant reads. That's a terminals list. You just go bark, bark, bark, bark, bark down the line. Because it gets very involved to say, "Would a (whatever your item is on the list) commit overts against a tiger?", because nearly every one of them turn on a slam. How do you pick a slam out of all those slams? Because one of the characteristics of slams is they are persistent. You understand?

Now, one of the best ways to sort this thing out so it doesn't slam, is to put the terminal it's against, if you're repeating that terminal every time, before the sentence. "On tigers, would waterbucks commit overts? On tigers, would fire wardens commit overts?" See? That's if you're calling the whole sentence. You'll find that's one of the most desirable phrasings. Because you get rid of the tiger's rock slam, and then you just pick up general rock slam that turns on either with the item itself or overts against. But overts itself occasionally slams, so picking your way through it is quite interesting.

But fortunately, with your meter turned up to a very high sensitivity you can read them once and take any instant read on a terminal. You cannot do this for an oppterm. A terminal's list can just be bark, bark, bark, bark, bark – once each. You understand?
Now, "Consider committing overts against," you see, any such phrasing as this can also be read just once if you're an old sharpie on the meter. Now, if you're not sure, for God's sakes, don't fake it, just read it again.

Now, do you tell the pc if it's in or out? No, you don't. The more words you can get the hell out of auditing, kick them out! Now, "Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. That is out." How long did it take me to say that? A shocking length of time. Multiply it by 80 and you'll see why it takes you a week and a half to find an item, see?

All right, we've got an oppterm list. See? Its got "tiger" on it. And right after "tiger," why, it's got "carnivore." We say "Consider committing overts against a tiger. Consider committing overts against a carnivore." Where's the "that's in"? Where's the "thank you"? Well, the hell with it. Pc's got all the thank-yous he needs. How does he know if it's in or out? Won't that develop you a dirty needle? Well, after a while he'll get bright enough to find out that your pencil goes flick-flick, when it's out, and flick when it's in. [laughter] They smarten up quick.

In other words you can read them once. There's no "thank you." There's no "that's in, that's out." We're talking about this peculiar type of nulling. This doesn't alter nulling and doing other things in other departments of the game, see. This is talking about 3GA Criss Cross. The auditor says bark, bark, bark, bark, new one every time, you know? Then all of a sudden, why, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden." Didn't miss that, you know? You don't say, well, "I'm awfully sorry, pc, I – hey – I – I'm awfully sorry – come out of your boil-off – I'm awfully sorry that I missed that. I – I – I think I should have – have – have watched the meter more closely. And if it's all right with you... I'd better run some Havingness first, all right, I'll run some Havingness on him." See, that's not the way you do it at all, see.

You say, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden." Didn't read it, see, you didn't read it, but you don't say anything at all, you just say, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden." That's all. You didn't get it the first time so you read it twice. Pc knows you're reading it twice and going to read it again, because he – his mind very rapidly gets educated to the fact that you don't go slant-slant, see. He hears your ballpoint go scrape-scrape. Slash. You got the idea?

Well that's how you pick it up to an hour and ten minutes to list and find the item, see? Now, that requires very, very reliable meter reading, because you miss the key one and you've had it. You shouldn't have gotten out of bed that all – at all that morning, because the pc now has a missed withhold and the pc has this and the pc has that, and everything has gone to hell in a balloon. Now, the upshot of all this auditing culminates in a reliable item. A reliable item. That can be an oppterm or a terminal. And that meant one that slams when you found it. It slams in the same session that you found it. It doesn't have to slam the next day. It reliably slams and that means found. You completed the whole nulling and that one slams. You completed the whole nulling and that one now slams and that is the proven item, that is your last reliable item. Next day doesn't have to slam, never has to slam again to the end of time. Be-
cause of course you discharge the slam off and it'll be rapidly transferred onto something else just the moment you start listing.

You've got to – it's got to find it that day, though. See, and it had to slam very nicely and then you mark it down there on the report in letters of fire that that item slammed, and how wide it slammed, and how long it slammed. Now, one that slams just twice is something that the pc – and then passed out, you can't tiger drill it back on again, that's not good enough, in the session, see. Because you should be able to get that slam on and off. You should be able to regulate that slam with a Tiger Drill, you understand? You understand that?

It's not enough to have it go slam-slam while you're listing, and then never slammed again and didn't slam at the end and you call that an item. You'll be up in soup. All the way down the list you've got an item slamming, slamming, clear to the end, you've got items slamming. You go over it again, you don't have a slam in the whole lot. And it's - h_u_u_h_h_h_h! You say, "What happened?" Nothing happened except the pc's rudiments may be out, but the fact of the game is because the pc was saying them while you were listing them put the pc on the other side of the fence, and now when you're nulling them you don't get slams back on. So don't let it worry you when something doesn't slam again while you're listing; only start worrying if it doesn't slam at the end of the activity. Then you should start worrying. No slam on the list. You understand that?

You don't have to get slams back. What do you expect this list to do? Just stay preserved in wax till the end of time? What do you think was happening while you were listing? You were listing a slam off. It very often puzzles you because you go by a rock slam. You know, it listed it and you marked it "R/S" and you go by nulling it and it doesn't R/S. There's many an auditor here then spends the next half an hour fooling around trying to get that to R/S. Ah, to hell with it. Don't bother with it. So it didn't R/S, so what? Make fairly sure your middle rudiments are in and carry on. That doesn't mean you get your middle rudiments in just because it didn't R/S, either. You just go sailing down the list.

waterbuck commit overts against a tiger?" Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam, that's fine. Slams went off, and came on, and go out, and you mark it down in your auditor's report, and you say, "reliable item." In your red pencil in the middle of your blue report, you say, "reliable item, tiger." There it is. Underscored. Never has to slam again to the end of your days or anybody else's and probably won't. You understand? But you've got the last reliable item.

Now, why do you want the last reliable item? Very simple. There's the law of the last reliable item. What do you do when you've followed the rock slam to a dirty needle and went off the deep end of the cliff and you are now nowhere and the pc is ARC broken and disinterested and all life has turned green and gorgeously bilious? What do you do? You return to the last reliable item and do something else with it.

Second rule is: there are two things you can do with an item – you can oppose one or represent one. If you have opposed one the other thing you can do is to represent. If you oppose one and don't get a slam, then you can represent and down to a slam. In other words, if you've done one, you now do the other. If you've done one with no result you now do the other. And you'll probably get your result.

Now, items that are listed on oppose are always reversed. You say, "Would a waterbuck..." you know, "Who or what would oppose a tiger?" you know and "Who or what would a tiger oppose?" You always call them both ways. You make two lists, treat it as one list when you null it, but reverse your "Consider committing overts" command, if you're doing it that way or if it is a terminals list, just call it one-shot, you know, one item at a time on the way down, mark any instant read as in. In other words you get two lists out of an oppose. "Would a waterbuck op-" in other words, "Would – Who or what would oppose a tiger?" and "Who or what would a tiger oppose?" And you'll always catch the brass ring in that particular fashion.

Now, inert – this is the law on this: Inert items are represented most of the time, and active emanating items are opposed. And you won't go very far wrong by doing that. If you ask the pc is it – pc sometimes doesn't know. Well, do one or the other and you'll only be 50 percent of the time wrong. You see how this is?

In other words, you represent an inert item, something that is not active. "Dumb bunny." There is a good inert item. So you represent "dumb bunny," Supposing you come to the end "an ox head." All right, now, you represent "an ox head," don't you see, because it's still inert, and all of a sudden you'll find yourself sitting there with an active item. So you oppose it. Got the idea? "A spitting cat," oppose. Get the idea? "Shotgun," oppose. See? And you most of the time you'll be right. And part of the time you'll be wrong.

What do you do when you go off the deep edge? You use the rule of the last reliable item. That's a very reliable rule. The last one that you could really count on, you represented and it wound you up nowhere, ha-ha! Go back and oppose it. Supposing you neither get a represent nor oppose off of it and it all goes to hell? Then you go back to the last reliable item before that. Got it?

An item may rock slam and not be accompanied by cognition. Very doubtful, very doubtful. You'll get sensation on oppterms, pain on terms. You will get a rock slam and a cognition. In other words the pain or sensation, depending on whether it's a terminal or
oppterminal, and in addition to that, the rock slam, and in addition to that, pc's interest and cognitions, and that's what it takes to make an item. If you follow that on down and you either oppose or represent against the rule of whether it's inert or emanating, you'll find yourself following the rock slam. And you will do a very lot for the pc, and eventually, you will find that an item you get to, rocket reads, unless the pc has something against going Clear. But I will take that up in another lecture.

Thank you very much.

Good night.
Thank you. It has become damp. The English weather has turned into unusual California weather. Used to have a secretary while I was working down in Hollywood for films. Studio would send her over every morning. Route me out. She'd come in. She'd open up the blinds. She'd look outside. She'd say, "My! What unusual weather!" see. This kept up for about two months. [laughter] So, one day she came in and she opened up the blinds, and she looked out – and before she could speak, I said, "My! What unusual weather!" She applied for a transfer to some other writer. [laughter, laughs] I can tell you that as a story, Suzie isn't here yet. [laughs]

Anyway, this is the what of what?

Audience: 25 October.

Twenty-five – 25 Oct. AD 12. This is the month, with the thermonuclear in it.

Well, this first lecture here is an experimental approach to 3GA Criss Cross, and accumulated data on 3GA Criss Cross, and I have awfully, awfully, awfully good news for you. I have made a breakthrough, I think, which you will find very, very interesting. And if this works out uniformly – which I have no reason to believe that it will not – it will be a simple method of an assessment on a couple of lists, and you'll have your first item with a crash on the pc. That's interesting, isn't it?

Audience: Yeah.

I don't know why you should be so lucky as to have me around, but there it is. [laughter, laughs]

Now, the rock slam was called a rock slam because it was obvious that the first item on the pc's track was an item with which the pc had a very large confusion. It was the first thing that he used to help with or to get help with or something of this sort. And it was called the Rock. And it's actually original definition, I believe, was that it was the first mass that he attributed large significances to.

Now, we were clearing people by merely clearing out of the road the Rock. Now, that was done exclusively with Help Processes on about a 5-way bracket. And we did make some Clears – people that went free needle and proper point on the tone arm, and felt wonderful, and so forth. Just by this process of assessment for the Rock.

Now, I noticed in doing the research work on this, that the road to the Rock was accompanied with a very peculiar agitation of the needle. And no other word or name had been given this agitation of the needle – which went left and right and back and forth and so forth –
and I gave it the term "rock slam," because it's certainly a slamming needle. Its going to the left and to the right, and back and forth in a high degree of agitation.

Now, that phenomenon is an extremely basic phenomenon in clearing. And as you can realize the number of stable Clears that were made in earlier years must therefore be very close to zero. We've made temporary Clears lots of times. We've – people have hung on quite a while, and all that sort of thing. But stable Clears, no. You see. And that is our target. Somebody who will simply get that way – and stay that way along the line.

Well now, obviously a person who was a Rock Clear – that is you could get down to their Rock, and blow their Rock – still wouldn't have knocked off all of the GPM. Because underlying that Rock was a goal. And between that first – that ACC in which that was taught – was that the twentieth?

*Male voice: Yeah.*

The 20th ACC, and sometime, just before I – it was about the time of the South African Congress, I integrated "goal" as the underlying thing, below the Rock. Now, this broadened out clearing considerably. You see. Now you have a whole channel of pertinent terminals, of various kinds – things that the pc has been – and then this goes down to the earliest been-ness – which is the Rock, see. But underlying the Rock we find the goal. You get what the anatomy is. You can draw yourself a little channel here very, very easily, and you would see exactly what we are looking at here.

And these data are very hard to come by, by the way. Here is your – here is the way it might be said to be. There's the Rock at the bottom, here. And then, here's the goal. Now, you see that? See, there's some sort of a channel of livingness which comes down this long line and gets to the Rock and there's the goal. All right.

Now, the goal then lies earlier than the Rock. But the Rock is the first big mass that occurs after this fact. And of course, up this channel of livingness we have all sorts of small valences, you see, or repeating valences. And what I didn't know at that time, and which I found out about the middle of last year, is you actually have two valences like this – one whose force is that direction, and one whose force is against it in that direction. Looks like a dumbbell.

Every once in a while pcs run into these things and they say, "Ron, how did you know?" Well, I looked. And anyway, the – this thing is the basic unit anatomy of the GPM. You have mass A versus mass B. And they are impinged on each other and one is a terminal and one is an oppterm. Referring you to last Tuesday night's lectures.

Therefore, the Rock must have another Rock. Get the idea? The Rock's got another Rock. Now, you have to ask this question about the GPM, see. "How come it stays in place?" "How come it stays in place?" "How come it stays suspended in space?" "In time?" "How come it stays with you?" Well, it must be very carefully balanced against an opposing force. And hence we get this word, "Goals Problem Mass" heard relatively a few months ago. Last autumn, I think.

Why Goals Problem Mass? Well, it is that mass which results in the problem of the terminal versus the oppterm – as a result of the pc having postulated a goal. Now, this inter-
esting proposition could be offered, and we could say that that's how it hangs up so delicately in space. I worked this out synthetically, you know, just on asking this one question of how the devil does it stay there, you know? And it has to be opposing forces, which are in balance with it for the thing to stay in place. So we have these two dumbbells, one against the other – repeated many times in the bank – but each one of them held in very, very critical balance.

The one thing that is missing in Newton's laws in the field of physics that no physics professor – and I think there must be hundreds of thousands of them lecturing on physics throughout the world – has ever seemed to have noticed. There's the law of comparable magnitude. And they violate this. They know them – the data is incomparable all the time, and they give you such an idiocy that when you stamp on the Earth, the Earth moves back to the degree that you move down, you know, relative mass, yes. Well, you know I've gotten out there and taken a look, you know, and it doesn't!

Now, we have the comparable magnitude of the overt. You consider it no overt to swat a fly. Yet flies swat you through disease and other vias, once in a blue moon – but you don't consider that a return of the overt. I don't think that's much of a terminal-opportunity situation, you swatting a fly. You see, the law of comparable magnitudes is violated.

Now, Newton's three laws are only valid in the zone of comparable magnitude. For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction. Well, that isn't necessarily violated, because it does say "equal." But that in itself is the assumption of an absolute which makes the law, heh-heh – a little bit questionable. But, there's the law of acceleration, there's the law of inertia – the tendency of a body to remain at a state of rest or remain in a state of motion, don't you see. All these things are true unless you get forces which are too different – too far apart. You get the idea.

Inertia: The tendency of a body to remain in the state of rest. Well, I think, actually, when a cannonball hits a palm tree splinter, I don't think the palm tree splinter has any law of inertia. Get the idea? I mean, it has no tendency at all to remain at a state of rest. See, it'd be utterly unmeasurable. And it becomes idiotic, see. Drop the Empire State Building on a fly. You see, and then say the fly had a tendency to remain in a state of rest. These things become ridiculous, don't you see?

Now, the size of the basic Rock-opprock is pretty darn big! And these things versus one another contain rather interestingly strong forces. Very strong forces. And they're studied, and pushed in against, and everything is smashed up together, of smaller pairs of these dumbbells. And there's smaller pairs of dumbbells and smaller pairs of dumbbells, and the further the thetan progresses in time from the moment of the assumption of the Rock, then the less force or mass he has to have to consider it force or mass. His consideration of what is force and what is mass, deteriorates. So you get smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller dumbbells. See?

They go from – well, you've seen somebody around, and you've swatted him on the back, you know, in a friendly gesture – you've patted him on the back, you know – just about hardly any – hardly even that, you know, and he says, "Oooww! God! I've broken my ribs!" You know. Well, a slice of carrot, versus a slice of cabbage would appear to him to be insurmountably great and powerful. You get the idea of the size of the dumbbell. It's declined. His
conception of his own force, his ability to handle force, and so forth, and mass, has deterio-
rated. And it's deteriorated down to a point where the dumbbell at the top of this – if we con-
sider that now – is almost microscopically small, one versus the other. And then as we pro-
gress down from the top toward this Rock, we get bigger and bigger dumbbells. A versus Bs, you see. Till we get down to the Rock versus the opprock and we've got it, see, and that's big.

Now, that tells you at once why, when you say to somebody, "All right, that's your
goal – well, why don't you just change your mi-
nd?" See, that's approaching clearing on a
no-gradient. And he can't do it. Why can't he do it? Because his concept of force in the vicin-
ity of the time he postulated this goal, envisioned something being pretty forceful before he
would call it force. And now, he lets out a gentle sigh and thinks he is blowing a furnace
blast, you see. So he can't face that much force. See, he can't face this much force at once as is
contained in the Rock-opprock area which is much earlier in time. Do you follow that?

So, you say to him, "All right. Blow the GPM. Thank you. Well, I guess you failed,
huh? Heh-heh-heh!" Why can't he blow the GPM just like that? Well, it's a decline of force is
the story as the eons have marched on – his concept of what is force has degenerated. In other
words, he doesn't consider that that forceful. He doesn't consider... Once upon a time he con-
sidered motion with an exclamation point, you see. Well, that'd be something on the order of a
meteorite hitting a spaceship. He'd say, "Hey, pretty good! You know? Ha!" And now he
dents the left fender of his car slightly, you see, and "Oh, my God!" you know. That's too
much force, you see?

So the reason he doesn't blow his goal instantly and at once is a very simple reason.
The goal lies before and earlier than a higher idea of force. And he gets into that zone, and he
can't tolerate that much force in that much area, so he cannot confront it. He just can't con-
front that much force. "It's too much for me!" he says.

Now, you might be able to get the forces of this lifetime and audit them very easily.
But as soon as you start chipping back about five or six lifetimes you start running into this
phenomena. You know? I remember my idea of a good way to warm up was to take a horse
like a Percheron, you know, and take ninety-eight or a hundred and ten pounds' worth of ar-
mor and take about a fifteen foot long ash spear and go out in the lists someplace, you know.
And get this horse up to about thirty miles an hour, you know, and let him run head-on into
another guy coming down the course in the other direction at thirty miles an hour. You know?
That was a nice, quiet way to warm up!

Now, the reason why it was spectacular is the people in the grandstand considered that
too much force for them. And the reason one was successful at it, is it did not exceed his idea
of what was forceful. Because that didn't look like all that much impact to him. Why do you
stop such a thing?

Well, after a few centuries of monkeying around this way, you pick yourself up off the
ground and pick the hardware off of yourself, you see, and your head is ringing! You know,
and you say, "You know, I'm just not the man I was once. I think I'll take up judging these
things," you see? [laughs] See, you said, "That's too much force for me," you see?

Once upon a time, this was almost a gag. See, that much foot-pounds of impact – well,
that was just a good way to warm up – you know? Yeah, make you feel kind of alive. And
you deteriorate in your concept of that same thing of, "Good God! How can they stand up to it?"

Similarly racing. On this – at this time on this planet you have many of these ideas, in restimulation, and so forth. You've got racing. It's always coming as a surprise to somebody that he can't stand up to as much force as he thought he could. A car hits a brick wall, or something like this, and he gets his wind knocked out. And the fenders get dented and so forth. He hasn't conceived there was that much force. Well, how does his idea that that isn't very fatal permit him to go into a race where that could be very fatal? Well, it's his misconceptions of the thing. He's measuring track by an earlier-track idea. Follow this?

Now, in the Marcab Confederacy a racing car was a turbine-driven job and they went on for thousands of years. I think there was ten or twelve thousand years. They always had the same race cars, same races, everything. They didn't believe in progress. And they went about two hundred and seventy-five miles an hour according to our present standards. They went at a high whine. And they used to have casualties. Those things would go into a brick wall or one of the concrete ramparts or something like that, and they'd have a casualty. They'd have to take the pilot out and take him to the hospital tent. See, take the driver out of that and take him to the hospital tent to patch him up.

Now, that is within the last forty thousand years. You get how rapidly one's concept of mass can deteriorate. Because – I mention that because some of you have got Marcab on your tracks. A lot of you people run into bits and pieces of the racetracks of Marcab. Well, take a look at it – at how much force, you see? Two hundred and seventy-five miles an hour in a turbine-driven car hitting a concrete wall and having to go to the hospital tent. Hundred and ten miles an hour – caroming off of a brick wall or a fence and getting buried. That's different ideas. See, it's a deterioration of the idea of force.

Now, that doesn't say that the thetan sometimes miraculously suddenly can't regain his older ideas of how much force he can tolerate. But, it does say that on the average there's a general deterioration. So when you ask a thetan to go on the earliest track, find his goal, be right there at the point of his goal. "All right, now you see that, now just change your mind. Thank you," and it blows the whole bank – you see now why that doesn't work? See, you've asked him to go and climb in to a five hundred mile an hour racing car, hit a concrete wall and live. That's the way it looks to him. He says, "What! Ha-ha! Ho-ho! You silly? You must think I'm stupid!"

Well, at the time he made up this thing it'd been something on the order of if he went at the speed of a meteor and you hit an asteroid – well, that was a good way to acquire mass! See? About the time he was making this goal up that was his idea of mass, you see. Impact, force – way up there!

Well, you want to know what you're up against in clearing somebody. You're up against a concept of mass and force relative to their experiences and bad experiences. And there isn't even any name for this. We have randomness, its plus or minus motion, can be tolerated by the individual. And it comes under the heading of randomness. But it would also be an extension of this thing called randomness. It'd be plus or minus force the individual could tolerate, and plus or minus mass.
How much mass is mass? And early on the track he said, "Oh, well, that's a pretty good-sized mass there," and he points to a big planet. "Yeah, that's a nice piece of mest. You know? That's nice. Just about my size!" And we find this same thetan late on the track, and she can handle a bonbon very well. Say, "What's – what's – what's your idea of mass?" and person says, "Ah, that – that bonbon, that's very nice, very nice piece of mass, there." Or a diamond ring – very nice mass.

Now, if you don't think people's ideas of mass deteriorate rather rapidly, you should look at the disappearance of solid coinery in the bigger denominations – gold pieces, that sort of thing. That isn't all, it isn't just the scarcity of gold – somebody could have dreamed up something to solve this, I'm sure. But, it's another thing. It's another thing. Do you know that they used to make silver pieces in very outrageously large sizes. I saw one time, I stepped off the plane, to get a breather, I think, in Salisbury. And somebody at the lunch counter was fooling around, I think, with a five-shilling coin. It was an interesting looking coin! It was a monstrous coin. It was very thick, and it was very soft, and it was solid silver, and it was way back from the old days when they used to dig it out of a vein down there, and throw it in the mold, and hope it was legal tender, you know?

But that was at one time a nice – well it was money! It was valuable, it could buy something. Well obviously it's too much mass, now. That's obviously too much coin. Because that coin – although five shillings doesn't buy now anything it would have bought then – why the people take two much smaller coins to make up that five shilling, by preference. Don't you see?

You get the deterioration of the monetary idea. Well, you can see this almost anyplace around. There's some signs of this thing.

Now, what's this add up to? It adds up to why you can't immediately, rapidly and right now clear somebody. And why some cases clear easily, and some cases clear hard. And this is the answer to that. I can guarantee this to you, now – that is the answer. It isn't anything else.

This case has a very – still got a very massy idea of mass, you know? You know, he says, "Well, yeah, a nice piece of mass, you know, a mountain." Well he clears pretty easily, see? But this next case says, "Well, a nice piece of mass – take that dirty coin out of here!" He's inverted on the idea of mass. Can't look at it. Doesn't want to have anything to do with it.

Also, it might surprise you, if you haven't thought of it – that the idea of pain as an undesirable commodity – pain as an undesirable commodity is a late idea! Pain is not uniformly an undesirable commodity on the whole track. It is simply another sensation!

Now, pain tends to increase as an unwanted, feared and undesirable thing as one's concept of mass and force deteriorates. There's a direct relationship between these two things. Well, let me – let me state this properly, mathematically. It's an inverse relation. So the more a person fears pain and shudders away from pain, why, the less mass and force he can tolerate. In other words, this idea of pain.

Pain is basically a sensation of impact. That's basically what it is. You seldom have pain without having some separation of impact, or collision of impact, or something like that.
Pain is most normally in this line. Although pain is a heat-cold-electrical sensation. It is that with which force begins to be greeted as the individual's idea of force deteriorates.

Well, let's take in one lifetime. At the age of sixteen, fast enough is ninety miles an hour. He considers that's pretty good. Ninety miles an hour – that's fine with him. At the age of twenty-five – fifty-five, sixty, that is fast enough – and that's fine with him. Thirty-five on – forty. That's pretty fast – that's fast enough. And about the age of seventy – you get the character who causes all the accidents by going down the middle of the road at fifteen!

Now, people may think they want bigger mass, but they tend to compensate for it with slower speed. So there is also a speed-mass ratio of tolerance. You can have a big mass if it goes awful slow. Therefore, you see the fellow in his Cadillac going twenty miles an hour on the turnpike, you know. You see this quite a bit, you know. Massive car – very tiny speeds, so on. The car would be totally undesirable to him, you see, the speed-mass ratio would be too – have too high a figure if he drove that ear at a proper speed. Thirty-five, forty, fifty – something like this. Ha-ha! That's too much for him, man!

Also, you get the popularity of small cars and the popularity of scooters, motorbikes – but not motorbikes that go fast, but scooters that go slow. And you find those things are getting – they have a popularity. Well, they may or may not have a practicality – they do furnish transportation at very, very low petrol and gas cost.

But remember something. You're actually increasing the liability of an impact, see? There's something going astray here, because the percentage of accidents that occur on scooters – I'm not condemning anybody's scooter, I'd just as soon ride scooters. I'd preferably prefer TT Model 650s however – but the deterioration of his idea of what mass is good mass actually puts him in danger, see? So it isn't reasonable. Sense and logic have nothing to do with this. It is simply the concept of how much mass is mass, and how much, and so on – and they will do stupid things!

And you want to know how stupid they can get? About 400 A.D., the Roman legions – because the armor was too heavy – had ceased to practice with practice armor, which was always heavier. And they have ceased to use practice armor of any kind. It was always heavier than battle armor, don't you see? Nobody could get them to practice with it anymore. And fifty, seventy-five years later – we find these same legions going into battle having thrown away their armor! They're nuts! See. They no longer can strike an accurate blow, and here they don't even defend themselves, don't you see?

So, frankly what happens is – their concept of the stronger higher forces diminishes and disappears. See, it fades out. They no longer have any concept of these forces. These forces are beyond their concept. Well, similarly with pain, an individual readily forgets how much pain, pain can hurt. You know, how much pain can pain be?

You find accident victims very often are surprised as hell at how hard it hurts! See? Well, similarly, they're just surprised as the devil when that much mass occurs. That's too much mass, see. They get the idea. In other words, not only does the ability to experience it deteriorate – but the ability to conceive it deteriorates. So eventually they start doing stupid things.
See, they're trying to avoid pain, so they get hurt all the time. That's your accident-prone. They're no longer able to conceive the mass, they're no longer able to conceive the force, and they're always being surprised at the pain. And it doesn't last in their minds any time duration at all, so they get hurt again – and they get... And that – sometimes these people will explain to you the chain of circumstances by which they were hurt. And man, it hasn't anything to do with what happened. You stand there with your jaw dropped.

You've already made a leg up on this before you came to Saint Hill, actually. Because all the time you've been in processing, your tolerance of mass and force has been increasing. And because you can wipe out pain in yourself with an assist, and you've had experiences of this particular kind – your respect for it, and your awe of it is diminishing. Well, you're just climbing back up the scale. So I'm actually talking about something – a route you have been on for some time.

Now, it'd be just a little bit difficult for you to immediately and directly then, catch up with what the (quote) man in the street, (unquote) has as a concept of pain, force and mass. See? What does he think these things are? What is he willing to handle? What does he conceive of as actual force?

Actual mass? See? And so you see him going on doing silly, stupid things. And one of your biggest protests against the world around you is people are doing such stupid, silly things! They're doing very silly things – they do very silly things with force – they do very silly things with mass.

You've got an instance right this moment, (although I told Ron I wasn't going to say anything about the world situation), you've got this very moment * – and have had for a dozen years or more – oh, more than that, twenty years, force which is totally beyond the concept [with a trembling voice:] of the world's greatest leaders. You have to say that reverently. [laughter] But they don't know what they've got their paws on! See?

This you read with amazement how they compare nuclear fission to a hundred-thousand-ton bomb of TNT or something – or sixty-two TNT bombs, or groping around, you see, within something that they can call a textbook, you see, response of World War II. Well, that hasn't anything to do with it! Because that force and mass is delivered in a split second. And because it is delivered in such a small moment of time – it has enormous impact value which is upwards through millions of times the impact value of TNT. But, you know, not even in their textbooks have I seen them sort that fact out. They don't adequately sort it out.

You see, actually the force increases as the time decreases. Because force is always measured in units of time. So if you have milliseconds of time in which a force is delivered, you see – you can't use force without a reference to time – just that – by definition that's what force is. So, the shorter the time period of the force delivery, why the greater the impact. You see the greater the actual force. I'm using very clumsy words, because force does contain time, don't you see?

* Editor's note: This refers to the Cuba Crisis which reached its climax in the late October of 1962
See, you can't say that the smaller amount of time in which that force is delivered, you'd have to say the foot-pounds are delivered, see. You deliver a thousand foot-pounds, you deliver a thousand foot-pounds in an hour, and all you are doing is driving uptown in your car. See? Something like that. And you deliver it in five minutes, and you're probably pushing over a brick wall or something. And you deliver it something on the order of a half a second – you're getting up around naval gunfire. See that's – well that's a thousand foot-pounds, don't you see? So this distributed out over a period of time becomes confrontable. But as it is reduced in its period of time, becomes un-confrontable.

And nuclear fission has done just that. There is no such thing as comparing it to a thousand TNT bombs. Exploded at what frequency? How often? In what mass? Because they don't even go off as fast as nuclear fission. This is very interesting, because they've just totally avoided this whole idea. So they don't know what to do with this. They haven't any idea of what to do with all this force.

Here's a head of state, and he has these tremendous forces, and these tremendous striking powers, and all that sort of thing – and he says, "Well, go shoot me some gnats." See, do something like that with it. He doesn't know. He's groping. Don't you see?

The distribution of this force – what would happen to it? You'd find all sorts of arguments. They take great – great pat on the back. They pat themselves on the back as realists. They say, "Well, it wouldn't crack earth's crust. If we exploded a thousand of these things over Russia – it wouldn't do anything much. We hope. We guess." Well, I frankly believe that any time they start using this stuff at any great range, or action, and so forth – I firmly believe that it'd be just exactly like firing a shotgun with the breech half-closed. The guy firing it is going to get just about as much as anything being shot at. You know, they're up there to a force that they can't live with having released.

So that's why you have these brothers around conference tables discussing and arguing. And they're trying to play chess with this stuff, you know? You watch this, you know. Well it isn't that these are great men that know what they're doing – and guiding destinies all properly – it's just that they don't know what game they're in, see? This is going to surprise them! They're going to get a very great surprise! War usually surprises such people.

You're wondering whether I think there will be a nuclear war in the next five minutes. Well, I'm not going on a vacation on the second of November. I just looked at the old crystal ball, and it looks sort of explosive up there around the twelfth or thirteenth, so I thought, well, I'll go later. Oh, I don't think they'll do anything very desperate. I'm just giving you an idea. These birds – the forces involved are actually sufficient and adequate – if they had any concept of what they're doing – to bring them at once to a conference table, to arrange to disband the lot! You get the idea?

Let's take it all down, let's put it in a hole someplace – and make fuel out of it or something – and they'd just be pals, you see, about this whole thing, you know. And, no no, they're playing games with it, you know. "I'll shoot you if you shoot me," you know. God! That's crazy, you know? Because leader A fires at leader B, the same shot is going to take leader A's head off.
Yeah, I often wonder if they don't think of themselves as the whole world in flames, and the government building untouched. This is marvelous to behold, don't you see? But they're just dealing with greater force than they have any concept of. See, and they're actually – still want to play politics. Well only mad men would do something like that.

I had a good title a few years ago; I was going to write a book: The Madmen in Charge. Never got around to it. But, still may do it. Sounds like it might be an interesting book.

Washington, by the way, its evacuation plans change every month or so. But, apparently everybody in the Navy Department is supposed to go get their car in the parking lot and then drive past the entrance to the Navy Department. And then the people in the entrance to the Navy Department are supposed to come out of the entrance and they're supposed to get in these cars, and then they're supposed to go to an area nearby. And then they're supposed to set up something there. I'm not quite sure – I think the plan fades out before they get to this new area. We're going to have a queue of two thousand cars, or five thousand cars, or fifteen thousand cars – strung out in front of a single entrance. Aw, they'd just never make it, that's all.

This deteriorated, these civil defense plans deteriorated to something very amusing. I think not too long ago, somebody from civil defense headquarters in Washington, from writing books, as to what we were supposed to do – I saw their last set of plans. This is very interesting. They move things from one section of town to another section of town, compared to which section of town was damaged by the bombs. Yeah! And their – the hospital, where they're going to bring all the casualties to is in the middle of town! [laughter]

This is just insane raving, don't you see? I was very much amused at all this, but the denouement of this – having been issued many copies of this from time to time and changing plans, and so forth – why, the last one I heard from FCDC is the civil defense officials had come around and called – I think it was on the Org Sec – and had asked him if we had any civil defense plans! Did we have any plans? He didn't want them for the town – apparently the policy now is for every organization to have its own plans for civil defense. You get the deterioration into the total individuation of it all, see. Now everybody's supposed to have a separate set of plans. And man, that'll really look good!

You get around Washington, you know, some of the kids around Washington, they really laugh about this, because they go out along the highway – I think they've taken most of these signs down. I didn't see them when I was over there last month. I didn't see a one! But I wasn't looking very hard, either. But they used to have signs, and you drive outside the District of Columbia in any direction and it said "In time of national emergency," (or something like this) "this highway will be closed to civilian traffic." Only it was on all highways, and on all roads – on all sides of the district. Marvelous! In other words, they cannot plan in the face of that much force, do you see? They become totally illogical in the face of that much force. There is no planning involved beyond their concept or ability.

Telephone call this afternoon from the States, somebody remarked that people are tearing around madly in all directions buying supplies of food and digging holes in the ground and they're having a ball! They're having a ball. Think probably the safest place in the world is probably Washington DC. Probably very safe – because, you see, if their level of confront
is that poor – it's very doubtful if anybody will confront Washington or Moscow. Because
these'd be the two places you would have to confront to solve the situation. But I don't think
the war will ever come up to confronting either place! I think we're in more danger. I think
they will probably find out that it was England and South Africa that started the whole Cuban
invasion. [laughter] They'll get something figured out!

Therefore, you are baffled very often at somebody's approach to his (quote) "Prob-
lems" in life. What he will do as a solution to his Problems, and how this sounds logical to
this person, you don't dig, see. You listen to him, you hear words – but it doesn't make any
sense! Now, let's see, if he just sends his wife, who's forty, to the university and if he himself
will take up skin diving, why, somehow his overdraft at the bank will all work out. And man,
you'll hear some wild ones! Now, what's the matter with this guy? Well, his problems contain
force. And he cannot confront either using or receiving that much force, so he simply neglects
it.

Now it's this factor alone, on which the governments of the world are constructed to-
day – that people cannot conceive force. You realize, if you break the law flagrantly in any
large country – you realize that the entirety of the army, the navy, the air force, and the whole
police, the entire judiciary, and through newspapers and so forth, public opinion, meaning the
rest of the population – can be totally turned against a single individual. You realize it's
rigged that way? Well how could it possibly get rigged that way? It's because nobody con-
ceives that it's rigged that way. They say, "Well, I have the power of vote, and I am a free
citizen," and you go on hearing these yap, yap, yaps, see. And then all of a sudden this indi-
vidual says, "No! I won't pay any taxes." Well man, they make short work out of that!

Well, what if this individual got themselves a machine gun emplacement and sat down
and spoke back in kind? What do you think would happen? And then supposing he got two or
three other means of defense and got a defense in depth, and so forth? How much troops do
you think would eventually be piled up against this individual before he finally surrendered?
It would be the whole force of the country, wouldn't it? Well, every citizen in a country is
versus the force of that country. This is not democracy – this is just blindness. Who ever got
around to figuring out a form of government like that? It has no freedom involved, it's just an
overwhelm – a total overwhelm.

Ireland didn't quite buy this. Ireland had an interesting thing and – in its government.
You can sue personally any individual in the government who does anything you don't like.
Now, of course, that rather returns it to a democratic process. Cop gives you a parking ticket,
honest! He's just in trouble if he doesn't have witnesses. Because he can't enforce the collec-
tion or the fining of that ticket if you contest it. Because you could sue him for the full value
of the fine if you won your case. You don't get a very militant police force this way. They're
more angry than otherwise. But all right.

In Washington, this might theoretically apply, but in Washington you should realize
that about seventy-five warrants a week are requested of the federal district courts against
government officials for non-constitutional and illegal acts in the performance of their duty.
Just about seventy-five a week are requested by the public in that one area of Washington.
And to date, the district court has never issued one. They simply refuse to issue. It just stops right there. They just blanketly refuse to issue those warrants.

That means if a government official came in, pulled out a gun, killed everybody dead in the house – this is the *ne plus ultra* on the thing – and some relative wanted him indicted for murder, it wouldn't happen. That is the government of Russia today. So you see how governments deteriorate? That's not the government of the US or England today – but it's the government of another country today. They do walk in and kill everybody in the house every now and then, and drag somebody off to prison. Nobody ever hears of them again. And there's no recourse. Nobody can say a word. You have to – in England and the United States, we generally keep a propaganda fan going of some kind or another. It's just propaganda. It's just talk – against the official. We back him down. We back him down. We always got to keep him more or less convinced that he hasn't got any rights. See? You've got to keep snarling. You got to make him trouble. See, you've got to do this, you got to do that. The English have got this down to a fine art!

That's how you keep a government from finally caving in and falling all over you, you see, and dragging you off in the middle of the night, see. But the truth of the matter is there's absolutely nothing that restrains them from doing it, except tradition. Rather thin stuff, tradition, isn't it? Yes, when I'm faced with machine guns and cannon and troops with fixed bayonets – there's nothing like having only tradition to hold my position, I always say. It's so thick – so protective.

Every once in a while, though, you hear of somebody getting very satisfactory – a very satisfactory bang out of dying like a hero for his country on the gallows, or for the people, or something like that. Well, I want to point something out to you – he died on the gallows. Cost him a body to make that remark. And at one body per remark, it gets expensive! [laughter, laughs]

Well, there I've pointed out to you on upper dynamics the decline of force till force becomes invisible to the person. He doesn't recognize that the force is there. Well, as an individual goes on from the time of the goal through the Rock area and the opposing masses, and he's terminals, and he's faced with oppters – and all this gets crushed in and the counter-forces and that sort of thing – the whole thing eventually vanishes. He can't see any part of it anymore. He doesn't even know it's there. See? It doesn't exist! And you tell him to try to confront it and he flinches. Well, it's interesting that he flinches from nothing.

The modern psychologist can give you a very good example of this. He says there's no such thing as a mental image picture. Occasionally you'll run across in his text some mention of it. I ran across a mention of it one time, and he said children and morons sometimes have them. Yeah, that's fascinating! The man is below observing them. He's never observed them professionally until it's walked into his science, see, as a fact, that they don't exist.

I preserved carefully the last copy off the publishing company's line – it was the textbook on psychology for the University of Chicago, I think. And it moved off of the assembly bookbinding line – as the first copy of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* moved off that line. See? The last copy of that run was followed by the first copy of *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. I picked the book off and said to the publisher – (the
binding was not well pressed or anything), and I picked this psychology textbook off, (actually it was, right on the assembly lines, on the belt, you know) – and I picked it off and I said to the publisher, "Look, let me have this, will you?" I said, "Because after this they're going to be writing this book into their newer texts, and I want to know what exactly psychology was." And he said, "Oh, yeah! Well, you can have a copy of it, Ron." So I kept it. And I've still got it.

It's rather fascinating. Because in the last twelve years they have taken different looks at things – and they have discovered all sorts of things, prenatal influences and that sort of thing, and they will discover more and more as time goes on. But what does it depend on, that series of discoveries? An improvement of their own ability to look. So you get them to confront a little bit more and a little bit more – and they can't confront what you can confront – but they can confront a little bit more, don't you see?

Well, their gradient scale of confront is what you are up against, in handling any pc toward clearing. And isn't enough to just tell him, confront it and confront it and confront it and confront it and confront it – because every now and then you tell him to confront it and something knocks his silly head off – and he knows better next time. Because you've pushed him into an area of too much force. Too much mass, too much force, it's getting too real to him. And he backs out.

So the study of clearing – now that one knows the mechanics of clearing, and what the bank apparently contains and looks like – brings us to the realization – not to the startling new data, but it brings us to the realization that a gradient scale of confronting is the only way we ever clear anybody. The improvement, of the ability of the pc to confront then becomes a very pertinent point in clearing. And that too cannot be done directly, because you have to find out what he can confront.

And fortunately if you – if you just asked him to confront, and confront something more, and confront something more, why he, theoretically, you see, would come up with his goal in the end, and he would be Clear, and so forth. But let me point out to you, this has never happened, and it's never likely to happen because there's already too much there for him to confront. See, he's already above the confront level.

So this meter or any variety of meter gives you – this is what this meter does, oddly enough, that does – it's unsuspected by you unless at least you take a look at it – it gives you the highest, toughest confront that the pc is capable of at that given moment. And it's a measurement of confronting.

So if it took you ten thousand hours on gradient scale of confronting to clear somebody – you wouldn't but, let's say that you did – just ran some confront process for ten thousand hours, maybe you'd get a Clear. Who knows?

This, to make clearing factual and fast within reason – so that you get it done now and then and once in a while – you've got to be able to pick up the highest level of confront that the individual is capable of, repetitively. In other words, you've got to give him everything he can confront right now. And then everything he can confront right now. And then everything he can now confront right now. Got the idea? And his confronting has got to be beefed up and
improved to that degree. And a meter selects out for you, the auditor, to find something the pc can confront.

And oddly enough – this is just luck on our part – we have an instrument which leads us straight down this channel without any divergences, by giving us the mostest he can confront now. Now the most he can confront now, see? And by these great big bites of increased confront, he gets over the idea that he can't confront. He actually would confront no more than you can find reading on the meter – he'll confront no more than you can find on a meter.

If you can't find it on the meter, there are only two reasons why you can't find it on the meter. And the first reason is, he can't confront it, and the second reason, could be, that you just haven't found it. In other words you didn't get anything on the meter, so of course he can't confront anything on the meter.

Every once in a while you'll be busily clearing somebody, and, suddenly you'll see that thing go slam, slam, slam, slam, slam! You're running lines, see? And you'll see it go slam, slam, slam, slam! And you sit there and utter the command, one of two things happen – either the slam dwindles, or it vanishes. Now, if it dwindles, all right. If it just vanishes, you ask the pc, "What'd you do?" He says, "Well, heh, hah-heh-heh-hah was a little bit too hot for me, ha! Oh, I'm sorry, I backed out of that!" See, they didn't know what they were getting into, and it made them nervy, and they backed out.

Now, that doesn't mean that they won't go back there, or won't mean that your commands and so forth, just ordinary process of doing lines, won't bring them back into the channel again. But what is this slam, slam, slam, slam you see on the meter? Actually, it is force hitting motionlessness. There's a motionlessness in the bank that is being impinged upon by forces. And the direction of flow, back and forth, and motion of particles in the vicinity of that motionlessness apparently is what gives you the phenomenon of a rock slam. In other words it's something that's changing polarities at such great speed – from plus to minus, and back and forth, and so forth – that it causes direction of potential changes, and so forth. So the meter doesn't know what it's measuring and it's measuring high-low-medium-high-low-medium-high-low-medium, see? And it'll go badada-badada-dadada-dadada-dadada-dadada, see?

You could say that you're coming down the exact meeting points of the terminal and oppterm. You're measuring their exact collision points. So that's where you'd have maximal force with minimal motion of the obstacles. So these things start flying apart when you start disturbing this balance of potential between the two of them. And you eventually get down, blow the Rock, and – you hear the Rock go kind of... It'll go – I don't mean that, actually. The pc says, "Something went!" you know.

Once in a while, a couple of pieces of something goes, and you get fooled. One dumbbell goes, well, that wasn't the Rock, see. There'll be another one blow and there'll be these other things happen. But he gets on down below, and he finally hits his goal, and bang, it goes clear, and it goes kind of pop and there it was and that was why I made up my mind, and gee-whiz. Give him a bit of a Prepcheck, get rid of the fragments, and that's that, he's Clear. You never do it without following them down the line on a meter, and you'd never do it with-
out the maximal speed of improving his ability to confront. That has to be steep. As I say, if you just took it, at a slow poke, you might be ten thousand hours in the process before you made it. But you hit it on the high line, you come right straight down the rock slam channel, it goes right on down to the Rock, the Rock and opprock, and you've all of a sudden have got it the whole way, you're down to basic, that blows, the rest of it tends to fly apart and that is that.

You understand now, why this is important? And what you're doing actually in clearing, of course this is – I give you this mainly as a – allegory, and so forth. But actually, that's a pretty accurate graphing of the way it is. Under that will lie another package and another GPM.

Somebody said to me, "Why don't you run the assertion that goes just before the goal?" He didn't realize he was saying, "Why don't you run the second goal you're going to find on the pc before you run the first goal you find on the pc?" Why doesn't the second goal register? Ha-ha! It can't! How can it? The guy's confront isn't up to seeing the first goal. Well, the second goal is just that much stronger and that much bigger. So you have to run the goals off by a gradient of confront – and you run down to these rocks by a gradient of confront. You understand then?

So you got a whole series of these things, one after the other, of these whole maps of a GPM, see. And eventually, when you get to that, you'll just raise the level of confront all out of proportion. That's why your pc gets to feeling better, why your pc looks better, so forth. The pc is much more capable of confronting force, much more capable of withstanding pain, and much more capable of observing and conceiving mass. Okay?

*Audience: Mm-hm.*

Thank you!
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All right. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, October 25, AD 12.

Now, the experimental material – I've given you very factual material so far in this lecture series tonight. The experimental material consists of, how do we find an entrance to this channel that leads to the Rock and the goal?

Now, we should recognize that the pc will very often conceive he has seen and blown the Rock because he has seen a couple of dumbbell – you know, these two spheres fly off. Very often these spheres fly off and he doesn't even observe them because he's inside the mass and there's an impenetrable barrier between himself and the outside of the mass. These things very often fly off the outside of the mass and he doesn't see them, but he happens to be located in a fortuitous position and he sees a pair of them blow off. Well, he's already progressing very well down the channel if he sees this phenomenon. And they – nobody has reported to me watching the Rock go, which I consider is very interesting that no report has existed on it and that is why you'll find me continuously working with lines and telling you that you have to finish off clearing. You see? Because there's more there to blow.

Now, you should recognize this channel on your meter, looks like a whole series of rock slams of high agitation, but in actual fact is not a series of rock slams. That's just your meter manifestation, don't you see?

It's a whole series of these dumbbells, you see, with their opposing forces.

It's a whole series of these things, don't you see? And looking at them in proportion as you would go down, they are not inverted and getting smaller; they are in actual fact getting bigger. See, they're not growing as you process the person, they simply – the earlier it is on the track, the bigger they are. You see? So you enter it, blowing small pairs, and wind up blowing big ones. See?

Now, it requires – it requires a pretty good faith in the auditor on the part of the pc in order to list.

Why? Well, actually, the pc's ability to confront is: pc plus auditor versus the bank. I give you The Original Thesis. And when you've got the auditor plus the bank versus the pc, he's got too much to confront in present time and he doesn't do any confronting.

The length of time in listing is directly – inversely proportional to skill of auditing. In other words the greater and smoother the auditing skill, why, the less time, theoretically, it
would take in listing, because the pc's ability to confront is rising because he feels safe and able and so forth, under the guidance of this auditor. Therefore, you never jump a pc; you handle the pc very smoothly and very permissively in listing, particularly.

Too overwhelming an auditor activity while trying to find items at the beginning of a case, of course, will seal off finding any items.

Now, that is said with reservations because when you think of this, most of you right here, right now, have an adequate auditing presence and handling of the pc in order to achieve this fact. I'm not talking about anything that is totally beyond you. But, the better your auditing presence and ability to handle the pc, the easier it is for the pc to find items. Don't you see? Because you see, his ability to confront is raised by the fact that somebody's helping him confront.

Now, help very easily goes on an inversion. It gets covert help which is actually destructive. There's real help high on the scale and of course like all things it has its lower-scale mockery. You see this in psychoanalism. You do. That's a lower-scale mockery of help. They tell the person all about it. They're helping him out all right – only they don't see this as anything bad, that's just a built-in procedure. Well, we know that's quite destructive. That's evaluation and so forth.

So the pc has really got to be helped. In other words he's got to be guided into areas where he can confront things and find out what they are. He's got to be guided into areas where he can confront things and where he can find out what they are. But he's got to be guided into those areas – not shoved, beaten, pummeled.

Now, what area are you guiding him into? You're guiding him into this channel toward the Rock when you're doing it by rock slam. You're just guiding him in that direction and he goes in that direction.

And the first items you get are not the biggest items of the bank, but they're the items that the pc finds it feasible to confront at this particular time. At this stage of his case he can confront those items.

Now, you find one item, he's finally – says, "Ha-ha! What do you know!" you know? Part of his cognition, which he never speaks, is, "Hey, you know, I can look at this and think about it, you know?" It's a locked out area. It's been a locked out area to him. And he all of a sudden finds, "Well, hey, what do you know! I can get into that valence; I can look at that valence. Ha-ha! It isn't as dangerous as I thought." And that's sort of part of his cognition. So he tells you all about it, he's very interested in it, you know? "Here I am, standing in the middle of this powerhouse with a million volts flying all around me and look at-look-look at me, I can talk to you and I can think in here. Ha-ha!" You know? There's a bit of triumph involved in this. Don't you see? Because always before he has established this item at the level of reality. His last intimate acquaintance with this item was a dim memory of how awful it was in real life. So therefore, he doesn't want very much to do with it. Now, he finds that the item can be confronted in the bank, just as you get somebody – you start him in through the beginning of the engram, let me put it this way – start him in at the beginning of the engram and he – he protests, "Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh. Go through that – oh, no, man! Go through that opera... Oh, no! Ha-ha-ha, not me! Uh-huh, not me!"
And it takes a little bit of skill to get him in there and get him going through this thing. And he runs through it and the somatics run off and you do a smooth job of auditing, he eventually winds up, "Ha-ha! What do you know! That wasn't anything." You know, got the somatic, confronted the thing, gee, what do you know! You get the reaction, as you – you probably had this. Ask somebody to look at something in the bank and they say, "Oh, I'm not so sure about that. Oh, no way." Most pcs you get are that way about their whole case. See?

So you, the auditor, are overcoming this first reluctance and that is the highest level of your skill – overcoming that first reluctance to look.

There are all sorts of gradients we've had in the past on this. We stress this much harder in the past than we have these days. We kind of take it for granted that an auditor will be able to persuade somebody to look. But actually, there are all kinds of mechanisms which – you can do this.

Remember "Look at me – who am I?" That was your first auditor process. "Look at me. Who am I?" And you get pcs that are having a bad time, why they eventually come up in their level of confront and they say, "Ha-ha! My auditor." You know, first recognition, you know? You were Aunt Grace and Uncle Bill and you were almost anybody. You were a policeman and – God almighty, what you weren't! And then they eventually look at you, you know, and they say, "my auditor," and you thought that was a good time to begin the auditing session.

Actually we've undercut this in many ways. We don't demand that he confront the auditor by "Look at me. Who am I?" We just sort of say, "Well, if you'll not be too uneasy with me I will show you a piece of the bank you can confront." You see?

Now, what can he confront? Well, he'll confront what he – what registers on the meter. It doesn't register on the meter, he won't confront it. Now, an example of this in your assessments, an example of this – and a very good example – is the fact that early in auditing your pc will put items on his list which turn out not to be the item. Has no cognitions or anything on it; they're just part of the list. And now we find an item, and then we find another item – we're still listing on more items, you see – and we get down and maybe with the third item or something like this, we find as one of the pc's items something he put on the first list. See? Now, this suddenly is his item, you know? "A black bear." He says, "Ha-ha! Black bear. Oh, yes! I was down in camp one time and I all of a sudden – so and so and so and so on, and yeah, oh, they've been terrible to me – and so on, and that's probably why I have a craving for sweets, you know? I often think of that and I get – catch myself every once in a while doing this on tablecloths and that sort of thing. Yeah, it's probably right. A black bear. What do you – ha, well, a black bear – well, that's funny."

Why didn't this happen with the first list? You know, he put it down on the first list, didn't he? Well, why didn't we get it on the first list? No, we got something else. We probably got "a teddy bear." In other words, the more items we find the more the pc can confront. See, it's his state of mind versus the actual mechanics of the bank.

Now, many philosophic schools of the past have erred in trying to say that it is 100 percent state of mind and that there is nothing else. Well, where are these guys on the scale of confront? See? Well, let me tell you that these things are. They're not imaginary, they are.
Don't you see? One of your biggest arguments you will run into with some dean of psychology or something like this, when you're talking about it, is his insistence on the imaginary character, what you're handling. The fantasy of this or "Hubbard's fantasies about these things" or something like that, you know? They're totally unreal to him.

Well, in the field of, well, Christian Science, gives you a ne plus ultra on this. Wow! "All is mind and it's nothing and the physical universe is nothing and there is no more of that." Don't you see? Well, look, look: the thing is, see? There is something in the bank. You see? It isn't that the pc gets afraid of biting it so that it bites him. If you were to shove him in at it hard, it'd bite. You understand?

You got the same thing as when you shove somebody into the tiger's cage and he keeps – if you were of this extraction of thought, this just "all is mind and there isn't anything else," you know, "there is no world; there is no mind; all engrams are really just imaginary. Ridges, you see, don't exist, these dumbbells Ron is talking about are just conceptual things."

You get that, all that kind of thing.

Supposing you had that frame of mind as you had this poor "Joe" outside of a tiger's cage? And you said, "Well now, I'm going to throw you in the cage."

And he says, "You-go-gonna-go-gonna throw me in the cage?"

And you say, "Yes, yes – it's merely illusion. Tigers are just illusion, you know? There's – they're really not real."

And he says, "Well, looks awful damn real to me!"

And you say, "Well, just, just calm yourself now, calm yourself and just realize that if you have faith, you have faith, now, why you can just go into that cage, because you see, tigers really don't exist. You see, the bars here are just an illusion and so forth and I'm just going to open the door – and the door, that's an illusion, too. And supposing you did lose a body, a body is just an illusion of one kind or another. So what are you – what are you raising so much fuss about?"

And you finally sell this poor Joe, you see, on the idea that there is no tiger, there is no tiger cage, it's not dangerous, you get the door open, you pitch him in. There's a large snarl and a piercing scream. That'll teach him to buy your brand of religion, you see? He got et.

And somewhere up the track we find it as an engram. See? It even made a real engram. [laughter]

Now supposing if he had an auditor sitting there, supposing this had happened to him, he'd been persuaded on the not-is-ness of it all, and supposing he came up the track and got audited by an auditor, said "Now, well, now, there really isn't anything in the bank and this is just illusory and there is – really isn't anything there that bites, you see, and you can go into this with perfect bravery, and because there's just nothing there, you see? That's all ..." so on. You throw him into this thing over his head, with a terrible insistence that he do this, that, or the other thing – and it bites! Don't you see? And this disillusions him. He's got his second disillusion.
The truth of the matter is, the meter is your best sorting out mechanism of this. Your meter won't give you something the pc can't confront. Well, the reason it can't give you – it won't give you something he can't confront is kind of interesting, because if he's not in the vicinity of it, it won't read. See, it's kind of an idiotic reason. You can't enter buildings unless there are buildings there to enter. Don't you see? Well, you have a fair guarantee that the pc can walk in that door with impunity if it will read nicely on the meter.

Now, a slam on the meter is the mostest confrontingness that he can do at the moment. So the first slam that you get on the pc is at one level of ability to confront the bank. Then you find a second item – that's another new increased ability, by having been increased by finding the first one and he'll find a bit more, and the next one up the line he'll find a bit more he can confront, don't you see? I mean, this new thing that he can confront is bigger and more beefy and more powerful than the first two, you see? And then the fourth one will be bigger and beefier and more powerful, you see. You see how it goes?

And it – this individual is actually increasing, and oddly enough he's being met halfway because the bank that's there to confront is decreasing. See? So it makes a very happy combination. Your pc doesn't have to grow nine feet tall all that fast. See? It's good enough to be six-foot tall and look at a six-foot bank. Because then your pc is, next time is going to be six foot one, and the bank is going to be five feet eleven. Don't you see? You already unsettled this balance. And then he's six foot two and the bank is five feet ten. You see how you're approaching this?

So a successful discovery of an item that the pc is permitted to cognite on is marvelous. Your Problems Intensives are absolutely phenomenal because the pc finds out he can confront this later section of his life with equanimity. He discovers that. He discovers he doesn't have to handle it with a crush and a protest and a this and a that and the other way, see? The Problems Intensive is a very good gradient on this sort of thing. But understand, you're not asking him to confront anything very tough.

When you start clearing him by finding items and then finding his goal, you're asking him to confront nice, great big bangs. See? You're asking him to do quite a bit. So as you start on this procedure you should then fully expect to have some trouble. Because you're jumping at one fell jump – you're asking the pc to do something the pc is very doubtful that he can do. His confidence is just about, well, that tone of voice, "Heh-heh. Others can, but I don't know, I – per theory – I can do this perfectly well. There's nothing much to it – you just confront these items in the bank and I could confront almost anything, I guess." But you say, "Who or what would not be part of existence?" Well, that's a long, tall order. Why does he get this reaction?

Well, the pc believes he's being asked to confront more because he's already kind of quasily aware of this spook standing over there, see? And you're saying, "Well, what isn't part of that – what isn't – what isn't over there?" Therefore, you're not sure. See? He isn't sure.

Now therefore, if any fumble is connected with clearing, if there's any real fumble, it'll slow down the process. You might even lose ground that you have to recover. In other words, it might – a badly audited pc is harder to audit than the pc who wasn't audited when it comes up to finding items and goals. Don't you see?
Now, he might have become convinced that he had less confront than he thought in the first place. In other words, he slid down in the well. Now, fortuitously ...

Well, let me make this one point: that the faster you clear somebody, the easier it is. So you see, one of my efforts forward in all this is not just making it easy so you can do it. I'm making it easier to do by your doing it faster. Don't you see? That's part of it. You take a couple of years to do this job and you're going to have an awful time, if only because of the intervening PTPs.

So the – interestingly enough, the faster you find a goal, the easier it is to find.

Now, that has only this proviso on it: that your pc has got to be up to confronting some section of the bank where his goal is located. Now, the mind runs with wings of thought through the bank, you see – I mean, a thetan, you know, thought – easy. He can pick thoughts out of this bank, but he can't pick masses out of it. See, you can get the goal long before he can confront any masses – long before this, see, the goal will read. But the goal tends to pull him into areas that make it pretty necessary for him to confront things and so you'll find the goal easily and then the goal submerges if the pc is already pretty bank-overwhelmed.

It's quite common to find the goal and then have the goal vanish. And it'll have to be laboriously prepchecked back into position again.

Now, I can assure you at once that the prepchecking of the goal back into view again is a waste of time if it won't tiger drill in. The best way to get a goal to read is by Prepcheck, but if your Prepcheck is hard or arduous and the goal has gone out easily, you're frankly wasting time. Because somehow or another, either through a little bit of rough piece of auditing or something of the sort, you've already heaved this pc into a tougher spot than he can easily get out of.

Now, the reason why we're balancing around lines and trying to get lines that are easy, is not to get the pc in deeper than he can confront – that's the problem of lines.

Now, your suddenly rising tone arm, which goes up and sticks on a series of listing lines – as you're clearing the pc after you've found the goal – is as really a result of his getting too deep to confront it. He's gone a little bit further than he would really care to confront. Now, doing it by Prehav level, listing by Prehav level, gives us this monitoring influence: How deep can he confront? Well, it reads on the meter, so he can confront that deep.

I hated to have to come back to Prehav Scales, but they have been come back to. Because all too often the pc, left on his own with an arbitrary series of lines, will get in deeper than he can confront and then the case stalls and sticks and takes forever to list and you go on and on and on and on and on and on, and I finally had to make up my mind that we sacrificed the ease of listing a guy off with no Prehav levels, because it's taking much longer than if we found some Prehav levels to list him on, see? There's no choosing between these two things. You take a series of arbitrary lines – some pcs take so long on these things that it would have been infinitely faster to have found some Prehav levels. Hence, this slump back to Prehav levels. This is how deep can he look in the bank? Well, he can look as deep as this level of doingness.
Actually, what you're finally going to run out of the bank is "kill everybody for the hell of it." See? That's what you're going to confront up to – something like that, maybe, it – on this goal, some kind or another. "Just kill everybody for the hell of it." That's going to be his feeling. You're eventually going to get that feeling. And where do you enter it? "Not to talk to anybody with a frown on your face." See, "Don't talk to anybody with a frown on your face, that – it's an overt."

Well, of course your meter will register talking to people with a frown on your face. Well, he doesn't like that and he knows about it, so he'll run out talking to people with a frown on their face and then you get some other lower level of other doingness or action of some kind and you'll get down to being able to run that. But if it shows up on the meter it'll run, see? If you can get it on the meter, it'll run. That's your crux of the matter.

Arbitrary lines occasionally will throw a pc in too deep. And an auditor for instance who will take up an engram while listing ought to be shot. Because the engram probably isn't being confronted by the pc anyhow or wouldn't stick there, it'd blow, see? And an auditor suddenly listing and find a great big juicy item that the pc just hints at and following the old theory that we must make the auditor confront and this pc has just hinted at tigers: "I wonder if I blah-blah small cats, I-I – striped beasts, I-I ... Oh, I-I don't really care to put that item on the list at this time – pussycats, kittens so forth."

Now, the auditor would say, "Well, what were you going over there minute ago?"

"I was going over a – I was just – it – just something got very unreal." Got some sensation of some kind.

"No, but what – what were you – what were you trying to look at there?"

"Well, I-I-I-I'm not sure that I-I..."

"What is it? Confront it!"

Tone arm: wheee! Case jammed.

He isn't ready for this till day after tomorrow. See? And he'll go whizzing down the line and he'll say, "Carnivory, tigers, big tigers, ferocious tigers, tigers that want to get away, tigers that run like hell, tiger skins." You get your gradients of approach as he gets deeper in clearing.

Now, when we say the entrance lines – not as the playwright would use it, but the entrance question – we've got this pc, the pc's been prepchecked, no goal's been found or a goal has been found but it's gone down with a small bubble left on the surface of the sea. Goal found, something happened, pc had a goal found, the goal, can't get anything to read – that sort of thing. That's the same case as just starting a case down the channel. We have, then, a means of putting the pc closer to the goal, masswise and in terms of mental reaction, making him more capable of confronting the goal so his thought can fly around in that zone or area of the bank and pick the goal up again. And we have both of these problems. Either picking the
goal back up or the other problem of getting him closer to it or pointed in its direction, on making him confront it. These are the same problem. In other words, make the pc more capable of confronting the goal and putting him closer to the goal for him to confront and we do those two operations.

And they're done by this series of assessment that we've called Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam and we're calling 3GA Criss Cross, which is better descriptive terminology.

Since were going to get an opposition terminal that he can confront and then we're going to get a ter... maybe another opposition terminal and the maybe a terminal that he can confront and then maybe another terminal an then maybe an opposition terminal that he can now confront – and we're just putting him within reach of where this goal is. We're just showing him which direction this is. And the meter will show us because as long as we can go the track of the slam and follow the slam, why, we're fine.

We don't care if those first things that he gets as items are highly conceptual. You know, we don't care if his first item – we don't care if his first item was "dreaming." See? We don't care if his first item was – we're not talking about – talking about items, see? And it's – he didn't get an item all. We got this as an opposition to what he's doing. This is a lot – this is quite up the line.

Then we get to an action. We don't get an item, a solid mass, we get an action. See? We get breathing. See, that'd be the action or then we get that as an item. It's on his list, so it's an item. Don't think that your item – it's – the reason I don't call them terms and oppterms is because they really don't have mass yet when you go at this gradient. This is a very, very slow gradient. But these things will all rock slam just as though they were – they were big, massy things. You see? And then the fellow has got the idea of pen scratches, see, and finally he gets to the item, and you've got him down the line – you've got an opposition terminal now of a tame horse. See, all these things will slam.

Slam doesn't mean violence – it means what's the pc up to confronting. Because he's – but – what's he up to confronting, with an effort. Get that? That's a differentiation, see? He can stand still at this point and gaze in spite of the snap, crackle and pop going on around his ears, see? The bank is going zzz-bing-click-prent-tow-pow-ssqqu-ssss-paawww-blmmp-glmpp-glmpp-glnkk-glnkk. And he can sort of – you know, it's like a guy walking uphill against a high wind. He feels he can make it. But unless you get him pointed uphill against the high wind, hell go around and confront things that are too easy to confront. Don't you see? Why, it'd take ten thousand hours of all things he can confront. The gradient would maybe be thousands of items between, you see, this first point you pick him up and the first item, if you were just doing it on some – some queasy idea, "Well, what can you confront? What would you rather not confront?" See? You're getting him in that direction, but you get a thousand hours of auditing maybe, to get him up to the point of your first item.

You actually find out for him that he can stand there – he actually gave you the items so he must be within reach of them. See? He can stand there in a high electronic breeze, man, and he can say, "That – that is a soup bone. Ha-ha!" See, feels brave. You know? Great!
Now, you take him from that to the next thing. Well, these happen to be key points on this channel, if they slam. Because realize, that he's approaching closer to the basic center of commotion, which is caused by the basic terminals originated after he made the postulate. See?

He made this postulate called a goal, and he's actually approaching the core of the situation, and he's walking inward – he isn't blowing outward. And although it's sort of uphill, has a lot of wind around here, he sort of gets the idea a tree's going down every once in a while, you know? House roof just went by. He's sort of queasy about all this and all of a sudden he sees "soup bone" and he's made it. See? Because it was "soup bone" that was causing a lot of commotion. He can stand there and look at "soup bone" and know that it's the source of a tremendous amount of commotion. You get the commotion commoting, but eventually he's located the source.

It wasn't an evil witch who cast spells with soup bones. See? It was just a soup bone. See, it's actually devaluated at the moment he grasps it and cognites on it. The mystery is gone off of it – it doesn't look so tough to him now, see. He knows now, see? Those are the things that are important.

So, all right. It doesn't matter how you enter, as long as you enter it on a slam. No slam registering on the meter – no electronic windstorms going on. Little dirty needle – probably there's the soup bone to be gazed at and he's standing way over at the side there and he's examining this little green pebble. And he knows the pebble, he's heard of the pebble before, it's a good, safe thing to look at. Or it might very well be that it's a saber-toothed tiger. He's only up to looking at the soup bone. See? And he's got this little *bzzz-bzzz* – occasional dirty needle that goes on and off, you know. And if you said too strongly and violently, "All right, we've assessed it all on down here now to a saber-toothed tiger. Now, why the hell don't you agree that that is your item?" You've added your force and power to the force and power residual in the saber-toothed tiger and you've got a very overwhelmed pc. He goes "Aggggh!" Because you let the tiger right in on him. See? A saber-toothed tiger.

He knows it isn't real. That's one of his basic mechanisms. He's standing there with wide-open mouth and gleaming teeth and he says, "Oh, well, it's a rug." "What do you want me to look at the rug for?" *Rrrrrr!* Protest. "To hell with you." See? That kind of a reaction. Not real. Later on you'll get saber-toothed tiger and he'll say, "Yep. Tiger. Well! Tiger, yeah! Yeah. Tiger. Big tiger. Bigger tiger. Going into tiger caves – rugs, tiger rugs, putting tiger whiskers in your gun case for luck. Yeah, lots of uses for tigers. We used to hitch them up to channels back in Pooh-bah Planet." Tell you all about them, see? But at this stage of the game on this assessment, man, he's not up to it, so he tells you it isn't real – it isn't so. You get a little, tiny *zzzz*. Tiny needle. See?

So you either have an item that it wouldn't do him any good if he could confront it, like a green stone, or if he could – if he did see it, by your trickery of auditing, it would be huge and tough and too much for him and he'd shut it right off – just like that. You persuade him to see it and off it goes.

That doesn't mean why your rock slam turns on and off. Your rock slam turns on and off because he's saying, "Well, I'm not sure. Well, I'll get brave now, I'll look-look there – a-
ha, I'm not sure about that. Well, I'll look – uhhhh. It's awful murk... ah, well, we shouldn't get into that." You know that's why it is, he's suppressing it and he's protesting and he's doing this and that, and all of a sudden he says, "Soup bone! Aha-ha-ha-ha! Soup bone. There it is." Perfectly comfortable now.

Actually at that point, the rock slam that he's confronting must be from something else deeper in the bank. Although you say "soup bone," you've turned his attention toward the center of the bank again and he gets the benefit of the rock slam. But the soup bone now isn't rock slamming. Even though a soup bone now turns on a rock slam – follow me closely – soup bone turns on a rock slam and you'll find that pcs very often get haunted by slamming items you haven't found yet. This is the bane of the auditor. This is when you should take out your insurance that doesn't refuse to pay off in the event of suicide or something. Because that's mean, man.

You start getting the pc that every time the pc has the slightest withhold, has not told you all and you get a wide slam, you're going to find nothing but item after wrong item after wrong item after wrong item. There's going to be no cognitions to amount to anything or the pc is cognizing and the pc feels all happy about it and is trying to please you, you know? Pc, though, is getting no better and no slams and you just apparently find goals forever. Till you finally, knucklehead, get smart enough to go back to your last reliable item. What was the last reliable item? Well, you have to sort out the items you've found by "What wouldn't you give to a ___" on each item. And find out if they turn on a slam and if the item doesn't turn on a slam, then it wasn't an item even though it slammed when it did.

In other words, you can be fooled by a lurking item that the pc has not confronted but is straight in front of his face. And it'll – every time he picks up the slightest withhold, didn't tell you that he actually was uncomfortable with his legs crossed, at that moment you're reading "fisherman."

You say "fisherman. The pc says, "Well, my legs aren't very comfortable," and you get slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam, and you say, "Boy, look at that – look at that rock slam. Ho-ho-ho! That's a nice rock slam." And you get the next item or two and you think the rock slam is merely persisted. And then the pc gets a little bit of withheld or like he says, "I wish I had a drink of water," and at that moment you're reading "A man-at-arms." So it goes slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. Then you go back and reassess the list and you can't find any slams on it. You tiger drill "fisherman," you can't find anything. You tiger drill "man-at-arms," you can't find anything.

What happened? Well, those are known as false items. They're slamming because the p... they're charged up enough to make a rock slam on the part of the pc's actual item show up on them if he gets a withhold at the same time they're read. You follow that?

A real item slams – there's a very easy rule on this – a real item slams when the rudiments are thoroughly in. And a real item will always – can always be coaxed to slam again, within reason, in the same session. You can coax the slam back in the same session. A false item slams only when the rudiments are out. If the rudiments are wildly out, why, the false item will slam some more. If the rudiments are then put in, it doesn't slam. See?
A real slamming item slams only when the rudiments are in. There's not a ghost of, "don't knows" or "failed to reveals" in the session or on the item.

And it's for that reason that the exact, proper procedure for nulling a list is asking the pc the auditing question that you're going to ask him, "Who or what ...," and making your list of his answers, and then nulling it down to the last three – sometimes you can't cut it that close and it's the last four – and you suddenly notice that you're down that low and taking your last three or four items, and then taking them one at a time, and thoroughly tiger drilling them. Tiger drill each one – Big Tiger, see – tiger drill them hard, man. Oh, yes. Work those things over. Coax them, man, because it may be in with the tiniest, little tsk that disappears, too, as you're tiger drilling and you say, "Oh, there's nothing left on this item." Then you ask just that one more question and all of a sudden it ticks again. And you ask one more question. Then you get bright. And you say, "In this session, have you protested anything?"

"Yes, I'm protesting you using all of these rudiments and that sort of thing, because they all seem to me to be very silly."

"Well, what are you doing? What are you doing?"

"Well, of course, each time you start to tiger drill, I'm just hoping they won't be in. I'm postulating they will not now be in."

You get all these little things sorted out and little minor casualties that you have and you get them all sorted out, and all of a sudden you look at that item and it goes slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam – like crazy, see? And then the pc, all of a sudden, gets a "Failed to reveal." It stops slamming.

You say, "What's the matter?"

Pc says, "Well, I was looking at it in your magnifying glass. I was watching and I didn't tell you, but I was looking at it, heh-heh, the reflection in your magnifying glass. It was slamming a little bit, wasn't it?"

You say, "All right, thank you very much." And you say, "Tiger." Slam-slam-slam-slam-no slam. What happened? Well, actually what happened mentally with the pc, the pc is sort of – they got – you know, they remind you of putting a periscope around the doorjamb to look into the place, you know and then they get – they get brave enough, see – they get brave enough to eventually stick one eye around the doorjamb and then they get brave enough to open the door a little bit wider. You eventually got them – get them brave enough to walk in the room. See? And every time they get unbrave, they suppress, they protest, they don't want to look at it again and so forth.

So a real item goes off when the rudiments go out. A false item is lurking around. Let's say you bypassed an item. You should have found item 3 and you just didn't find item 3. Instead of that, you went off on a wild tear, did something very unusual, picked one off of the hat, got one off of the beginning goals – this is a mistake I made the other day and wasted about an hour and a half of auditing – get one off the goals of the session. Slam-slam-slam-slam. My God! I looked this over as to reasons one couldn't get Clear and all that sort of thing. The second I got the rudiments in, it all blew up. It was the real item slamming.
real item was slamming. But neither the pc nor I could have told what the real item was at that particular time.

The real item required the pc to sit quietly. So every time the pc sat quietly, the real item turned on. So if the pc was sitting quietly while giving me the goals of the session, you know, consciously sitting quietly, while giving me the goals of the session, I'd get a slam. Got the idea? Real cute.

This is your problem. This is your – your problem is, that if the pc is sitting in a real item and you've monkeyed around with it and brought it up to maybe – you've found one and you've found two – you should have found three, but you didn't. Then three is liable to linger around and trigger every time the pc has a withhold from you. This should happen to you. See?

The exact procedure, then, is to ask the pc the proper question, list that thing out till the pc says, "No, there are no more." Get your mid rudiments in. Ask the question to see if you get a bang on the meter at the question being asked – see if it instant reads, the question. If it does, make the pc list some more, get on down to a point where you can get the mid rudiments in and get no reaction on the question itself on the meter. When this occurs, be very happy that you've got a complete list or total rudiments out. You can always be certain about these things.

Now, having gotten that, you go back and null the list with an appropriate question. The questions are not all the same questions for all the same lists, so let's not say the question at this point. Null it down to the last three or four items left in – that's by elimination – and it's instant read, very sloppy, loose instant read, you know? It can happen before, it can even happen afterwards – if it disturbs the needle.

If you're trying to do a pc on a dirty needle, you ought to be spanked. You've got to clean that needle up. That needle's got to be a nice, beautiful, smooth flow before you do any list. And that puts an awful burden on you because the pc is under very heavy agitation during this whole time. The pc just stops talking to you for a moment and says, "Well, I won't disturb the auditor," and you get a dirty needle. See? One of the ways of getting around that is "Did you want to say anything?" you know, and don't try to keep your mid rudiments in.

You see, your – I mean, just don't keep punishing the pc with mid rudiments or something like that. Be more graceful about the whole thing. And here the needle was free and smooth and you say, "To shoot redcoats. To shoot redcoats," you know? Something like this, we don't care what you were saying. "Consider committing overt against redcoats," is the way you would interpret it right this minute, until I'm going to tell you this other. And it's very beautiful, and you read this and you leave it. It read instantly, you left it in, you left it, and then all of a sudden, you're looking at this needle pattern, you know? And you can't read through it and what the hell.

And if you start chanting at the pc every time this occurs, if this is the type of pc you're auditing, "In this session, is there anything been invalidated? All right, in this session, is there anything been suppressed? In this session, has anything been protested? In this session..." so on, every time you get a dirty needle, I tell you, on some pcs you're not going to be
doing anything but sitting in session and saying, "In this session. . ." on and on and on and on
and on, see?

There's a smoother way of getting around this. "Did you want to say something?" You
get over – you're sort of hypnotizing the pc into believing he didn't have a withhold, see?
"You want to say something? Did you want to say something?"

"No. Oh, yes! Yes. I thought of redcoats. I thought – ha-ha! That couldn't be my item!"

You say, "Good," and you go down three later and you've got "tiger," and you read,
"Consider committing overts against a tiger." It read very nicely, you know? Very fine. You
mark it in. Go on to the next one, "waterbucks." You know, "Consider committing overts on a
waterbuck." Yeah, they're very often same list, wrong side, you know, the pc mixing up the
terminal and oppterm. And you say – you say, "Consider committing ov... What the hell was
that?" See? "Co... – co... – In this session, has anything been suppressed? In this session, has
anything you have been careful of? In this session - in this session - nyah-nyah ..." Of

Graceful thing to say is, "Did you want to say something there?" He didn't want to say
anything – he thought something, see? If you ask him, "Did you think something?", why, you
get a slightly different response. But if you say something like "Did you want to say some-
thing?" You get something on this order: the pc will say, "No..." That's true, too. He didn't
want to say anything. "Oh, well, I thought – I thought that that couldn't be my item.
That-that's-that's too late on the track. That's much too late on the track and I thought there for
a minute that you looked kind of cross at me. That's-that's what I thought."

And you say, "Good," and your needle cleans up again and you can carry on. Got the
idea? But don't you ever try to do any of this with a dirtied-up needle, man. You get your
auditor presence up so smooth that you can put that needle back in smooth. Put it in smooth
gear, man – put it in smooth gear.

And you try to get somebody, and the pc says, "Oh, that's my heart beating." You
know, tick-tick-tick, the needle's going. Sure it's their heart beating! But what the hell is their
heart doing cooked up, connected to the E-Meter? Takes a withhold – takes a withhold or a
Protest or an Assert or a Mistake or a Suggest or an Invalidate or a Suppress to make that – or
Careful of – to make that needle register a heartbeat. Don't forget it.

Pcs don't have needle patterns. Pcs have out-rudiments. So his rudiments have been
out for the last couple of hundred years. Well get them in, man, get them in! But learn to get
them in smoothly, not abusing and bumping the pc around about them.

All right, now, let's go just a little bit further here. That's your right procedure for get-
ting those things in. And by the way, don't give up on one because it reads faintly, because it's
liable to bloom into the most gorgeous rock slam you ever saw in your life. Be wary of those
that rock slam and then they don't rock slam and you haven't done anything. And neither has
the pc, apparently. And you can't find any rock slam and then you clean them up and there's
no rock slam of any kind whatsoever. Well, they were rocks – you – it's a missing item.
There's something missing here and the pc just keying it in. And at the moment that item keys
in, if the pc has a withhold at that exact instant, it rock slams. Don't you see? That's a floating item. It no longer registers the moment you get the rudiments in.

So a real – a reliable item is one which registers with the rudiments in and man, that is a very severe definition. Well, that's how you do this.

Now your main problem, is how do you turn on a rock slam in the first place? And this is an experimental licking of that problem. I have learned, through a great deal – you know, I have been auditing my brain to the bone here, lately, and I finally found out that with – that "oppose" and "overts" are sometimes too strong and sometimes too weak for the pc and so you overshoot the item. This item would not commit overts against tigers. This item would go back in the brush, get under a bush and natter plaintively about tigers. [laughter] And that's not directly committing an overt on a tiger while actually being an overt on a tiger, but it won't rock slam or answer up on the word "overt". It'll answer up on "natter."

And so we move into some use for the Secondary Scales of last year. Two Secondary Scales: One is scale number 21, the Secondary Scale of Withhold and scale number 16, the Secondary Scale of Overts. This is a long, arduous, gruesomely long scale, this Overt Scale, and would undoubtedly be able to shorten it down, but these scales do exist at this exact instant and you're indebted to these Secondary Scales – to have these.

Now strangely enough, there would be another way of entering this whole thing – is just to do a Prehav Assessment on the pc, find out where he wound up and then do that Secondary Scale on the pc. There is that method of handling this. But look, look: rock slam is peculiarly withholding and peculiarly committing action. It's peculiarly a withhold and peculiarly an action. It is action. Now, I don't think, and I'm speaking experimentally, that we have to go to the lengths of doing a Prehav Assessment and then finding its Secondary Scale and moving into the Secondary Scale and doing some kind of an assessment, or balling it up in some way. It is my concept from what I have seen, which is not very much of this yet, to merely do an Overt Scale, because you're looking for the overt terminal – and oddly enough, the Withhold Scale, because these terminals are also withhold terminals.

And the case that won't slam, and you could just drive yourself to drink trying to make this case slam, is just a super-withhold case. You have a hell of a time making this case slam, man. You get down and uhhh! Well, the terminal they're sitting on, terminal number one, and it – by the way, the only one that is available is number one. There aren't 865 terminals available. There's only one that will slam first crack out of the box. Discouraging, isn't it? Actually not, because you can locate that one and maybe that is a withholdy-type terminal.

So if your pc consistently and continually doesn't have anything to say and never does anything to anybody, you possibly – you possibly could pick it up with the Withhold Scale much more easily than you could the Overt Scale. Because the withhold is the overt. Follow that? But oddly enough, anything that will flash on overts will also flash on withholds.

Now, supposing you've got a lot of items on the pc and sometimes they turned on and sometimes they didn't turn on and actually you don't know if it was the rudiments in or the rudiments out that was giving you these items and all that sort of thing. Well, just sit down and make yourself a short list on each item and see if you turn up a slam of "What wouldn't you give that item?" That is a proving action. You say, "What wouldn't you give that item?" –
you get the same slam. You'll at least get a -- get some of the slam back. But items that won't slam on that particular action aren't items. They're false items -- items that have been made to slam because some other session condition was present. See? Pс had a withhold. See, they're not actually the item. You couldn't get anything off of them. It drives you batty trying to get something off of them.

All right. Now, one of the ways of going about this, to find the entrance point of the pc, is, you just got a pc, you see, and you got a meter, and you know how to audit, and how the devil do you pick up the first rock slam? Well, here is a way to do it. There are many ways to do this. One is to just ask him -- ask him for somebody he detests and he gives you that and you notice that slams and then you check that one out and then you ask him for, well, what does that person represent? and so forth. And he gives you that and that slams and that checks out and then you ask him for what would oppose that, because it seems to be a very overt terminal. And it gets a slam, and all of a sudden you see that it kind of rocket reads, too, and you say, "All right, well what..." you haven't got much time that day and you simply say, "What -- if you were part of that, what goal of yours would be imp... were impossible to achieve?" On the second item or on the third item you just say, "Well, what goal would this waterbuck have? What goal would the waterbuck have?" and the pc says, "To -- to go on a spree." Rocket read, rocket read, rocket read, rocket read, see? "To go on a spree, to go on a spree, to go on a spree," and "on this, has anything been suppressed?" and nothing's been suppressed. Everything is all clean and so forth -- the rocket read, you know -- there it is: bang, bang, bang, bang, "to go on a spree," that's the pc's goal and that's it. And that's an hour and eighty-five minutes from the beginning of the first session, see?

But don't forget that there are lots of pcs like that. And you, operating with altitude, will very often land square on your feet.

Next pc that sits down is going to go ninety-nine hours to goal. Ha-ha. With the very best and most arduous item-finding you ever did in your life. What's the matter with this pc? Pc won't slam because the pc slams on everything because the pc is everything, because the pc is the item that does slam. That's one type of pc. I haven't met him yet, but I imagine he exists. He exists only in theory. He slams on everything you mention. I haven't met him yet. You've got to find out what he's slamming on in particular. I haven't met him, but I can imagine he will exist. I simply predict somebody will run into him someday.

Now, that'd be your total-overt pc. And then your pc who isn't saying very much, being very quiet, isn't answering up either -- mostly protesting what you say. And you're not going to find anything fast. And you after a while will just be able to ask the pc a few questions in the rudiments and the pc, well, "What have you done?"

The pc says, "Well, ah, oh, uhmmm..." Fifteen minutes later, they still haven't answered the question. Well, you better ask it on the Withhold Scale, see? You'll learn to estimate your pcs this way.

We just do a plain Assessment by Elimination on something like the Withhold Secondary Scale, scale 21, on that quiet pc. You take what you've got, and then you say, "Who or what would (whatever it found)?" You'd have to put "somebody or something" after it to make it make sense sometimes. "Who or what would chain somebody or something?" So you
did an assessment of the scale and you came up with the type of withhold is "chain." And they'll give you the item and it'll rock slam.

All right – or you start over here on the Overt Scale and you just run down – do an Assessment by Elimination of the Overt Scale. When you get down to the end you've got one line in, you've got one level in, just by instant read, don't you see? No trimmings. You don't have to say "Would you," or "Would the item," or something like that. You get on down to the end and you find out that "thieve," "thieve" is it. "Who or what would thieve?" And the pc says, "A roff and a rauff and rrhoof and a roff and a roff and a roff and a roff," and you finally get "magpie." Slams like mad. Get the idea?

Well, we can improve these scales and improve on the line, but that is by moving right into the middle of all this. Now, how about the next item? How about the next item? You could use exactly the same system. Don't you see? The same system that's adaptable to the next item that you find. You want to know "Who or what would withhold from a magpie?" Seems to be very quiet on this one. Or "Who or what represents a magpie?" is just your standard response. But a magpie being a chattery overt sort itself and so forth, would probably be something that's opposed. But you don't ask for who or what would commit overts or who or what would oppose a magpie, you'd want to know "Who or what would (Overt Scale) on the magpie?" And the funny part of it is if you – I think if you just do it straight by elimination you'll come up with the right answer. You don't have to say magpie or anything else. Then you do a list of "Who or what would wound a magpie?" He almost gives it to you at once. "Small boy," slams – there it is. Got the idea? Get this method of sorting it out? Not depending on the broad term of overt, "commit overts on," or something like this.

So all the way down the line, as you did that resulting list, which is made "Who or what would wound a magpie?" you say, "Would a – would a cat wound a magpie? Would a small boy wound a magpie?" or any other way you want to do it and it'll pick up the slam. Or you just do that one by elimination if it's a terminals list, just – almost the way you – you just did your list of items and you get the last four, tiger drill those and then test them. "Would a cat wound a magpie?" slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. "Would a cat wound things?" slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. This isn't slamming on magpie – it's slamming on that cat. "Cat," slam-slam-slam-slam. "Cat" – you know, there you are. Now all of a sudden that disappears. "Small boy," and the whole read settles on "small boy" and freezes in, but it's a small boy would "wound" a magpie, not "commit overts" on a magpie.

The more particularized a case is, the tougher it is to find the entrance point. In other words, the case is more – is very differentiative in ideas on this and you don't get a broad – a broad class of anything slamming. It has to be quite particular. We have these two scales in existence – I'll turn them over, by the way, to your Auditing Supervisor. We have some more of these scales. I will be making up a more suitable scale from these old scales and we will see how this thing goes. But you get the idea how this is done? Rather simple.

Assessment by Elimination is the way this could be done, and you – I think you will – my guess is you'll be seeing slams you never saw before on pcs and seeing them faster. Doesn't take any time to do – for instance a Withhold Scale on a pc and then "Who or what
would...," see, whatever it was. "Who or what would cache things?" – C-A-C-H-E, see? And he gives them to you and the item will be on it.

See, you've assessed to find the zone of the item, then you assessed to find the item by rock slam and you've got it made from there on. Got the idea? All right.

Well, we're moving in to easier, faster – I want to set you up so that you can find a pc's goal in a morning; see, in a morning of auditing. If I can get that, that is an extreme, man. That's an extreme. But if I can set you up so that you can do that, I will be very, very happy indeed, and go take a vacation. So make some headway, will you? I need a vacation!

Thank you very much.

Good night.
Well, this is the what of what?

*Audience: 30th October AD 12.*

Not even Halloween yet! Thirty Oct. AD 12 and first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

[Part missing]

Now, it's a very fortunate thing that you are here tonight. Very glad to see you tonight, you knuckleheads! [laughter, laughs] I'm glad to see you in such a happy frame of mind.

Well, what this is about, actually, is we're turning the Z Unit loose on itself. And you've seen the policy letter by which the Z Unit is being turned loose on itself. And I just want to make an announcement; that is more than meets the eye. The auditing style, skill, boo-boos and that sort of thing of the Z Unit will be very, very closely supervised – very, very closely supervised.

And when you get out of here, Z Unit, you won't have Phil or Herbie or Fred or Reg and Mary Sue and myself to say, "Well, have you been sitting down across the table from the pc?" [laughter] You know? You'll be on your own. And you'll have to make decisions regarding cases and what to do with those cases, across a lot of miles. And the time for you to fall on your heads is here, not in lower north South Amboy. See? That's a mythical place. That's where we sent the chosen few from Johannesburg – they'll never be heard from again. [laughter, laughs]

Now, that opens up a new chapter in training. Your training, you should realize, is quite different than any training done on Earth to date. There are some parallels of one kind or another and here and there it's the same. Sometimes they'd let an engineer see a transit before they graduated him as a skilled engineer. That's about as far as practical application of engineering ever went. Sometimes in polytechnic schools, they let somebody build a small stool or something.

But were doing different than that. We've divided education into theory, practical and actual application of what is learned in theory and practical. And I'd like to bring it very severely to your attention that practical is not extended into the Auditing Section. You can't perform in the Auditing Section – well, you've had it. That's it.

Auditing is something that is performed. It is performed on a pc and it is performed with benefit to the pc. And these are very severe restrictions. It is something that is done, it's
done on a pc and it's done to the benefit of the pc. The Auditing Session is not someplace where one practices what one learned in Theory and Practical.

Now, the faster we upgrade that, the better off we're going to be. This isn't a lecture on training. This is just a prior announcement here.

We've just found out something that's very, very, very, very interesting. There could be other reasons for this that you could explore, but the only boo-boos of magnitude being made in the Z Unit were being made by people who had been put in it without their checksheets complete. That's a sweeping statement. It's more sweeping than it looks because it tells you that any staff training program that you conduct in any organization or District Office has got to be as tough as this course or the boo-boos are going to show up in the HGC! They're going to show up there right up front on the public. You understand?

There's apparently a direct coordination between the completeness of a checksheet, the thoroughness of its examination and the skill of the auditor. These things are direct in their relationship.

You see, there's a lot of feeling that somehow or another you get around a course and it sort of leaks in the pores. You hear a lot here and you hear a lot there and – you know, and you can kind of pick it up and you get it off on the fly. You know, there's a feeling that this can go on. And that is true, some of that does go on. You can get the inter – correct interpretation of this and that more easily on a course than anyplace else, that's for sure.

But if that were the only method of education, we would be turning out Oxfordians. Did you know people in Oxford get educated just to pick up the atmosphere? So they can look like an Oxford man? And they never have to pass an examination, they never attend any lectures, they just spend four years there and it sort of leaks in and they become an Oxford man. As an old Cambridge graduate I'm licensed to make libelous remarks about Oxford.

But the point that I'm trying to make here is although that takes place, it is not any substitute of any kind for thorough and severe theory and practical study and examination. If you want to know why some HGC is doing very badly, you can go round and round and round. You can try to audit all the pcs in the place yourself and you're going to get no place. Where it was, was right there, originally in the Academy, somebody wasn't tough enough. And then later on, on the staff training course, they weren't tough enough and then that culminates in no results in the HGC. And I just wanted to tell you this because I fitted it together and sniffed it out and I knew darn well you could benefit from it.

So sometime in the future, when you're tearing your hair out – and you will be! – over the total no results, you say, "Well, all I did was tell Joe to sit down there and run 'Since January the 3rd, 1938, has anything been suppressed?' and that's what I told him to run and here's his pc all spun in. There must be something wrong with Problems Intensives." No, there was something wrong with the staff training program. See? That's where it was wrong. You got to correct it before it gets to the session.

Now, those are just preludes. I have an actual lecture to give you this evening. But I just thought you would be interested in that fact. That goes contrary to some of your – some
of your feelings on the thing. It goes contrary to maybe some of your instincts on the thing and it certainly would go contrary to mine!

Why, the other day I sat down and took a tape examination and flunked it! [laughter] I missed the last question. Why'd I miss the last question? Because on that particular tape of October the 2nd, I think, or something like that, I had since put out new gen and suppressed the older. So, if I can flunk them, so can you.

Now, don't ever go feeling sorry for anybody on the subject of harsh, rigorous, positive training. Don't ever feel sorry for the pcs who have to experience auditing that wasn't so trained. If you're willing to take examination and you're willing to pass them, you'll make it, of course. But are you also willing to make somebody else take examinations and pass them? Make somebody else take drills and pass them? Are you willing to do that? Because you have to be pretty willing, otherwise you've got to take responsibility for every flub that auditor is going to make from here on out and for every pc that auditor is going to mess up. So that's something to think about. And that's something I very, very definitely do take responsibility for and I try to take the responsibility right here.

This course is getting better and better and better. And I'm very proud of this course. I'm very happy with the way it's going. So therefore, I'm making it tougher and tougher and tougher. I know now what all the people who have left here – I know what all these people have flubbed on. I know how they flub and I've known why they flub – not so much in the field of technology, but other little things, just like the theory, the practical that weren't passed.

Too soft on their TR 0. Fellow sat there tipped halfway out of his chair, you know? Nobody was quite tough enough. And when they came into actual auditing, why, they softened up quick and their TR 0 really went to pieces. You always see an auditor, he'll always look a bit worse off the course than he looks on it. Count on that, because there's just not quite that much discipline. See?

So that's where it's going and that's why it is and I'm very proud of what we're doing. I'm very proud of what we're doing with auditors and I think we're being very successful and I'm very proud of you. And therefore, I'm not going to let down one single tiny bit of it. Okay? All right.

Now were going to have a lecture. The subject of this lecture: Prehav Scales and Lists – how to do them.

There may or may not have been lectures in the past on this, but any former data that exists on the subject of doing scales and assessing scales was prior to a tremendous amount of experience on the subject of nulling goals.

Tiger Drill has been born since that day – a lot of data as to why things stay in and why things go out. All this data now tells us that things can mysteriously disappear off a list without being out and things can mysteriously appear on a list without being in and all of that data now must be integrated into every type of nulling that is done. And out of this we will get a very set procedure.

And that procedure is more or less as follows.
We have a scale – list, call it – scale or list. Now, it doesn't matter how we got it – if it was put in our hands from a bulletin or was taken from the pc or any other way that we get this – and we have a whole lot of terms or words or terminals or actions or verbs or something, and they're all in a column of some kind or another, they're lined up in this column.

Now, the Assessment by Elimination which we used to do is being superseded, here and now. You'll have a bulletin on this in a few days, but it won't be to the extent that I'm giving it to you in this lecture.

Now, Assessment by Elimination is infinitely faster than tiger drilling every level. You can do this much quicker – Assessment by Elimination – and that consists of taking this list or scale or whatever it is and reading it against the meter, with one or another wording. We don't care if we just read it, each one once, or "Consider committing overts against it," or whatever it is we're saying, whatever that wording is, it's all actually the same action. And that is to read it one item at a time and those that produce a disturbance of the needle – get that; that's used advisedly: disturbance of the needle. I'm not talking about instant reads. Because some of your rock slammers, the rock slam has already begun as part of the rise and you don't notice that it has begun to rock slam, so you get apparency of a latent read. You leave that out and you've had it, because you've got your rock slamming item.

So anyhow, it's any disturbance of the needle in the vicinity of mentioning the word. You got that? That's about as broad as I can make it. Now, disturbances of the needle that become before you mention the word are suspect. You don't think that's funny, but I do! The funny part of it is, a pc can go over a list two or three times and he knows what's in or he can go over a scale two or three times and he knows what's the next level.

Something very remarkable happened on this on goals. You know, I checked out a goal in Washington that wasn't it. After it was unburdened, it was it. Pc had to be checked – prepchecked like mad before this goal stayed in. I may not have the story entirely straight, because nobody gave me a blow-by-blow account of it. It just occurred in another list. And I saw that the old goal that I had checked out in Washington as not it, was now it.

Well, how'd that happen? Well, a goal has to instant read. That goal wasn't instant reading. I was that person's oppterm. Me, personally, see? So every time I would draw in my breath to say the goal, I would – you know, the PC would already get it running through her head and the goal was about a five-word goal, see? And I would say, "To be a" – rocket read! "To be a quee..." rocket read! Got the idea? And the goal was "to be the queen of the universe." And it should have rocket read after "universe." But because the PC was very disturbed and very out of session and I was the Pcs oppterm and a lot of other reasons, that read was occurring anyplace. Any time the pc thought of it, the read occurred. So my starting to say it caused the pc to think of it, which caused the read to occur. Do you understand?

Now, that is terribly unusual, particularly in a goal, for a goal to be this far out. Goals almost always do an instant read. Of all things that instant read, you can count on a goal. You see? But in this particular case, you couldn't even count on a goal. You see how far out this thing is?
So when you're doing a scale, the time to adjudicate whether or not it is a fair read or a proper read or an instant read or whether it is one twenty-seventh of a second after breath has ceased in the auditor – see, the time to discover that is when you've got it still in at the end of the list. See, that – I mean, after you've eliminated everything and it's one of the few remaining, now is the time to eliminate those factors. Now you start getting nice. See, now get nice about whether or not it's reading on the button, and so on. Now get critical. But up to that time it's just slop, man! It's just sloppy.

Now, what do you do? This term, list or scale, is any series of words. You go over that once: line by line, level by level and you take those that are in and you mark them in. You mean "in" – "in" means they disturbed the needle. I don't care whether they gave you a rocket read, a rock slam, a dirty needle, an instant tick, any – any valid disturbance of the needle. The needle was playing "Dixie" and it all of a sudden started playing "rally round the flag, boys," you see? All right, there it is. It did something else, so therefore it's in. You got the idea?

There's no adjudication necessary, except the ability of the auditor to see that the needle is disturbed. And of course, you disturb me – the number of times you miss disturbances of needle – it's too often missed.

All right. So here's our criteria: That means read, and "in" means disturbance of the needle and "read" means disturbance of the needle. Got it? Needle disturbed – in. Now, when you're dealing with the rock slam and the channel of the slam, down toward the goal, man, that pc is like a bear on ice skates, you know? Just all over the darn pond. You get anywhere around a rocket read, why, the PC will read pretty consistently. But you get anywhere around a rock slam, it's anywhere. It can be early, late, not. It can be all kinds of wild things because he doesn't read well – this pc doesn't read well on the auditor. Why? Because the item that is going to slam has far more authority than the auditor has.

You watch these items just tear this pc right out of session, you know.

They – whooo! Man, they introvert. And that's fine, but remember they can get so introverted they're out of your control. They might not be leaving the auditing room by the door, but they've left it by going in. Now, I've seen a pc not bother to tell me anything for minutes. See, pc cogniting, silently. Totally forgotten me. "Oh, that's a so-and-so mmm, hmmm, hmmm so-and-so hmmm, mmmm, hmm – off they go mmm, mmm." Of course, you're used to a pc cogniting verbally. That's only some pc who's still aware of you. You're almost hit him over the head with a Chinese gong and they wouldn't come out of it.

You understand, in the vicinity of one of these items, the power of the item then, has more command authority, very often, than the auditor sitting in front of the pc. So you say the item and anything happens. Got that? That's that – that's that much prediction. You say the item, anything happens or nothing happens. You get what you're dealing with, now?

Now, if all of this were reducible to a very, very neat situation – if we were just auditing robots and you could set the robot's chest, you see, and it says, "rocket read," you see. And then you'd say, "To be a robot" and you'd get a rocket read, you see. And then you turn another dial over here and it says, "rock slam." "Who or what would want to be a robot?" and
it gives you a wi... large slam. And then you have another button over here which you push on
the robot's chest and that says, "dwindling," you see. You sit there ... [laughter]

But, I assure you there is some reason why nobody ever found the trail to clearing. Well, you need all the tools of auditing to do it. Well, what you should realize, first and fore-
most (although I was going to talk to you about this in a second lecture), is you're not doing
anything ordinary. And that we can provide – and I can fix up and guide you in ordinary pro-
cedures to do this extraordinary, fantastic thing that hasn't existed on the track for two hun-
dred trillion. It's utterly fabulous! Yeah, that's a shocker – except you're used to it, you don't
look at it and so forth. Well, think of the command value of one of these levels that is the pc's
item – has terrific command value over the pc. And it's guided his life and kicked him around
for many an eon now. It's dictated his every action. It's made it so he couldn't eat cereal in the
morning. It's fixed him up so if he went to sleep, he had to have a hyacinth on the bedstead or
– so that only girls who wore Chanel No. 5 were acceptable. See, it's guided his life, man.
And you're sitting in a session and you say offhandedly, you see, "Cat whiskers," see, and the
pc says, "Lwaaaagh-ch-aaaaggg!", you know. Next time you say, "Cat whisker," where's the pc?
Well, he might be up in that corner of the room, you see, he might be totally introverted now.
He might be way down in the bowels of the Earth! We have no guarantee where he would be
at this particular moment, because he gets a sort of a – of a funny look in his eye, if you've
ever noticed, when you hit these things and he starts cogniting.

You do a list of dynamics, for instance. Well, you're foolish, on a good – on an
easy-working pc with a good dynamic list, to go down the list at a terrific rush and not pay
any attention to the somatics the poor pc is getting. Because on one of those levels he's liable
to feel like he's just been slammed into a brick wall at about 225 miles an hour. See? And
you're going to read the next level? Huuuh! What next level?

See, pc's going to stop right there with that, you know? You'll very often find the full
valence sitting right there when you're doing this kind of stuff. He's just sitting in it! And it's
never appeared to him before and you read the item and he's all of a sudden – you know,
there's the – cased in concrete.

"Huh? What's that!" He's liable to try to tell you, "What – wait a minute, what the
hell? I mean, I-I'm missing my head. I mean, wh-what happened to my, you know, my arms?
Uh – khmm. " You're going on down to the next level. And you get the next level and the next
level and let's get him tangled up, protesting the next level and protesting the next level and
trying to communicate to you that he can't talk. And you're just sweeping grandly on down the
avenue.

Well, it's little things like this that give you wrong assessments. So, theoretically –
theoretically, you just read each level off or each item off or anything on the thing – list that
you're reading off, one after the other. Theoretically, theoretically, it goes like this. This is
theoretical perfection. You've got a list and it goes off; Item one, item two, item three, item
four, item five, item six, item seven. And needle's nice and clean and it's going ping! and it's
going ping! And then it doesn't go ping and it doesn't go ping, and it doesn't do anything. And
then it goes into a little dirty needle, bing! And a little one there, and that one's in and that
one's in, dang, bang, bang, bang, down to the end of the list. And you go back and you take each level that is now in.

And you go over each level that is now – that was in the first time, you see – there's a little mark there, said it was in – and you go down that, and you take only those that are in now, and you read those. And theoretically you go down there, pang, pang, pang, pang, the remaining levels that are in, pong, pong, pong, pong. Now, those levels are in twice, some of those dropped out. You go over it the next time and you take the levels that are now in and you go over those, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong. And you go down to the end and you finally have one. You go – repeat that each time – you probably wind up with two. You go to the item and then the other item. And then one of them drops out and that thing remaining that produces an action on the meter is the found item or the found level or something.

Now, that's theoretical Assessment by Elimination – theoretical. That is the exact theoretical way it is done and that is the way previously it has been taught. But it won't work. If your pc is perfectly in-session, the chances of your getting correct levels on this pc are very good if you're a very good auditor. But remember very good auditing required to stay in two-way communication with the pc, without Qing-and-Aing and so forth. So a good auditor always got good assessments and a bad auditor got bad assessments.

And the bad auditor would say something to the pc and it wasn't two-way comm, it was an evaluation. "What do you mean, this level 'failed to withhold' is in?", you know?

Pc says, "I-I-I didn't put it in. I-is it in?"

"Yeah, well, it's in, and – heh-heh! – we know all that isn't alive. Why is it in? Why – why do you have this level 'Failed to withhold' in?"

Pc doesn't even know it's in, see. This kind of corniness going on, of course, would louse up anything, because it'll make "Failed to withhold" now read or something like this, don't you see?

So any rough auditing throws this thing out. Any roughness, any failure of two-way comm with the pc; any out-rudiments; any of these things would have thrown that assessment out. So it was almost accidental. A very good auditor, in good two-way comm with his pc, always got a reliable level.

But factors change the moment that you start dealing with items on the rock slam chains. See, it wasn't as important before, if you sometimes got an offbeat level or an item; it wasn't very important. It's important now. It's very important.

Therefore, although theoretically that is the way you do Assessment by Elimination, your pc can be sufficiently disturbed by the types of lists you're doing or the targets of the Prehav levels or other things of this character – he can go so blasted out of session – that you're liable to find yourself winding up with a wrong assessment unless this procedure is revised.

Now, this is all of the revision. It becomes very simple. It is very easy to do. It first requires that you notice when the needle of the meter does something else. That is necessary. I
wish to call that to some auditors' attention – that the motions of the needle have something to
do with the auditing session. I know this will come as a surprise. But some of those reads, if
not noticed, will cost the pc the level. Some of those reads not noticed will cost the pc his
item. Some of those reads not noticed will end up the whole goals-finding operation in the
well known cul-de-sac.

Miss one; you've – maybe, maybe that's all right. Maybe you're lucky; maybe it wasn't

the one. Because after all, there are hundreds of reads. Miss two, miss three, miss four – no,
I'm afraid we're way out! We're way out. We go down that list and we miss four reads on the
Prehav Scale. Well, that's pretty sour. So it does require very accurate, very precise meter
reading. That's the first thing that this requires.

The next thing it requires, of course, is your R-factor and your H-factor. Pc has to
know what's going on, has to know what you're looking for, has to know what you're doing.
Otherwise the whole list is a protest, so everything will read. Get your R-factor in, tell him
what you're trying to do, what you're trying to find. R-factor and H-factor, if not put in, can
cause the whole list to go hot or go cold or do something, because the pc doesn't know what
you're trying to do.

The next thing is make sure that you can read the list that you are trying to assess. You
get some other auditor's lists some time. Man, this'll throw it out like crazy, because if he
couldn't write very well and you can't read it, why, you'll stammer every now and then –
you'll say – you'll say – you're going down the line, and you say, "Waterbuck. Tiger. C-ca-uhm... cuh-ca-catchup? Catchup." Pc gets a strange look in their eye.

Actually it's all on record, it's supposed to be "catfish" see? Pc knows it's supposed to
be "catfish." And you hang him up right there. See, a mistake.

He'll say, "What was that supposed to be? What was that supposed to be? What was
that supposed to be?"

You go on down the list, see. You're going pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, "Polar
bears. Wolverines," you know, we're going down the list, down the list, down the list.

The pc's saying, "Catchup? Catfish? Catfish? Must have been catfish. Catfish –
catchup. Couldn't have been catchup. Must have been catfish."

Hour later, you're still charging on, you know. The mails must get through! [laughter]
You know?

"Couldn't have been catchup."

You get back to it again. You get back to it again. Maybe you have the bad luck to
have a sleeper – a rock slammer who hasn't been detected as a real slammer on the subject of
an auditor or a session or Scientology, but can develop a rock slam. And you go past this
point and you say – next time through, you say, "Catchup," and, why the thing rock slams like
crazy! Beautiful rock slam! "Catchup! Ha! Boy, you know? I'm..." the auditor that ought to be
shot will sit there and he'll say, "Oh! Oh! Look at that! A rock slam! Well, we finally found an
item on you! It's 'catchup!'" [laughter]

Pc says, "Catchup?" [laughter]
Finally found an item – pc had never even put it on his list! Wasn't – wasn't even anything the pc ever had in the bank! See, you get a false slam on it. It will – it'll look just like a slam. Somebody else comes through, doesn't clean it up, for a little while it will slam. So, that sort of thing – that can happen!

Now, let's take it on a much minor scale. Going down the list, *pocketa* – this happened to me the other night – *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, down the list, you know, down the list, *whaaaaaa*. Everything's going fine. Getting the mid ruds in about every three levels, you know. Everything going smoothly, you know – dirty needle and, you know and tone arm keeps going up to 6 and 7. You know, smooth session and so forth. I'm going along the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. Pc, of course – we were doing it against an oppterm that was very restimulative. So of course this was going mad. And the pc already pretty introverted, you know?

All of a sudden I hit this level on the Prehav Scale, "Pull". It had absolutely nothing to do with the pc, had nothing to do with the case. And the pc's first reaction was that it had nothing to do with the case. I saw that it could have nothing to do with the case, so I just left it in to find out what the hell's going to happen.

It stayed with us, man! I even let the pc get off of it a little bit. You know, get off a little bit about it. Still with us! We'd of – would have wound up a Prehav assessment with the level Pull, which had nothing to do with anything!

You see why? Because as I went back, the pc says, "You know, that hasn't got," to self, see, says, "that hasn't got anything to do with anything! Nothing to do with anything in the session. This one is totally extraneous." Makes a big comment on it, protests it. Auditor, by reading it the next time, asserts it. Pc protests it – we get a lovely read. Do you see that? And that, amongst other things, was why the tone arm now really started to go up to 6 and 7 and get dirty needles and everything else. See that? So it became very difficult. Everything became very difficult.

All right. That's just one phenomena. That's the wrong item in. There's another phenomenon – much more gruesome. You're going down this list and it's "Tiger. Waterbuck. Catfish." See? And you get "Tiger" and it's in; "Waterbuck," it's in; "Catfish," it's in; "Wolverine," it's in; "Polar bear," it's in; "Deer," it's in; "Stag," it's in; "Mouse," it's in. You say, "Dog," it's in; "Cat" it's in. Everything's in.

Or we're – go down the list – we go down the list – we know very well this pc is allergic to cats. Every time a cat walks in the room, pc gets a black eye. We happen to know this out of the case history, see.

That, by the way, is old L. Sprague de Camp – one of my archenemies as a writer. I always thought that was very amusing, always offering to give him kittens. Even occasionally take one to a party and give it to him. He'd get two black eyes, just like that – bang! – the second he saw a cat. Most satisfactory result, you know, I've seen. [laughs, laughter] And the only reason I got any satisfaction out of it is he used to criticize my stories to my editors – mostly because they wouldn't buy his. Yeah, he had a couple of weak points. That was one of them. Anyhow ...

So this becomes very amusing. You, then, are asked to decide how many is the right number in? And I now look at you platitudinously and I say, "Well, my child, experience will bring you answers to these things." How long is a piece of string? How many should be in? Well, the proper number.

I don't know what the ratio is, but I know a page looks right – I know a page looks right for a pc. The reason you can't say is, it varies on pcs. But it looks right. There's one in every now and then. And there's little runs of one or two in at a time. It looks right. There aren't columns of Xs and columns of reads and all that kind of thing, see.

Now, that's a problem in mid ruds. So, you have in doing a list – listing this isn't true – until a pc stops listing you don't have to get mid ruds in, if you're getting the list. But that isn't the subject of this lecture. We're talking about assessment of the list. So you get in the mid ruds and the pc runs out and then test it.

No, we're talking about something else. We've got this list. Now, we're going down the list – bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, level by level by level by level. And if the mid ruds of the session go out, then the pc is hauling an invalidation, a suggestion, a failed to reveal or a mistake on down the column. And everything, as we go down the line, reads because it stays in. You see, because we're still dragging this error. For some reason or other, because he's got an error – see, one of these items I mentioned; he's got – one of these items is out – then the auditor's voice and the item creates a greater impression on the pc. Like in bridge, the pc is now vulnerable. He's got a withhold, so he's vulnerable. Don't you see? And this reflects on the meter.

See, if he – if he's got this invalidation that's floating along in the session – it's a session invalidation. He's invalidated some item or he's invalidated the auditor, he's invalidated something. We don't care what. Something's been suggested, he's suggested something, he withheld it, you get the kind of combinations of things. And then the auditor's voice, reading anything to the pc produces a reaction in the pc so that everything reads.

It is very disturbing to the pc if you suddenly start to say... You're reading a perfectly valid list and you suddenly start to say, "Hot dogs. Cat fur. Horns. Automobiles. Austins," just to see whether or not the thing is reading on your voice. That's quite disturbing because you throw the mid rudiments out further by being unpredictable to the pc. So this is not any kind of advice.

But if you were to just – if you were to – I'm just giving you the experimental action, see – if you were to just move over and just read a totally false list (you know, pick up some other pc's list and put it down there and start reading that against this pc who has this heavy invalidation, so forth), you get instant reads on everything. It's not even the pc's list. You get everything reading. That's the vulnerability of the pc because the pc has really got a missed withhold, you see? So the auditor's voice registers.
Now, if we increase that just a little bit further, we wipe out all reads. Let's say he's really got a missed withhold and it amounts to an ARC break and we cease to get meter reading at all. So we get nothing reading. Or if the pc suppressed something heavily or was very careful of something heavily, we also get a wipe out. See? So we get a whole column, a dozen at a time, go out; nothing's reading. You see those as liabilities?

Now, there's the liability of the session in one of these assessments. That's a session liability – that columns of them will read and columns of them will go blank, and the ones that reading are not it and the blank ones are not blank. You see? So that's going to throw your assessment out.

Now, there's one other factor you should know about this: You can get the mid ruds in for the session too often and drive the pc out of session. So you have some delicate balance here of getting them in when they have to be gotten in.

Now, actually, if you've gone down a whole long column without noticing that your rudiments were out and everything is in or everything is out, the only real danger – if it's all out and you don't recover it. So they're all in. The next time you're going to go over them all, why you're going to select those out. The danger – see, you'll select the ones that are really in. The danger is going down a whole long column of X's and not redoing them. See, you run into danger there.

You should actually just block out the Xs as though those things have never been done and continue your assessment and catch them the next time around. Just draw an oblong square around them – rudiments were out during this period. Because it's very disturbing to the pc to go back over the same levels you just went over. You get the idea? So just sketch a square around it and the next time through catch those levels. That invalidates all of your own Xs.

That's harder to do in doing some kind of a Prehav assessment where you're using the same scale over and over and over and where you're not marking them all out and that sort of thing. It's much harder to catch in that particular way, but I'll talk about that a little bit more later.

Your system then, consists of, basically, preventing reads from being wiped out by out mid ruds – that's the most dangerous action that can occur. See, you're not so disturbed about all these staying in because the mid ruds were out, because you're going to get a second crack at it with the mid ruds in – and then your selection of the right datum or the right level or the right item off of that list and that selection is done by Tiger Drilling.

Now, what you should actually do on an Assessment by Elimination is – let's say this pc – you're not in really good ARC with this pc or something like that and you're afraid of something happening and you feel nervy about it or something like that, then you'd tend to leave more in – you'd tend to leave more in at the end of the elimination than some pc you were quite confident of.

And I don't think in any case I'd leave more than eight in. And in no case would I leave fewer than three in. Now, I can give you an arbitrary figure, just so that we would agree on this and everybody does it the same. But we're being a bit arduous, because sometimes the
Auditor doesn't quite catch the moment when only three are in. He thinks there are a couple on the reverse page. And he happily turns the page over and by George, those went out the last time through and he's sitting there having nulled all of his items down to nothing. See? He can make a mistake this particular way.

So it is better to err on the numerous side and if you try to leave five in, you will catch it more often and more regularly than trying to leave only three in. See, you can tell when there are five in more easily than you can tell there are only three in, oddly enough.

Now, during your last pass through, you normally have four or five in, whereas you'd have to null half of the list or something to catch three in. You understand?

*Audience:* Yes.

The introduction of the exact number to be left in could be done only for the benefit of agreement that this is what we're going to do. Don't you see? Actually it serves no other purpose than that.

But to cut the whole list down on a freaky pc – pc's freaky, you know, got a false slam and a got a this and got a that and *huh-huh*, mid ruds go out and doesn't like to do the rudiments, and all this kind of thing. To cut that down to three, that's risky. That's risky. Because there are more items than that are likely to have been in because of invalidations.

Now, even though you got the mid ruds of the session in, you are left with the proposition that on that exact level it may still be out. In other words, the mid ruds are not out sufficient to now mess up the session. They're only out enough to mess up that particular level or item that they occurred on. Do you see that?

So, what do we – what's the best procedure? And that's to do Assessment by Elimination, keeping your mid ruds in, down to the point where you have a few left in – never less than three. And I'd be darned if I'd leave more in than eight, in any list. And somewhere in that zone start tiger drilling. And all you does, is you just takes it and you treats each level as a goal and that is all there is to it. You just tiger drill it.

Now, what Tiger Drill? Big Tiger? Little Tiger? Well, it's just the ordinary six on the left – three on the left and three on the right. In other words, the six button Tiger Drill. That's perfectly adequate for this activity – unless you've got a protesty pc, at which time you'd better add the Protest button, which gives you a seven-button drill. But you can swing these off awful fast.

Now, you just do all of those. Do all the buttons you have left – whether it was three or four or five or six, however many you had there and you just do those, each one Tiger Drill. And one is still reading – well, don't – don't be goofy enough to say that is it if you're looking for a slam and it's only got a little dirty needle on it. Draw a circle after it or something like that to indicate that it is still firing and go on to the next one and tiger drill that one up and polish that one up. See?

You're not trying to polish these up like a goal. See, you're just polishing these things up so you know darn well they aren't reading *because* of. And you come out with your biggest strongest read and you don't knock this thing out. Actually, tiger drilling a proper level or
item gives you an increased read and tiger drilling an improper item – this doesn't apply to goals – gives you a decreased read on items. It just – eventually just fades. Now it's just sticking the needle, so forth.

Well, you're – it's not with this precision that you're doing items or levels; that's the same precision as addressed to goals. You're getting right down there to that last point and you're fixing it up so that you can tell which one it is. That's what you're trying to do, see. You're not trying to polish everything up. See, on a goal you'd have to polish them all up, because you leave somebody stuck in a goal that's half out – that shouldn't happen. It shouldn't happen at all.

I heard one time an old-time Dianeticist of about 1950 vintage had become a psychiatrist. It shouldn't even happen to him. God, I never thought he'd stoop so low. Moment of silent prayer.

Anyway, the – the situation which you face then, in taking the item out, is you tiger drill them enough to prove it up which one it is. That's which one it is. You're not trying to wipe each one totally out. You're just making sure that none of them are reading falsely. And you'll find when you get the right one that it'll fade – the rest of them will fade, usually. Do you understand that?

_Audience: Yeah, Mm-hm._

You don't have the same thorough, half an hour per item. And, man, if I catch you taking more than three minutes, I'll – I'll swear! See, it's just a ... "On the item catfish, has anything been suppressed?" You know? "What was that? What's that? That, that, that. Oh, all right. Thank you. On the item catfish. Catfish. Catfish. On the item catfish, has anything been invalidated? Yeah, that. That. That. That. Anything been suggested?" Nothing. "Anything you failed to reveal?" Nothing. "Any mistake been made?" Nothing. "All right, anything been suppressed? Anything you've been careful of? Good. Good. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Yeah, that reads a little bit. All right, that's fine. What do you think about this? Got any pain? Got any sensation?"

"Oh, I've got this terrible sensation that's come on. I've been meaning to tell you about the catfish all the way along the line! Ooooh! Terrible!"

"Oh yeah? Is that so?"

Well, go on to the next three, because they might have even more than that! In other words, you just dust these things off, see. You dust them up very nicely and then you're sure that they're not in because the pc got stuck on them while you were going through and didn't say for the remainder of the assessment, "Catchup? Couldn't have been catchup." See? You get this method of Assessment by Elimination?

_Audience: Mm-hm. Yes._

Too many going out, too many staying in – you know, the pc is dragging a suppress or dragging a ... Too many going out, he's dragging some sort of a suppress or an ARC break on through the list, item to item. Too many staying in, he's dragging an invalidation on down the
line or a suggestion or something of this sort. So that's a mid rud situation – mid ruds on the session.

Get on down to the last few in, give yourself a good dust-over with a Tiger Drill. Give each one of those things a dust-over. Then you can't make up your mind which of the last two it is. Well, just tiger drill both of them harder, then suddenly, all will emerge and you'll have the right level. You'll have the right item.

Now, that's very sound auditing to do Assessment by Elimination. It could – can be rather rapid.

There's another condition for any such elimination list and this is a very difficult condition. It should be done on a clean needle. That's a very difficult condition, since you're saying something on the order of this: Let's say you've already found an oppterm and you're doing a Prehav level against the oppterm, so you say, "Would you (Prehav level) fail to withhold from an airplane?" You've got the oppterm and you're trying to find the terminal level. "Would you fail to withhold from an airplane?"

"You" sometimes clicks on pcs – quite often, as a matter of fact. "Airplane" was found because it rock slammed. Every time you say, "airplane" it upsets the whole needle characteristic of the pc. And you say, "Why am I ever – why'd I ever hear of this airplane?" Pc is very happy about this airplane, you understand. But it just keeps upsetting your meter and then your meter goes out and your needle gets rough and you have to get in your middle rudiments and that upsets the pc even further because they go into protest. Don't you see?

In other words, you got your work cut out for you and it's not an easy job and there's no reason for you to believe it's an easy job. And there's no reason for you to dust it off lightly to some poor suffering HPA and say, "Well, take this pc and find me the Prehav level and so forth. For this other, I haven't got much time here. And find me the Prehav level for this item oppterm 'airplane' that we found yesterday. I'm going to be busy," so forth. Don't be surprised if you come back at 2:00 A.M. and he's still at it. He's trying to read around the needle and he's trying to do this and he's trying to do that.

Now, the more you harass a pc about his dirty needle, the more dirty his needle is going to get. You start blaming the pc for his dirty needle and you're going to get a dirtier needle.

There's no sense in you sitting there saying, "What's the matter with you? Why are you doing this?" Because the pc isn't. You are! The pc does not have these items under control. You do! They're his items, but they're under the auditor's control and you're agitating them. So he or she isn't giving you the dirty needle. You are! So there's no sense in adding the untruth into the situation of "Why are you doing this? Why do you have such a dirty needle?"

Oh, jump a pc all over the place. He – you say – you're trying to run a Prepcheck on the pc for the last twenty-five years. Sheena was doing this the other day. I should have brought that dispatch along. I laughed, man! Some character that's been giving them all kinds of trouble over in the Washington area got onto their staff – their clearing co-audit. And she assigned some co-auditor, I think it was, to do a Prepcheck level and to flatten "done" on him.
and the period was the last twenty years. And the co-audit person, see, sits there – never au-
dited before in his life, apparently – and flattens it in five minutes.

Well, this was Mr. Natter from Yakville, see. And he's – the co-auditor said, "Well, the needle's clean." And Sheena put him on the needle and by George, it was clean. Everything was clean. "Done" was clean. "Done" was clean. First time he'd ever been run on "Done," but he's been yapping all over the place, but it's clean. So she knows more about the mind than this, so she rolls up her thetan sleeves and she let's him have it. Almost on the colloquial basis of "Just what the hell ..." you know, "You're going to tell me that in the last twenty years you've only done five minutes worth?" [laughter] "Well now, what have you done? Now, give! I'm tired of this, see." Off the meter and everything else.

He hadn't done very much – he'd spun a few pcs in. But he had been going around with a clearing process which he didn't dare let Ron find out about because Ron's reactive bank would stop it. [laughter] And he'd been secretly auditing pcs all over the place and spinning them in with this thing and that cracked the case – bong! It all went very nicely after that.

That was a missed withhold of such magnitude, you see. I thought that was very amusing. This Sheena is a very determined character. Said the pc was happy after this happened but she was a rag.

But anyway, the point I'm trying to make is, is you've got to be able to keep the pc well enough under control and in-session and unblamed and hopeful enough and calm enough about it all to get an assessment done in the face of the fact that you're assessing the most disturbing, upsetting items which he has in his reactive mind and which have controlled him utterly for eons. Do you see the problem in assessment?

So don't you start worrying because you particularly, find assessment a little bit rough now and then. Assessment is very often rough – very often. But you must not do inaccurate assessments. You must not do inaccurate ones.

The primary difficulties of assessment actually occur in listing. You do an incomplete list or you list on the wrong level or you list something you shouldn't ever have heard of and the pc wishes he hadn't, and you'll wind up with a dirty needle messed-up thing or something. Your list isn't complete enough and it's dirty needle the whole distance. Or you haven't asked the pc the right question to get the first slamming item and the needle is all mucked up – and it will be mucked up until you get that first reliable item on him.

All these various conditions exist to upset this business of listing. So that makes it in-cumbent upon you to be a very smooth auditor in whom the pc has a great deal of confidence. And that will get you over the hump in listing better than any trick I could ever teach you.

Assessment by Elimination, old style, is quietly buried. And this one I've just given you is very much in. Make sure that you have a proper number in for the pc and make sure that after you've eliminated them all, you take the remaining few and tiger drill them to make sure they're not in on the "catchup" principle.
And you'll always wind up with your right levels and your right items and it's very easily done. It isn't necessarily slowly done. The slower you assess by elimination the more trouble you're going to have with it.

It doesn't much matter whether you read them once or twice or three times or read one once – one level once and the next level twice and the next level three times. It doesn't much matter what your sequence is – just make sure that you have read what you have read and that what you have read is reading. You understand?

There are various tricks about it, these – I mean, as far as that's concerned, the types of question you ask ... What I mean to say – various tricks, the types of questions that you ask to assess a list, the types of lists, the types of scales, all of these sort of things – they have absolutely nothing to do with the principles I have told you.

The principles I have told you apply to: Prehav Scales, listing and assessing to find the rock slam on the pc (that's Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam), unburdening the goal, doing any type of finding something – any type of finding something. You could even do it with goals with some success, although I don't particularly advocate it. You know, null the goals list except for the last twenty – tiger drill those.

All kinds of things can be done with this system of Assessment by Elimination which I've just given you. And those principles I'm sure you will remain – you'll find remain very sound now and quite reliable, because I've been working on it very, very hard for the last week or two.

And as far as I'm concerned, that's what you have to know to do an accurate Assessment by Elimination. You got it?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.
LISTING GOALS

A lecture given on 30 October 1962

Okay. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 30 Oct. AD 12 and we are going to take up the subject of listing: its theory and practice. And when we say listing, we mean listing of goals. No other type of listing – just goals.

How do you list a goal out? This is a specialized action. How far do you list a goal out? Why do you list a goal out? What happens? What's your target? What words do you use? Why? These are questions which might plague you.

Now, a goal consists of a bunch of black marbles around a nothing, as you see it, as in the form of the GPM.

Actually a goal (quote) seen (unquote), naked and alone, standing by itself, would be totally invisible and totally nothing and totally nowhere and totally no-charge and totally no. It'd be as evanescent as a thetan.

In other words, a goal does not have mass, but a goal in place in the pc's reactive bank is surrounded by mass and the way it looks is a tremendous number of black marbles impinged on black marbles, each influenced by a single postulate.

This is very interesting – very interesting because it has an anatomy. And the discovery that it had an anatomy is of great importance, because it is the anatomy of the reactive bank.

The reactive bank also contains pictures, but these pictures also depend to a marked degree for their force – if not totally – on the GPM itself.

Now, you could take off on a basic-basic of a chain and erase the basic-basic of the chain and get the rest of the chain to fold up. You see this in Prepchecking. Now, that's getting the earliest on the chain.

Now, we see this with a goal. It is the earliest postulate on the chain. And because it is a goal and because it is the earliest postulate on a chain, it then erases – in other words, evaporates. But until it is contacted as the earliest idea, postulate on that chain, it is resistive – resistive in the extreme.

Now, as we look over a bank, we see this phenomena repeated; phenomenon is repeated over and over again. If you take an engram, any engram, you can trace the postulate which occurred before the engram was had. Now, this would be wonderful therapy, except for this thing: that decision or postulate is not the basic on the chain – and the engram itself is not the basic on its chain, so by finding the idea or decision which preceded the engram, you do not achieve an erasure of the engram always, but you sometimes do.
It happens to be an isolated idea and it happens to be an isolated incident. And if the idea is isolated and the incident is isolated, why, then it'll go up in smoke. So we're on the free track basis. The individual has never before thought the interesting thought of, "I'm going to raise hell!" And he proceeds to do so and he never did before and after that he doesn't. Let's say something like this occurred.

All right. That's then a free, relatively free, idea or postulate followed by a relatively independent mass and the two together make a solidity. You have the solidity as far as engrams are solid and you have it preceded by the idea.

Now, you can take any engram or any lifetime or any period of existence and find it preceded by a decision.

You can find the decision, you can ordinarily do something about it. Now, oddly enough, the more independent the decision is from the remainder of the track, the more the thing will read on its own merits, until you walk up to rocket read, which is the total independent postulate at the beginning of an enormous number of actions and ideas and then, of course, you're dealing with clearing and the GPM.

In other words, in vignette in the bank, this can be found and studied. But because you'll never find ... Well I – pardon me, I shouldn't say "never." Because you'll so rarely find a free idea preceding an action and you so rarely find the action free of earlier similar actions, you wouldn't run into much luck in erasing it. It won't evaporate because it's too dependent on earlier incidents of the same kind.

Nevertheless, the phenomenon does exist and I have seen this phenomenon and I have seen a whole engram and whole series of incidents blow up, just by having found the basic decision that lies before them. And it tends to make an auditor rather weird. You say, "Well now, if I could just do this on every engram, why, I'd be all set." And you keep on trying to do it in every engram and of course the next one is 2,000,765,962 from the first time he had the idea "I'm going to raise hell." That's the number you picked up. Well, it hasn't got a prayer. It hasn't got a prayer of erasing.

And then the incident which consisted of getting shot, see, happens to be the seven hundred thousandth time that he's been shot in that exact place, under those exact circumstances. And, of course, you try to pick this off that late on the chain, it just doesn't erase. So the idea won't go out and the incident, if anything, merely becomes very painful and hangs – hangs up. You can turn on the somatic and it stays turned on. You turn on the idea and the idea remains obsessive with the pc for some days.

Now, look on that as a false goal. Look on that original decision there that decision I was just mentioning there, before he decided to raise hell and then he got shot, you see – take that sequence of events. Well, if you were to run this you'd get, in vignette, the same phenomena as running a wrong goal. It's too late on the track. The incident has been repeated too many times. It won't erase.

The bank, in other words, won't grow less, but efforts to do something to it cause it to increase. Now, in the matter of the GPM, this is a singularity – an oddity – that the basic idea, although it may be influenced by other ideas, is a basic idea. It's a basic idea, postulate, deci-
sion – whatever you want to call this thing. Because it is basic on a chain, has a peculiar read which we call a rocket read, therefore, is identifiable. It also tends to stay in consistently and continually without considerable address.

And the incidents which pursue or follow that have little or nothing to do with the previous life of the individual. Now we're dealing, not with an engram, we're dealing with some whacking big piece of track. We're dealing with the trillennia. See, we're dealing with enormous time span.

And the thetan got this idea, made this decision at a time when he could make an independent decision that would stick with that magnitude. And this is pursued by a series of adventures consisting of identities and their oppositions and consists of a whole series of complicated games and goes on off down the line into innumerable side goals, side ambitions, side ideas, side valences. You know, there's terminals and there's more oppterms. And there's more oppterms and there's more terminals and many of them seem terribly disrelated from this original idea.

Original idea: "to catch catfish." And you'll find in there something like "to be the Lord Mayor." What's that got to do with anything? Well, you eventually could connect it up, if you cared to. But it actually is connected to this basic postulate or idea.

In other words, we can find in the bank a small picture, in the decision before the engram, of the GPM as a whole.

Now, the individual has lived these lives and in living those lives has alter-ised this goal. The keynote of a goal is alter-is – why it hangs up in mass. If it were purely and completely observed and suffered no opposition and nobody did anything different to execute it than just execute it, why, it'd still be floating free. But because the thing was altered, it developed mass.

And you will find out the first factor of listing is: that listing a wrong goal adds mass. Listing a wrong goal adds mass. That is very important.

And alter-ising the right goal during auditing adds mass.

If you know those two data as the two dominating data of all the listing of goals, you'll be able to bring off free needles on your meter. But if you neglect either one of those two, you're not only not going to bring off a free needle, you're going to bring more mass to the pc, more discomfort, more upset than he's ever before experienced. We're at that crossroads where auditing must be done with complete accuracy and understanding.

Now, auditing the right goal is repairable. If we also alter the goal a bit and make the pc protest and that sort of thing – we can always repair this. Auditing a wrong goal can also
be repaired. But therefore, we should know the processes of repair as the first step of listing a goal.

If one is listing a wrong goal, various phenomena, which I won't go into at the moment, will turn on (I've already mentioned them in an earlier lecture). If we list a right goal badly – get a lot of protest and the sessions are rough and all this sort of thing is – everything's going awry, one way or the other – we get a similarity of behavior on the part of a pc. In other words, rough auditing on the right goal – and any kind, no matter how good, auditing on the wrong goal – give us a similarity of behavior on the part of the pc.

So an exclamation point rule is: that you never monkey with the idea of a wrong goal. You never approach this idea; you never run in the direction where this thing – wrong goal – will occur. You understand, wrong goal: man, that is as wrong as you can get.

That's very, very wrong, because it will beef up the bank, it'll distort the pc's ideas, it'll upset him no end. This is brutal stuff – running a wrong goal.

Now, in that you can audit a – not necessarily you, but somebody – can audit a right goal roughly, poorly enough to give it an alter-is in the process of auditing it, to a casual observation – you could probably study this out and there's more data connected with it – but to casual observation, badly auditing a right goal and auditing a wrong goal are alike. So therefore, we never take any chances on it being a wrong goal; we always treat it as though it were.

You can just mark that down without invalidating the pc's goal for him – which you've seen rocket read and you're very sure of – the thing isn't going right, the thing isn't going right. That's all, man. Nothing is going right. Pc looks worse and so on. You can't get the goal to read well and have a hard time putting it in at the session beginning and a whole lot of sweat and travail on the thing – we just immediately treat the thing as a wrong goal. See, that's your response as an auditor – not by saying to the pc, "Well, this isn't your goal."

But finding out if it is the right goal or finding the right goal are both the same action. Do you follow that?

They're both the same action. In other words, we're repairing a wrong goal and we're straightening out a right goal more or less in the same way.

One of the ways to go about this is to just head the pc in the same direction as though you're going to find a goal. Now, what I'm getting down to here – what I'm getting down to, is a minimal number of techniques. In other words, if you go in the direction of unburdening the goal, you'll find yourself very often in the same channel as though you were finding a goal. Do you see? By unburdening the right goal, which you are already auditing, it will read. And if unburdened, a wrong goal won't.

Now, a wrong goal never rocket reads, but right goals very often die out and don't rocket read either for quite a while and then come back in with stuff that looks like Cape Canaveral during a Russian inspection. You understand that to sit there and ask you as the auditor, on this pc, to adjudicate whether you're running a right goal or a wrong goal is asking too much of you. See, that's asking too much because the risk of running a wrong goal is terrible.
So therefore, your technology of unburdening parallels the technology of finding a right goal. They're just all the same technique – do the same things.

So, you have a right goal which can't be run because it's – in listing – because it's running into too much hot water and it won't go in and the pc is having too much trouble. In other words, he can't confront the items that are coming up on it. See, the goal is unreal to him; it won't fire well. I mean, it gets lost – all these kinds of things. I could give you – I could give you just dozens and dozens of clinical studies of whether it is the wrong goal or whether it is the right goal or how to tell this and you look at the left hand corner of the pc's tongue and you find out this. And you could memorize all these things. You become quite expert on the thing. But why do all that if you can say, well, quite normally, "Well, I can't get this pc's goal to fire. They say it rocket read once, but I've never seen it rocket read. What do I do?"

Well, you always take the viewpoint that it is a wrong goal until proven otherwise and then you'll always be safe. You don't tell the pc. You don't have to, because you yourself don't have to decide. You don't have to decide that it's a wrong goal; you don't have to decide it's the right goal. All you do is unburden what you've got – which is a pc.

You see, you never run out of the pc. You run – might run out of goal and you might run out of bank, but these things are invisible to some degree, but the pc is still there. So you got a pc, so the best thing to do with a pc to make a right goal read or to make a wrong goal stop reading, is to unburden the goal.

So actually, when you get right down to fundamentals, you can be as stupid as you want to and you'll never make a mistake if you just follow that one rule.

Can't get the thing to fire. You've never seen it rocket read, and – well, it did rocket read. You saw it rocket read last month, but it hasn't rocket read since. You yourself are getting very doubtful of what you're looking at. It fades out. No Prepcheck that you do on it seems to do it any good. Nothing seems to happen here. Well, just treat it as a wrong goal and go on as though you were going to find a goal.

Now, that would exclude tiger drilling long lists of goals because that's not very beneficial. So the repair method for the wrong goal is the only thing that would contain an address to a wrong goal on the basis of a Tiger Drill.

You can tiger drill a wrong goal and you can bring some relief to the pc. You can clean up a wrong goal and you can bring some relief to the pc, but the best way to clean it up is by Prepcheck – not by Tiger Drill – but by Prepcheck.

So, your first action when you're worrying over somebody's goal – "Is it his goal? Isn't it his goal?" – what – something like this; "And it stays in, and it never goes out. And Joe says he saw it rocket read and it was checked out in HCO Berkeley. I've never seen it rocket read or that one time I saw it rocket read maybe he was thinking of something else." You know, you get all confused on something like that. First action: Prepcheck. All that serves is an unburdening action. Prepcheck it.

Don't tiger drill it. You're going to waste hours. I've already put this to the acid test. You're getting stuff from somebody who has done one God-awful amount of auditing along
this line, you know. I'm not talking theoretical now. This is hard won data, sweated out in the auditing room.

Basically, it's a waste of time to tiger drill it. If you can't get it to fire in a reasonable length of time by Tiger Drilling – such as twenty minutes, half an hour, something like that – if you can't get that goal to fire, it's a waste of time to go any further. What you want is a Prepcheck.

Oddly enough, on a goal like that, even though you use the most buttons there are, see, actually the Tiger Drill is going to take you longer than the Prepcheck. Because the Tiger Drill is never going to get there and the Prepcheck is going to get there, if it's the right goal. Follow me?

Do you see this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

So it's better to prepcheck than tiger drill. That's your first unburdening step then, is take this thing and prepcheck it. Well this doesn't necessarily take sessions. This might – very well might all get wound up in one session.

All right. Your next action, if it didn't result in a good firing, rocket reading – and don't let anybody come around and say it rocket read a sixty-fourth of an inch, because that in my book – in my lexicon that is not a rocket read. I like to see that rocket take off and strew red flames out behind it for a little while. You know? I like to see a little smoke come out of the meter once in a while, you know.

I like that – you get the goal going along awhile, why, you find it won't rocket read more than about a quarter of an inch or something and it's almost gone and free needles are occurring; trying to get it to rocket read gets pretty desperate. It's almost impossible at that stage of the game, but you've got a free needle now and a down tone arm. You got other indicators. You don't need all this, see. You knew it was the right goal or it wouldn't have wound up there, because a wrong goal produces more mass, which produces a higher tone arm. See. And a right goal, alter-ised, produces more mass and more tone arm height. You see this similarity?

So, all right, we tear along here, we give it a Prepcheck, and at the end of our Prepcheck it's still going thwp-thwp-phsss! thwp! Nothing, nothing, nothing – pip! Nothing – stick! Nothing, nothing – kkkk! Tone arm's sitting up here at 4.75. Well, I tell you, you're a mighty foolish auditor to go on and monkey with that. It could be the right goal. Could be the right goal – could be! Nobody's saying it isn't. Don't get into any big argument with the pc. Just tell him you're not invalidating your goal and you're not abandoning the goal and you're not this and not that and put in the hope factor, which is the true factor.

They get spiny, man, when you don't make this awful clear to them why you're doing this. You depart from the Prepcheck into a further unburdening action and your next unburdening action is to find items. Find rock slamming items – just as though you're going to find a goal.
Well now, I'm not going to give you a long dissertation on how to find goals at this stage, because this lecture isn't on it. I'm just talking about listing a goal to Clear. That's what you do when you absolutely run into it and you just can't make up your mind and you don't know what you're listing and it isn't behaving right, and so forth.

Now, you've got a special goals preparation cleanup, little intensive that goes along with that. And when you're going to haul off and find a bunch of new items and that sort of thing, don't leave all this stuff lying around. Do that October 29th little action as the first action of unburdening and finding items. That gets all the listing that's been done on it and that gets other things, gets it out of the road and it smoothes things up.

So your Prepcheck is your first action. Your next action is an unburdening action. Well, one of the fastest ways to unburden it is that October 29th, 1962 Goals Preparation Intensive. It's a little assessment you do, you know – it's real cute. It's a little assessment and you do this assessment and find out what you've got to run on this pc and that cleans up some segment of his auditing that probably is the most burdensome and it brings the TA down and some other things will happen. And the pc will find this quite pleasant. They get good gains on this, whereas you saw a pc into just an ordinary Problems Intensive and you're going to have some kickbacks. Pcs don't like this. It isn't going to hurt them any, but they don't like it.

Why? Well, doesn't address their goal. Well, you'll find out that after a pc's goal has been listed for a little while and you're trying to put the thing together, you'll find out that your best bet is to clean up the section of auditing that shows up on that little scale.

You do this little Assessment by Elimination of this little scale on the October 29th bulletin and you'll find you're sitting pretty, because the pc is now really getting audited on the goal's channel. Because, of course, that'll hit the highest mass on the case. See. And, therefore, it'll bring the tone arm down. And you get some interesting results and he still has a sensation of being audited on the – on a goal's channel and he'll feel better.

All right. Now, this action is a preparatory action that permits you to take off – either to find a right goal or to re-prove the goal that has passed. Now, you can go ahead from there and clean it up and find the right goal and so forth. Now, all that knowledge is necessary to the listing auditor before he starts fooling around too much with listing. Because he should know what he's looking at and he ought to know how to repair what he's listed into a hole.

See, so he roughly audited it and it resulted in a high, stuck TA and so forth. Well, he messed it up one way or the other and he can't get this thing to read anymore. Alter-is on a right goal results in a high TA; running, even smoothly, a wrong goal results in a high TA, so these are your steps of takeoff and that's the direction you go – and you don't keep on listing.

Now, this is a funny lecture when I'm telling you what not to do before I tell you what to do. Don't keep on listing. You do these other things. Got that?

Well, you'll have a lot of happy pcs if you handle it this way because you eventually... Remember that old goal, remember all those old goals and that sort of thing. Call them out of mothballs every once in a while and read them. Say, "Well, I'm going to check some of these goals, you know," and so on. And you got a new list of goals or something like that. Well,
let's check the old goal first. Let's not go and sweat ourselves to death. We may find it's sitting there, *rocket, rocket, rocket!* See? Three cheers!

All right. Now you're set for listing.

So, your first action before you list some pc is to establish the rightness of the goal and if the goal isn't right and the goal isn't rocket reading, to then take appropriate actions either to make the goal rocket read or to find a goal that will rocket read. Got that? That's *vital* to an auditor's know-how. There is no sense in doing anything else.

Don't sit there grinding away on a goal that won't rocket read.

Now, I'm going to tell you why. If'n da goal, she don't rocket read, she too much for de pc.

Once upon a time, he could play marbles with planets. And now a child's marble falls on his big toe and it takes him to the hospital. He's not up to regarding as much force as there is on that backtrack. And you start listing. This goal temporarily and momentarily rocket read, and oh, you're just fine and you've got this goal and it's all rocket reading, and now you're going to list. Anyway you put lines together you're now going to list this thing, and so forth.

Now, no matter how you put lines together, you have only one purpose in view and that is to undo the alter-is which has occurred on the original goal. That is the purpose of listing.

The purpose of listing is not to read lines to the pc. It's to undo the alter-is on the original postulate on that channel. That is what you're trying to do.

Whatever else you're trying to do, that one you're sure trying to do. Now, all listing methods are more or less adapted to that action – more or less. Some of them are better, some of them are worse. But your listing methods are just based on the undoing of alter-is.

Now, he had the postulate and he wanted to carry it out. This was his goal, his basic purpose. He had the postulate and he assumed an identity and then he was going to carry it out, but his purpose was alter-ised because he ran into a "wumph." And he couldn't go any further because there was the "wumph." So he had to have now a purpose to overcome the "wumph" before the "wumph" could overcome him and now, therefore, in order to overcome the "wumph," why then he's got to have an ally called a "bimph" and he's got to also have the "bimph." And then the "bimph" get – he can't be "bimph," because the "bimph" has got something that confronts a "bimph" and opposes it. So therefore he's got to be an enemy of the "yip" and so there he is... (I don't care what you call these things.) And there is his life, and he sounds like a bluebottle fly in a milk bottle on a hot summer day. You know? Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.

He's had nothing ever since but an alteration of that basic intention. And the alteration of the basic intention resulted in mass and every time he picked up a terminal that was going to do it, it didn't do it, so therefore, it developed mass.

So we have mass terminals. And these things, as I mentioned earlier, are actual mass and then they're bumped up against alter-ised opposition terminals in his own thinkingness.
and these confront these, and then those have others that confront those and so on, and they're all in pairs. There are pairs and pairs and pairs and pairs.

Now, there are four basic forces, four basic forces. There's the force out, the force which restrains the force out, the force in and the force which restrains the force in. You can draw these four basic flows. These are the basic forces.

There is the effort to carry out the intention. There is the effort or anything else, to oppose the effort to carry out the intention. There is the effort to retard the effort to oppose the intention and there is the effort to retard the intention itself. There are just four and they can be drawn by four arrows, which are in opposition to – two in opposition to each other and the other two are going away from each other and you've got the vectors that you're trying to list.

Now, the anatomy of this is called a Goals Problem Mass and it's called a Goals Problem Mass because it follows the same anatomy as a problem. You must have postulate-counter-postulate, you must have force-counter-force; you've got to have mass-counter-mass and all of these things hung up.

Now, a problem which goes on with the pc for years and years and years and years and years is actually a mass facing a mass of the pc. If you don't believe this, sometime get a pc who isn't too stone-blind as a thetan and say, "Did you ever have a problem?"

Person says, "Yeah, I really did. I've had a problem."

You say, "All right, what was the problem?" And he gives you the problem. And you say, "Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Good."

Well, oddly enough, he will see a black mass go floating away from him he never knew existed. It'll go way out there. Now, we've got him all cured of this, see; he's all cured of this problem. Now, we say to him, "All right, tell me a solution to that problem you just told me," see. "Tell me a solution to it. Tell me a solution to it. Tell me a solution to it." He keeps telling you solutions to it. It gets closer, closer and closer – and splat!

You say, "All right. Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Comparable – comparable – problem of comparable magnitude to that problem," It'll go way out there again. In other words, you can bring it out – you can push it out, you can get it in – with those two commands.

Although, of course, this problem is just a little old thing, doesn't have anything to do with the price of fish, it's normally a valence of some kind that is parked on the track and the pc is in its opposing valence and he doesn't see its opposing valence and you actually have the two black balls – got these two things impinged on each other.

With the problem of comparable magnitude, you see one of them float off. With solutions, you'll see it float back. It's very mysterious. This was the first basic experiment of demonstration of the Goals Problems Mass. That's why it is called a "problems mass."

Now, a problem, anatomy of, is postulate-counter-postulate. All the reasons you must solve it, plus all the reasons you can't solve it and all the reasons from elsewhere why it mustn't be solved and all the reasons why they mustn't oppose its being solved.
Now, that's the totality of intentions, if you want to get right down to it, that is connected with this GPM. And you've got two valences, basically: the Rock and opprock and then you've got other confronting valences and... Ah, this pc will have had a game going on for oh, I don't know, several billion years, where he was being a farmer and he was being a soldier. And this soldier was against farmers. And you know, soldiers against farmers and farmers against soldiers and he'd lead very unhappy lives as soldiers and then he'd lead very unhappy lives as farmers and there was just this big game that was going on, and he didn't know what he was, and – except in those lives when he was being a soldier he was very dizzy, and in those lives when he was being a farmer he hurt like hell.

See, we could establish which his terminal and oppterm was, but while he was living them, he never really could make it out, see.

And he'll have this game going on for billennia. He'll just have gone on and on and on with this silly game. See, as a farmer he's agin all soldiers, and so on. Well, this of course is always a problem to him. And then of course, subsidiary to it are all the problems that a farmer would have. It makes plenty.

All of this is representative in black. Why black?

Well, I can't give you a real good reason of why black, except for this: It is drained-out energy which no longer emanates – this black masses – and it has a timeless characteristic because it is – it's got no more change in it – apparently no more change.

Now, if you were to attack one of these black masses and do something with it – well, old Black and White works – but if you were to do something with it, like try to confront it out of existence – that's a good one – just try to confront it out of existence. All right. "What part of the black mass can you confront? What part of the black mass can you not confront?"

You're just going to wear your voice out as an auditor because absolutely nothing is going to happen to the black mass.

I tore one of them up one time as a theta, after a great – melted it down and tore it up and I never did so much work in my life, and so forth. And I was horrified to find it was still floating around in fragments. Well, it's non-as-isable in its current state and that's because it's an alter-is of the basic postulate.

See, the basic postulate is part and parcel to every piece of that black mass – no matter what alterations there were to mass, why, there it is. It's going to wind up as a black, drained-out, squeezed-down, cramped-up mass. It's very amusing to take one of these balls and as they're resolving, you will suddenly start seeing things in them – and all kinds of weird things. Thirty-five-millimeter picture slides and all this kind of thing. But actually a whole lifetime of track is all cramped, see.

Got a nice straight time track and when you finish up and you pass in your checks, why, it all collapses and you've got it. And one day, why, you're being audited on listing and all of a sudden you say, '"What the hell is this, a picture folder-card of Niagara Falls or where to spend your honeymoon or ... What is this?" you know.
And like a pc up in London: He really sold the auditor one day. He was a brand-new pc, raw meat—never had anything to do with auditing before. And I've forgotten exactly where this was, maybe it was here. It wasn't here amongst you pcs, but I remember it was a raw meat pc and really gave the auditor a sales talk because a black mass had opened up in front of him. He'd seen through it and he'd seen a city — space-opera city. And he sat there giving the auditor one God-awful sales talk about the fact that it was real and that he had seen it and that it wasn't this lifetime and he'd never seen a picture of it before and he wasn't making it up. You know, that kind of thing. See?

He was trying to sell a Scientologist on past lives or something, you know? Very funny. Anyway, these things shred out into that sort of thing. They unfold and mysterious things appear. When you first see them, why, they're just wound-up masses. In Book One we call them circuits, valences, identities, items — they're all — all those things mean the same thing, see. They'll also talk; they'll also do things; they'll also look like they're God or something. All kinds of wild things occur with regard to these masses.

In listing you run into the lot. If you're listing properly, you run into all sorts of wild phenomena or you run into hardly any phenomena at all. Things just keep melting away, down to the last few feet of filum.

Now, all of a sudden, things really start turning up. Guy will go through an overt-motivator sequence: zzzzip! You know? Zzzzip, zzzzip! And he tried to tell the auditor about it, you know. He'll give the item, tried to tell the auditor about it, "Well, you see, let's see, I was a colonel in this regiment and I had stole this fellow's wife and so forth. And there was a battle the next day and I got killed. It was only poetic justice, because I'd left poison in his coffee pot the night before. That's one overt. Yeah, that's right. That, that..." And this is going by — bzzzzzzzzzz! Fantastic rate of speed! It's track unwinding. Don't you see?

It isn't the fact that he's confronting it that is causing it to unwind. It's the fact that he's un-alter-ising the basic purpose. You get the un-alter-ises off the basic purpose and the track unwinds. You understand? And then you can confront it. Confronting is a subsidiary mechanism to identifying.

First identification of the rock slam channel results in a lot of items. And these items are very interesting to the pc and they give the pc a lot of cognitions and they blow off and they get him closer to his goal channel. All of these various things are quite important.

But, why the emphasis on finding goals by rock slam? Well, it's what he can't confront. So in listing you must have some commands, that first and foremost, label or identify mass which resulted from the goal — what restrained that goal or that mass, and then what opposed that mass and then what restrained the opposition of that mass. Now, these factors are vitally necessary in order to get the ball of yarn to unwind.

Now, what confuses the issue is, is there are enormous additional factors. They are just beyond count. The task is: is how many factors can you get away with and still win? That is the actual contest. How few factors do you actually have to handle? I've told you how few, but what do you have to do to handle them?
Now, that's the contest of how you make up lines for listing. It's – you want as few as
you need to handle it, that will handle it, see – not as many as you can possibly dream up to
handle it.

Now, there's your basic fundamental problem. Because if you don't have ways and
means for the pc to identify all these masses as they peel up and come to his notice, if you
don't have ways and means by which he can identify them and say what their relationship is to
other masses in the goal, why, then of course nothing will happen because the alter-is won't
come apart.

That these masses are basically composed of thought is self-evident. That they are
manifest is also self-evident. They aren't imaginary masses. But it's thought alone that takes
them apart. How come they come apart at all, saying "waterbuck," you know, "Eskimo,"
"cannonball," "white man"? How come saying these things and recognizing these things takes
them apart? Well, that's because they're basically thought derived out of the basic postulate.

So it's the alter-is of the thought and the take-apart, of course, is the straightness with
which they're now being labeled. There's always a small amount of lingual alter-is, because
you probably conceived the – oh, separate parts of these were conceived in other languages
and you're now naming them in English. And there's a slight alter-is of the nomenclature and
so on. But that isn't going to do you any harm. But it's absolutely phenomenal that the thing
comes apart.

If you think of the number of reasons why it doesn't come apart, why, you're immedi-
ately confronted by the fact that it's a miracle that it does.

Now, therefore you're not up against a simple trick. This is not a simple trick. If it
were a simple trick, it could have been done many, many times in the last two hundred tril-
lion, you see? And it hasn't been done. You're still here, aren't you? You've still got the GPM,
haven't you?

Well, there's many a time that you've exteriorized out of the GPM and made a new
GPM. And there's lots of conditions have occurred which made life seem different. There's all
kinds of things been occurring. But if you' d been cleared on the track, why, you would go
back to that point, you see, as your basic postulate  and then that would be very easy from that
point on because there wouldn't be anything before that. Well, I think if you' d ever been
cleared you wouldn't have totally forgotten it anyhow.

The upshot of this is, is that listing must permit the pc to easily confront and label the
minimal number necessary to cure the alter-is of the basic postulate – minimal number of
terminals, items.

Now, thoughts and doingness and significances are not going to get your pc anyplace.
He's got to label terminals and things. He's – these have got to be things – things, people, va-
lences, bedsteads and bedspreads and blondes, and catfish and the Mississippi River – don't
you see? These are the things you're trying to label. And that you must know, in putting lines
together, that you mustn't have significances as possible answers. You're going to get them.
Oh, you'll get significances and so forth. But by and large you must have a predominance of
mass.
Now, your pc is going to go so far in this mass and then he's going to find out that he can't confront something. This is what happens to a bad goal. Oh, we got this thing rocket reading and everything is going fine and everything – oh, boy, we're – here we go. And all of a sudden, you tiger drill it the next session and it reads less and you tiger drill it the next session and it doesn't read at all. Then it sticks and then it kind of

Now, if you consulted this pc carefully you'll find out he didn't have much reality on this goal or how this goal had influenced his life or anything else. It might be his goal, but he doesn't have – not too real to him. And also the items he's been naming have all been sort of vague. He said "an Indian princess" and "a Turk," but he just said them. And it didn't – and he didn't have any idea of Indian princesses or Turks. It isn't that he's supposed to get ideas concerning them, don't you see, but they all kind of – well, you know, sort of in a smoke and a dream and they really didn't exist and he didn't exist and he hasn't got anything to do with them. See, his reality factor on these things is very poor.

In other words, he's not doing a very direct confront. His confront on them is bad. Because his confront on them is bad, you're all of a gonna sudden – get into an overwhump situation. And he's going to be sitting there saying, "A Turk..."

And you're going to say, "What's the matter?"

"Nec... Turk..."

"What happened?"

PC says, "Oh, I don't..."

"What happened? You tell me," you know.

"Huh! I don't know."

He hit something and he doesn't want nothing more to do with it. If you'd been watching the meter, it'd probably do a big rock slam and then that dies out. In other words, he moved in close to this thing and he doesn't want any more to do with it. And you tiger drill the goal the next time and it's firing less.

Then he hits another section of track that is going all biluuuh and he doesn't want anything to do with that either. He says, "An Indian princess, huh-huh-huh. Well, we don't want that item. Let's see, is something else here?" In other words, he chickens out on this stuff. He can't confront it. It's unreal to him. It's not there, don't you see?

These are the liabilities of listing. Sometimes your goal read bright and clear. You got it to read beautifully. The first listing session, it all goes up in smoke. So having a goal and having a goal ready to run are two different things. You can have a goal that isn't even vaguely ready to be listed. But how can you tell? By listing it.

Now, certainly I'd list any goal that was rocket reading. And I'd list to the final hanging dog. First choice: list – with the condition the goal must be made to rocket read at the beginning of the session. And the first choice is list. First choice, make sure you list.
Now, I'd only start doing something about the PC, see, when I could no longer get anything to rocket read. And then I would do something about the PC on the rationale that I gave you in the first instance.

I'd say, well, either it was the wrong goal – which we know it probably wasn't if we saw it rocket read well – or the PC is overwhumpped. And the two different situations are gotten out of by the same channel. You've got to over – unburden the thing one way or the other.

And I wouldn't give it an arduous Prepcheck, get it to read, run one listing session, have it fold up, do an arduous Prepcheck, get it to read, do one listing session, have it fold up. I wouldn't go like this, you know. I would think after that had been repeated as a cycle for two or three weeks, that a fellow would sort of get the idea that he ought to do something else.

Well, you've fortunately got another something else to do. That something else happens to be unburdening, and unburdening probably will take many forms. There will probably be a great deal of rationale with regard to this idea of unburdening a goal. It's an old idea, as far as the track is concerned – goes clear back to 53, 54. And I'm not now going to tell you the exact way to always unburden the goal and so forth. I'm giving you the rationale with regard to listing. So don't list one that isn't rocket reading. Prepcheck it. Now it won't rocket read? Unburden it.

If you've been doubtful about it from the beginning, well, for heaven's sakes swamp it all up with the October 29th little intensive and sail on. Sail on. Unburden it as though to find a new goal.

Now, there's – some intermediate step will undoubtedly arise where we get this goal, it rocket reads gorgeously, and then we apply step 79 to it which unburdens it by using the goal. And you'll probably find something like this being issued: that we list the first three hundred items of "Who or what" by writing them down. And then we null them and present the first item to the pc on the silver platter. And then we get the opposition item either by listing who or what would oppose this goal, or by opposing this other goal. Always an unburdening step, see. And writing all that down, letting the pc examine this, don't you see, and handing him that item on a silver platter, and then going ahead and keep doing this.

"Who or what would restrain your wanting this goal?" you know, or something like that. And then, you know, list about three hundred items, write them down, and then take and find the item in that mess that kicks the pin hard. Get all the charge centered on it. Keep this up for a little while, and then, taking off from that point, you'll find out that listing can just go pocketa-pocketa-pocketa according to the cards or the notebook, and there you go.

You can undoubtedly – I can forecast that something like that will be moving amongst you very, very soon. But that would be another action. That would be the action of finding the goal – it rocket reads beautifully – and that is not doing anything with it but unburdening it for the first many items, don't you see. Which all would come under a listing operation.

But then this listing is done by writing the item down and nulling the list. So that's still just a listing operation, don't you see. It's a listing operation that unburdens, don't you see? And that makes it very easy for the pc then, and then he finally comes tearing down the line at
a hell of a rate of speed, and he lists 18,765 items in one three-hour session by saying them all in Sanskrit, you know? It's brrrrrrrr! They're all real to him and everything is fine.

Now, some pcs will give you some items with terrific reality. Everything seems to be fine. Everything seems to be wonderful – the thing folds up.

But you understand that is a listing action? You got the goal reading and you list it so you can unburden and list at the same time. That is not the patch-up item – the patch-up procedure I've been telling you about such as: it fades out, prepcheck it, get it back in order, treat it as though it's a wrong goal and go find the right one.

So essentially, you're writing it all down, finding the item on that list. That is just listing a goal out toward Clear.

Now, anything that is listed, whether it is listed by writing it down and finding an item; I'm talking about a goal now. You found it; it's rocket reading; everything is happy with it. And we don't care whether we listed with check marks or we listed it by writing them down and nulling out the list and presenting the pc with the item. However you were listing this goal out, the end product is always the same.

You'll find probably the most difficult times of listing come toward the end of listing, not the beginning of listing. And the pc very often would rather be any place else than there. The last couple of days before the first goal goes out are peculiarly trying to the pc, very often. This has happened – I've observed it several times. They'd rather not have anything to do with it, thank you very much, because they conceive themselves as about to lose the only game in the world.

The goal is "to find pennies underneath the slot grates of gutters in Minneapolis," see. And this is the only game in the world. There's no other game in the world. These other games don't exist; there's only this one game of finding pennies underneath the grates in the gutters of Minneapolis. Don't you see? And they know now that if they get rid of that, they will have no other game. Games end at that point. Well, of course the reason they can't play any game... They can't even play that game. They're at a point of no game at all. And until they get that – rid of that goal, they can't have a game.

But they never look at it this way and you could sit and argue with them for some time. And the best way to handle this situation is just make them sit in the chair in front of you and finish it up. But you can very often – will notice – now, this isn't invariable – but you quite often will notice that a pc will use various mechanisms to convince you that you shouldn't go on listing. They do a balk. And beneath it is, "going to lose all games."

That comes over them. And then they want to know where the goal came from and they get very introverted and speculative, and so forth, as to who gave it to them and why and all this sort of thing and then the thing goes up in smoke, pop, and it won't do anything anymore and that's it.

But you get down to that last period – if your tone arm tends to stay high and that sort of thing, the goal is best prepchecked out of existence, not finally listed out of existence. In other words, it should have – it went free needle and then it kind of froze up and while you were checking around the thing it all kind of got stuffy and stuck up. But you know that it's
been listed for quite a while and you saw some free needles on the thing and all that sort of thing; your best procedure to finish off the case is a Prepcheck. A Prepcheck on the goal just as before. Because it blows up all the little residuals of auditing.

Now, auditing itself was slightly an alter-is of the goal and this left a certain amount of alter-is on the track. In other words, you didn't get rid of all of the alter-is on the thing. It was – some of it was overlooked and it tends to blow off in the last Prepcheck. So no goal should be considered a valid goal – a validly cleared up – no goal should be considered to be validly cleared up until it has been prepped.

And the best way to test one is to see whether or not you can find a Prehav level for it, not sit there chanting the goal endlessly. Let's see if we can find a Prehav level for that goal. We do a Prepcheck and then try to find a Prehav level and we can't, and we're – got nothing but free needles in all directions and so forth, well, that's good enough. That's the way you wind one up and that's your end product of listing.

And there are probably some cases here that a simple Prepcheck would knock the goal right out of existence.

Now, here: why are you trying to find this goal and get rid of this goal by lining and get rid of it, and so forth? That's because the pc has no game until that game is out of the road. Now he can have a game. And the next thing is, is so you can get the next goal.

Now, there is no such thing as trying to get the next goal before the first goal is reason-ably out of the road. But there is such a thing as overrating a first-goal Clear. Don't try to make it all happen with one goal. I gave a lecture on this last year. Don't try to make it all happen with one item. Don't think because you're going to get an assessment down the list on who or what have you detested, and find out that it's General Pilsudski, that the whole pc's life is going to change. It isn't. It isn't!

It's going to materially better, but it's not going to completely change. In other words, don't try to hang it all on one action. And similarly, don't try to hang the whole case on one goal. Don't try to solve this pc's whole case on one goal. That is idiocy. You won't be able to do it! Because there's a goal back of that goal. There's a whole new GPM sitting back of that. And it can't be touched or monkeyed with till you got the first one out of the road.

Now, you're going to get the second one. And that's going to run off all the alter-is and you're going to find a lot more bank. And that's going to blow and then you're going to find the third goal sitting back of that. And then when you've listed that one – of course, they do list out with great rapidity when you get back that early – and now you're looking at an official Clear.

Three goals listed out – we start hanging medallions around the neck and plumes on the guy's cap. Up to that time, why bother?

There's lots of reasons for that. It's because finding the second and third goal are so much easier than finding the first goal, that you might as well do it.
There's the direction of case stability. First-goal Clear normally has a mighty vague notion of the third and fourth dynamic, let me assure you. It's pretty vague. But they have a darned good idea of the first dynamic. You get a first dynamic Clear.

All right, fine! That's wonderful! But why not push them on up the line? And why not, before you say, "Well, I cleared Bill" – just as he comes out having robbed the bank – why not spend just that little extra time there to find that second goal and find that third goal. Because they're actually quite easy to find. Second and third goals normally should be expected to be found just by tiger drilling a goals list. You make a fresh goals list, you tiger drill it out. You find the goal sitting there someplace. Easily the fastest way to do it.

Now, do you understand what listing is all about? That's what you're trying to do. I hope you're not trying to sit around waiting for Ron to give you the magic list of lines which clear your pc. Because the pc is going to get cleared on the lines that clear the pc, and pcs have gone first-goal Clears to find their second goal, and have found their second goal and cleared that on four lines. Interesting, isn't it?

You're sitting in an absolute cinch right now. You've got 3GA. You list 850 goals on the bulk of your pcs, you go down that list... Actually, on any pc, you're going to go clear out to the end of 5,000 goals, you're going to find this pc's goal on that list someplace. And you're going to set it down with four lines and you're going to list it. If it's the right goal, you're going to have a Clear.

My whole interest is speeding it up, making it easier, smoothing it out. Remember, you're working from a cinch and a certainty which has happened. You haven't got time to clear everybody the wrong – long way. So I'm trying to find you some shortcuts. But because I'm trying to find you some shortcuts is no reason you shouldn't use your noggin and realize that it has happened rather well and rather easily on four lines. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night!
Thank you.

When you were building this country, why didn't you fix up the weather? You know, really, I have my opinion of planet builders that go around designing weather like this, and that sort of thing. There's a great deal to be said for rain, but it quickly becomes hyperbolical.

Well, now tonight, I've made notes for lectures, so I probably won't talk about that. And this is the 1st of November, isn't it? What year is it?

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. All right. Lecture number one.

This is a brand-new subject to you. It's an entirely new subject to you. You have never heard of this subject before. In fact, you have never run it or handled it or had it done. I want to recommend, then, this lecture to you very, very seriously. There have been several bulletins out on it, but you apparently haven't read those. Now, therefore, this is new material here. And I want you to take to heart what I tell you in this lecture.

And the subject of the lecture is missed withholds. Now, it may surprise you that the first bulletin out on this particular subject of missed withholds is February the 8th, HCOB February 8, 1962, and it's marked, as a bulletin, "Urgent." And it says, "The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause." That's the first paragraph of this. It says, "Every upset with Central Orgs, field auditors, pcs, the lot, is traceable to one or more missed withholds." That's what it says. Well, anyhow, on February the 12th, because nobody got it then, I issued another one – rote formulas for missed withholds, and so forth. That's HCOB February 12th. It's *How to Clear Withholds and Missed Withholds*.

Well, they didn't get it then, so we issued another one on February 22nd. And on February 22nd, 1962, we had *Withholds, Missed and Partial*, see? And it has a lot to say on that particular subject. And it says, "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge. I don't appeal to reason, only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail..."
cases or fail in life. But at the moment, it may not seem reasonable, so just try it and do it well and day will dawn at last." Well, day didn't dawn. Well… [laughter]

So, on May the 3rd, 1962, you have the HCOB *ARC Breaks and Missed Withholds*, and it says, "How to use this bulletin: When an auditor or student has trouble with an 'ARC breaky pc' or no gain, or when an auditor is found to be using freak control methods or processes to 'keep a pc in-session,' the HCO Sec, D of T or D of P should just hand a copy of this bulletin to the auditor and make him or her study it and take an HCO Exam on it.

"After some months of careful observation and test, I can state conclusively that: All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds.

"This is vital technology," and so forth.

It says also, "There are no ARC breaks when missed withholds have been cleared up." And it goes on, technically.

Well, on May the 21st, we have one: *Missed Withholds, Asking About*, and so forth, but that's just a little more data.

And on June the 28th, 1962, we have *Dirty Needles, How to Smooth Out Needles*. There it is, and it talks all about missed withholds and so forth. It's not obviously and directly on the point, but it does mention withholds, missed withholds, overtss and secrets and so forth.

And on July the 4th we have *Bulletin Changes* which include missed withholds, and then on July the 12th, 1962, we have *Motivatorish Cases* and so forth, and that goes on talking about how to get missed withholds out of people.

And then on August the 13th we talk about *Rock Slams and Dirty Needles*. And there's some more about missed withholds then.

And then on August the 30th, while I was stateside, why, Mary Sue got desperate and issued some bulletins. And of course the first subject that she picked up was missed withhold handling. Well now, that is a lot of bulletins. Let me call to your attention, there's weight here, man. There's weight. There's been a lot said on this subject, see?

And it's just about the most important subject in an auditing session and keeping the show on the road, short of actually clearing and helping people, you see, it's just about the most important subject there is. And there isn't one here got it. None of you. You haven't got it. So I'm going to give you a lecture on it.

And I might as well start this lecture with, "The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause." Do you see? That's out of the February 8th bulletin. And "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge," on February the 22nd.

Listen. All you're doing and all you go on doing and all you keep on doing and all you do, endlessly, every time you're told to pick up a missed withhold, all you do is pick up a withhold. Honest. You're picking up withholds. I don't think you have ever picked up a missed withhold off of a pc in any session you've ever run. You've only picked up withholds.
You ask the auditor to pick up the missed withholds and the auditor promptly picks up all the withholds. You got the idea? Everybody says this, and I guess it's because of the semantics of the word missed. It says they're missed withholds, and by God, they are! Everybody misses them! See?

You see, it is so pat and it's so plain to the naked eye that this is what happens: Pce has a withhold, and you haven't picked it up. So therefore it's a missed withhold. No! That is wrong.

So, when I tell you to pick up the missed withholds, all you're doing is picking up withholds. You say, "Well, he wants us to pick up the missed withholds, so therefore I better pick up the withholds I've missed. So therefore, 'Do you have a withhold?'" When sometimes you even say, "Have I ever missed a withhold on you?" "Has anybody missed a withhold on you?" and the pc gratuitously gives you withholds; gives you more withholds and more withholds and more withholds.

No pc has ever given you a missed withhold. I'll bet you you've never picked one up. Now, I may be very harsh on this line, but let's get down to tacks here, man! Brass, iron and otherwise.

A missed withhold is a withhold that people nearly found out about but didn't. And you're only looking for the nearly found outs. You don't give a damn what the guy did. You don't care what the person did. You only want to know what people almost found out!!

Honest! I've been talking since February, you know? I'm getting hoarse.

You see, a withhold is something the pc did. That is something the pc did – do you understand? – that he isn't talking about. See? He did it and he isn't talking about it. Now that is a withhold and that is all a withhold is. And please don't keep saying also it is a missed withhold just because you didn't get it in a session.

You see, it's all very neat. You got it all figured out that if you didn't get the withhold in a session, why, therefore, it's a missed withhold. And that's not what a missed withhold is! A missed withhold has nothing to do with what the pc said. Nothing! Not anything to do with what the pc did and then withheld. It actually hasn't a damn thing to do with what the pc is withholding.

The missed withhold is something people nearly found out. It's an other-person action! Look. It's not the pc's action! It's nothing the pc did or is doing! You keep trying to pick up missed withholds by asking the pc what he's withholding, you never get anything but withholds and then you miss some more of these and you've got a pc even further upset!

Look, here are – here are absolute pearls on a silver platter. They're actually beyond price. And I've never got it across to you. A missed withhold has nothing to do with the pc. But nothing! It is an other-person action and the pc's wonder about it. I just know right now I'm not making any sense to you even this minute. I'll betcha I'm not making any sense to you.

It hasn't a thing to do with what the pc is withholding. Let's just sever the end off of the "missed." Let's forget that it is even a withhold.
You're looking for exact moments in the lifetime or lifetimes of this pc when somebody *almost found out*, and he's never been sure since whether they did or they didn't. And we don't care *what* they almost found out! We only care that they almost found out something! And that is the address to a missed withhold. It's an other-person-than-the-pc's action. It's an other person's action.

I really didn't realize that I hadn't gotten it across to you in bulk and in gross form till not too long ago in a catch-as-catch-can session I said to a pc – this pc was going natter, natter, natter, natter, yak, yak, yak, yak, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, yap, yap, yap. So I just routinely was running a little bit of – I said, "Well, what have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you withheld?" you know, that sort of thing. And got stuck in this area of the track and started saying natter, natter, and natter, natter, natter, and natter, natter, and natter, natter, and natter, natter, and natter, natter, and natter, over and withholds and withholds and withholds out of that area of the track, and withholds and overs and withholds out of that area of the track, and they would have been going yet if I hadn't – that's one of the dangerous things is Instructors are actually going to stop you sometimes practically running it. Because once you shove this down the pc's throat, it looks just like a Q and A. It's almost in the teeth of the laws about Q and A. You understand?

But the pc isn't clearing this. You've got this thing called a recurring withhold. You understand? You run into these things all the time. You were auditing a pc, so they're going to run some withholds, and they run the time that they locked their husband out. And you say, "Ha, ha. Thank you very much."

And you note down this fact, and a few sessions later, they tell you they locked their husband out, see, and they didn't tell him that they were the person that had locked him out, you know? Never confessed to it since, and he got pneumonia, and it was all pretty rough.

And so, a few sessions after this, you know, why, you're running down the track and they tell you they locked their husband out. And a little while later some other auditor is auditing this same pc, and they tell him they locked their husband out.

Look. Sometime or another, won't you get tired of hearing the same withhold? Isn't it boring? It's like watching a "C" movie that wasn't very good in the first place for the tenth time. That is a *missed* withhold.

Look. It has a very *special* anatomy: It isn't the moment they locked the husband out; it isn't when they withheld it from the husband; it isn't when they withheld it from you. These things have nothing to do with the reason this is charged up! That it is an overt, that it is a withhold – ahhh, yes. But there's this special thing called a *missed withhold*, and it hasn't got anything to do with either one of them. It merely uses them for fodder to feed on. And the overt and the withhold won't blow if a missed withhold occurs.

Now, what is the missed withhold? The only thing you have to ask this recurring-withhold pc is "When did your husband *nearly* find out about it?" Not "When did he find out?" – see, that would have blown – but "When – when did your husband *nearly* find out about it?"
Now, here's the actual mechanics of it. A few days later while he was lying there suffering with a fever of 118, why, his eyes opened slittedly and suspiciously and looked at her and glanced toward the lock on the door. Now, that was his action, not hers, see? That was his action. And ever afterwards she hasn't known whether he knew or didn't know. Ever afterward! She doesn't know! And that's why the recurring withhold hangs up.

Now, I lowered the boom on this pc, and I said, "All right. Fine. Thank you. Thank you. Good. Now, tell me the exact moment you suspected somebody knew what you are telling me."

"Ohhhh." And that was dead easy. It was right there. The whole package blew, and that was that.

Somebody had made a comment which might or might not have been interpreted as the fact that they knew about it. And the pc goes off in this fantastic confusion. Now, how can it be a confusion? Well, it's a confusion because there is an overt and there is a withhold. And these are the primary mechanisms which sit back of all this. But they actually aren't very serious until they get a mystery on top of them.

Now, you take an overt, a withhold, plus a mystery, and you've got a missed withhold. It's a mystery! Now, did her husband know about it or didn't he? "Did-did-did he find out – did he re – and – and is he withholding? And is he – did he – as he was lying there in a fever and so forth, did he – he really mean that look toward her and toward the lock of the door as an accusation for having accidentally locked him out in the snow storm? Or did he – did he ever know, or-or-or wasn't that? Or did it or didn't it? Did he fi... No. He couldn't have known about it. Oh, he – he did – no. No. He couldn't have. He-he did, but still he looked straight at the lock of the door and he looked at me. He must, I-I-I-I don't know."

Do you understand this? Now, that is a missed withhold, see? Had nothing whatsoever to do – you can say, "Now, what have you done?"

And she says, "I locked my husband out in the snow and he got sick with pneumonia and he was sick for seventeen months and eighteen days. Lost his pension."

A few sessions later, you say, "All right, rata-ta-tatta-tatta. What have you done?"

"Well, I locked my husband out in the snow, and – and he – he got – he got sick, and – and he was sick for eighteen months and eighteen days and he lost his pension."

You say, "Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good. (Maybe if I acknowledge it this time, maybe the pc will find out that I heard it, see?) Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Good, good. Good. Tha... thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Now, I got that. I heard exactly what you said there. I heard exactly what you said. Thank you."

Next morning in session you're running some General O/W, see? "I locked my husband out in…" [laughter]

Now, of course, that isn't as comprehensible as some offbeat – because this society is a bit offbeat on the subject of the second dynamic – you get some juicy second dynamic withhold of some kind or another. Get this girl, and she's making love to a dog, you know? You get this, you know? And then you, the auditor, get pulled right in on this. You say, "Well, of
course this is heavily charged! Of course the pc is having trouble getting this off. Of course, of course, of course!"

Don't be so damn reasonable. There isn't any reason why the magnitude of the overt has anything to do with the readiness of its blowing. The magnitude of the overt has nothing to do with the speed of its evaporation. I don't care if you've blown up a husband or a planet. It's an overt. And it – one doesn't blow any harder than another.

Well, therefore, we have to ask this question. "How come this doesn't blow?" Don't sit there and say, "Well, because the society is rigged the way it is and because so forth, and it's on her terminal chain, and it's probably something that rock slams. It's on the oppterm side, dogs are oppterms, and – and so forth, and I'll fix that. Actually she is stuck on the se... and that's why that overt won't blow, see?" Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, see? That's why you get this second dynamic overt ten minutes deep in every session, or every third session. Or every Prepcheck, it comes up.

Wouldn't you be a little bit curious why this thing keeps recurring? Well, don't be so reasonable. It is not recurring because it is badder than other overts, see? It's not recurring because it weighs heavily on the pc's conscience. I don't know where people keep their consciences – lunch boxes or something like that. Obviously, it's very dangerous to squash a conscience because things are – shouldn't be kept on the conscience, and so forth. It's all a very interesting mechanical problem to me, this whole problem of consciousness. Because you see, everything that is on a conscience is unconscious. It's all confusing. And you can just figure yourself into a grave with this if you don't know this mechanism.

One day they had this elderly man and he came to the house for dinner. And he had a rather false smile. He had false teeth, see? And he had – [laughter] and he had a false smile, and he looked straight at this girl, and he says, "You like dogs, don't you?" [laughter] And that's the missed withhold, see? The pc that you're auditing didn't do it. And ever since then: "Did he know? Did he really know? No, he couldn't have known. Yes, he…." [laughter]

Now, you getting hold of the corner of this thing's tail, huh?

All right. I – maybe I haven't been as articulate as I could be.

Actually, I figured and I figured and I thought and I looked at it and so forth. And on this demonstration the other night, I actually couldn't believe it when the pc said, "I never thought you had to remember a specific moment in time to get off a withhold." Even the pc had missed it, but the thing had evaporated. There was no more natter in that area. There were a whole bunch of overts and a whole bunch of withholds. But this was just pursuant with natter until the exact moment when somebody was standing there – see, this is the moment we had to find – and I said, "All right. Let's look for it. This is the exact moment I want, see?" Pc is just going off answering questions, answering questions, getting no place, see? I say, "This is the exact moment I want. Who almost found out you were doing that?"

"Oh, well."

And we picked up this exact split instant in time and it was just somebody making a casual remark that it indicated that they might know about these overts. You get the idea? They might know. But they didn't. But did they? See, there's the mystery sandwich.
If you want to see what is sticking a pc to something, always look for the mystery sandwich. Mystery is the glue which sticks thetans to things. Mystery is the glue. Even overts wind up in mystery. You shoot somebody. Now you don't know whether you shot him or you didn't shoot him or if it was a lucky shot or you should have shot him or if he was a bad man, or if, if, if, if, if, if, or if you should have done it. So it's the "if you should have done it" which causes you to pull back the withhold and sort of withhold a further action like that.

All things boil down to right conduct. Here is the crux of this situation. If you go on asking the pc, who doesn't understand what you're asking for, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "Have we missed a withhold on you?" and the pc is glibly giving you withholds, you ain't gettin' noplace. You is on the Arkansas Special with its wheels locked, its brakes on and the rails torn up. You're not going down any track anyplace.

Now, you can take the edge off of a case. I salute the fantastic workability of General O/W, you see? See, it is – it's the woof and warp of the GPM itself. And it's right on down the line. That's why it's totally unlimited in the amount of run it can have. But I don't think you'd like to run out a GPM with General O/W. You're perfectly welcome to try if you've got a few centuries. Numerically, to count up the number of withholds that the person has, pursuant to the number of overts which they have committed, gives us some figure that if we were to write it up on the wall behind me in very tiny figures, starting at that corner and then just keep on writing across the whole top of the wall with groups of three zeros, you see, and then without ending the number, come just down below it and start right straight across the wall again, and then come down another quarter of an inch and start writing zeros there, you'd get some kind of an idea of what this guy has done and withheld.

Well, that many answers is not necessary to clear somebody. So although the overt is very powerful in its ability to aberrate the individual – the withhold which follows it is locked up by the overt itself, of course – and although this mechanism is the mechanism underlying the gathering up of energies which results in solid-mass terminals and gives you the game in the first place (see, the whole anatomy of a game is O/W).

In spite of all that, why, you don't have time and the pc doesn't have enough body years to run out all those overts, even if you could keep him in-session that long, even if he could spot them all that long. And you don't even have time to run them out for one lifetime. How do you like that? And you haven't got time to sit around watching a pc's dirty needle go bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, and try to settle it with General O/W. Recurring withholds will result.

General O/W, of course, is enough to straighten out the thing and get the session running, and all that sort of thing – a very valuable process; don't think I'm running it down. I'm just going to say it's too lengthy for that sort of thing.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody's missed withholds, I want you to pick up another person's action and not the pc's action. And it's best characterized as "nearly found out." Don't ask the pc for a missed withhold because he obviously, I have learned lately, he doesn't know any more of what I've been talking about than you have. See, you'd have to explain the whole anatomy to him. So there's got to be a better thing, see?
It – "What did we almost find out about you?" It's got to be that "almost." It's got to be "might have." It's got to be some conditional word. And then you will see a case suddenly go *spoing!* *nyyow!* and pick up the – a funniest, funniest series of disrelated incidents that that case had never looked at before, never had anything to do with it before. You'll see the tone arm do peculiar things and the needle do peculiar things that you've never seen it do on O/W because you're running a different track. You're running the "almost discovered" track.

Now let me give you an example. Once upon a time I was up in the wilderness and wilds of Montana, and for some reason or other, a wolf, gray timber wolf, showed up and I shot a bullet over his head. I don't know just exactly why I shot at him because I never have any trouble with animals. I was very young at the time. And he heard this bullet go by over his head and he reached up and he snapped at the place where the bullet had been. And he decided to come my way. It upset him to be missed.

Honest, you never quite see anybody quite so upset as somebody who has been just barely missed. Look at a pedestrian who was not hit. [laughter] The examinations flunks which you're most upset about were those which you passed all except for the last half of the last question. See? That's the nearness of the miss. In other words, missing things upsets things. It's a misestimation of effort or thought or something of the sort.

Now, a thetan's main attention is on estimation of effort, estimation of thought, estimation of look. He wants to know how much look is a look and so forth, and his certainties are all based on proper estimation of how much look is a look and all that sort of thing. See, just look at your Know to Mystery Scale, you see? How much knowledge is knowingness, see? That's an estimation. University is very simple. University hands you an old school tie, and you now know that you have the knowledge necessary, see? You can wave a pennant with your right hand so many motions to the left under the sis-boom-bah, and you're all set in life. That's how much knowledge, you see, is necessary to be knowledge. So that's an estimation of knowledge.

Now, you can go right on down the scale and how much emotion does it take to be emotional? How much emotion is emotional? Well, you get lots of answers to that: enough to create an effect on somebody. If you're a TV actress, it's very simple: enough to please the sponsor. You can go on down and take another one at random. What is a proper symbol? How proper is a symbol when it is a symbol, see?

Well, you can estimate everything, except "How much mystery is a mystery?" And of course that's a mystery. You're into the no-estimation-of-effort band. No estimation of the think, no estimation of anything; it's all mysterious. You don't know. The not-knowingness of it all is what is upsetting.

But now you take a not-knowingness which is probably known and play it both ways. Now, they knew but they didn't or couldn't have known, and you knew that they knew but you knew they didn't know.

Now let's just get the four-way flows on a not-know and you've got a missed withhold. And it's very painful to a thetan. So I really don't blame you for avoiding it like a plague.
See, the fellow walks up to the girl and he smiles and he looks at her in a sort of a false smile and he says, "Well, little girl, I understand you like dogs." Well, right away, her concept of him is – is "Did he know? Didn't he know? He couldn't have known," she thinks to herself. "He must know." But then complicated into this is the fact that he looks like he knows but he hasn't said enough to indicate that he did know, so he doesn't know. It's strictly ding, ding, ding, here comes the wagon, you know? Strictly. This is the stuff out of which insanity gets made, see?

It's a can't reach, not reach, must reach situation, and so forth, in the effort band. When you get insanity in the mystery band, it's a "did know, but didn't know, but mustn't know," you see? But he must know, but he mustn't know, you see, and it's the sort of reach and withdraw, only it's not a mechanical thing. And there it is and it's just pure mystery mucilage. And a thetan will stick right to it, man. Now, in trying to pull off the overt and the withhold in the presence of something that has a missed withhold on it does not accomplish an as-isness of the section of track in which the pc is stuck. Because the pc is not stuck with the overt and is not stuck with the withhold; the pc is stuck with the "almost found out." So, of course, nothing as-ises and you get a recurring withhold, see, because he isn't looking at that section of track where he did it or where he's withholding it. He's only looking at that section of track where it was almost found out. And you ask him for what he did and what he withheld, you don't as-is the section of track he's stuck in. So therefore, it just perpetuates itself and goes on forever.

And if you want to see something very remarkable in a pc, just very remarkable in a pc, just sit down in apropos of nothing, after you've got the pc in-session and so forth, just start running in any command sequence, "Well, just get the idea of nearly being found out." See, it has to be nearly being found out, see? "Get the idea of somebody nearly finding out about you." "Get the idea of you nearly finding out about another" – that's an unnecessary leg to the thing, but you could make it up – and the next thing, more track would be going by that this person had never heard of before. Didn't matter what else you'd run. That's got a brand-new track area. They've never seen this track before and it's been with them all the time. It's what's stuck out in front of their noses. Directly in front of their noses.

I could just ask you at this exact instant to "Recall a time you were nearly found out." Now go ahead, think of a time you were nearly found out. ... Having any trouble finding this time you were nearly found out?

Well, I shouldn't think so because that's the bulk of the stuff in front of your schnozzola. Most people can't even find an engram, merely because there are so many missed withholds in front of their faces. They can't get any clear view of anything, because they got missed withholds in front of their faces.

"Did they really know or didn't they? Was I actually discovered at that time or wasn't I?" See, that is the question.

"Who has nearly known about you?" Think that over for a while, you'll come up with people you have been leery of or felt nervous around.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody's missed withholds on Scientology, I don't want you to pick up the overt's that they have been withholding. See? I couldn't care less about
these overts, don't you see, that they have been withholding. That they have been withholding them, oh, all right, so they have been withholding them. You can get TA action by finding all the things the fellow has been withholding. That's good. That's fine. But this is a junior action. That would be asking you to run General O/W on a pc. That'd have nothing to do with missed withholds.

Now, when I ask you to find out something about missed withholds, get this pc's missed withholds. Don't you dare come up with any withholds. Just don't you dare! I want the name, rank and serial number of the person who missed it. God, I couldn't care less what was missed. You understand? I don't want the pc's actions, I want the pc's guesses about the other guy, see? That's what I'm asking you to find out.

Now, this is very arduous to run, because sometimes you actually have to bear down on it if your command has not been sufficiently explicit. You have to direct the pc's attention rather heavily. Let's say you've run a lot of O/W and so forth. Well now, you think you've got this all licked, you see? This person has been taking things from their company, you see? And you've run this – and they're taking things from their company and stealing them, actually, and you think you got it all licked. You've got the number of fountain pens and the number of stenographers, and all these things they've stolen from their company, you see? And you think you've got a tabulated list now and you say, "Well, that cured it" and so forth, and next week, why, they take a typewriter.

There's something missing here, something – something went wrong. You got all of the overts, and you got the fact they were withholding it. They're not now withholding because they told you – see, there's the rationale. And so therefore it's now all hunky-dory, and so they go back and steal a typewriter and the week after steal the boss's secretary, see? They're still nervous about the company. The person is not in a forgive-or-forget mood about the company. See, that's because they've gotten off these overts, why, you have a feeling, and your feeling is quite right by the way – you're not totally stupid – your feeling is quite right when you suppose that after they've gotten this straightened out in their mind they'll feel all right about the company. And they very often don't. They feel propitiative or they feel sort of guilty, or they feel some other weird misemotional way about the target of these overts and withholds, and you don't feel this is right. And so you keep plunging and asking for something else they did. And if there's anything guaranteed to drive the pc round the bend, it's after he has told you everything he has did, you insist there must be something else the pc has did-did did. You're in essence cleaning a clean, see?

Now, actually, because you sense that this pc is still a little bit "mnyah" about the company, why, then you assume there must have been some other overt. Well, he can always dig up another one or two, or something like this, and the basic on the chain, and... And the trouble is you so often have a near win on this that you really never get your win. You sort of quit eating just before dessert.

And there was a lot of people that were with us in 50, 51, that sort of thing, are starting to write me now and they're starting to get in contact again and that sort of thing.

I just sort of laugh rather raucously, by the way. The last one that did, I said he quit before dessert, you know? I'd realized after I had mailed the letter that I had missed a wonder-
ful sort of an epigrammatic sort of thing that he deserted before the dessert, you know, but it's – that's what you're denying yourself. You're denying yourself a forkful of strawberries and cream, see? You quit with the gravy and mashed potatoes, you know? There's still one more course.

So, he stole a typewriter, and he stole an eraser, and he did this, and he withheld it from this person, he withheld it from that person, and he stole the boss's secretary, and he goes so, and yes, all fine. Yes. And he's withheld it all these years, and now you know about it, and that's fine.

And he's sort of still kind of blowy and sort of nattery about the company a little bit. A week or so later, you see him; he really doesn't feel good about the company, and so forth. Well, you just quit before the dessert was served, that's all. You've got to find out who nearly discovered this, when and how often? And he'll give you exact split instants. Now. Now. Now. Now. All of a sudden he goes "Uu-huugh-coooo. I should say so. Ohhhh!"

See, the idea is you've gotten off all the overts, you've gotten off all the withholds, and he still doesn't like the Materiel Executive. Got the idea? He still feels a little peculiar in some parts of the organization. You see, you really didn't clean it up. Because the key-in – the bullet that passed almost into his ear but not quite, you know, just fanned air – was one day the Materiel Executive stepped out of the back door putting an inventory sheet in his pocket and looked at him rather frowningly and went on by into his office. Like somebody who has been in a hotel that has thin rooms and floors, you know, and the guy upstairs drops one shoe, you see? Five o'clock in the morning, he's still waiting there for the other shoe, you see?

Next action, you see, never proceeds from this point. We have started a piece of time track here which doesn't go anywhere. Next action is he's – you see, he's doing all this quite reactively, and it's down underneath the surface of analysis, you know? I mean, at the surface of his analytical processes. And he saw the fellow do this, and he knew it made him nervous, and he goes back in, and he doesn't want to have the phone ring. Because he knows what's now going to happen, you see? If the fellow did know, this is what's going to happen: You see, the phone is going to ring, and he's going to be sent for by one of the directors of the company, and then one of two things will happen. They will either hand him the pink slip, or there will be a policeman standing there, see? And then there's two choices that come out of that, and if it's the policeman, that's got one choice, you see? And you get a big dramatic sequence about the trial, you see, and he has to have all of the bad things the company did to him, and how it's actually one of the junior directors trying to cover up. See, he's got to have all the whole story manufactured for this, but is there any reason to manufacture the story? Did the Materiel Executive really know? See?

Here we've got the track that goes nowhere, don't you see? And it could develop into track, but is it going to develop into track or isn't it going to develop into track? Here's where this thing – just as far as time is concerned, it becomes a mystery sandwich and there's no time in it because those events don't take place. So therefore, there is no time track for it so the – which hangs it. It's not spotted in time. It doesn't fire off right, don't you see? There's nothing goes right about it at all because this isn't any estimation of it. You can't figure out what you would do because it didn't happen. You can't figure out what you would have said
because nobody said it. You can't figure out what explanation was the right explanation because you never had to explain it. You see? But you should have explained it, but you didn't. So there's just nothing known and you just get this terrific area of just total – it's not even hardly a positive-negative. It's just *thaah*. And that's a missed withhold.

And the missed withhold depends on the other guy – the accidental action of another person.

Sometimes it'll be a piece of paper, or something like that. He's sitting there. He's sitting there in conference and he suddenly notices that just showing in the boss's in-basket is a memorandum with his own name just showing above the covering pieces of paper. That conference is ruined for him. You see, he never has another thing to say during the whole conference. He sort of sits there and sweats, you know? But he really doesn't quite realize what he's sweating about. You see, there's his name on a memorandum. He doesn't know what the memorandum is about except that it concerns him in some way and he can't see what the subject of it is, do you see?

Now actually, three people are standing together in the hall, you come by and they shut up. There's a very good missed withhold situation. If that was preceded by an overt which the person wasn't telling anybody about, if that was the morning after the high-school girl's first raw escapade – see, the truth of the matter is that they probably had their mouths full of candy and couldn't talk when they went by. [laughter] But then one never really knows what the truth is, you see? No, there's no truth contained in any of it. It's just one huge glob of mystery. And that is a missed withhold.

It's a "should have known" as it has been described, but you will pick it up and be able to relay it much more ably if you call it a "nearly found out." It's a nearly known, see? Nearly found out.

Now, if you wished to clear up somebody's missed withholds on Scientology and you said, "What have we failed to find out about you?" he would give you a whole string of withholds. And this would then go no place, see? No. You want another word, and this will clarify it to you and this will clarify it to the pc and everybody will be as happy as clambakes. Now, "What have we nearly found out about you and when did we nearly find it out?" comes much closer in to what you want, see?

See, you want to know what. Well, he's not likely to give you the rest of it until he has identified, to some degree, what. See, "Well, my escapades with young boys," see, or "wild women or something," see? "That's what you failed to find out about me," you see? That's what he kind of answers. "What did we nearly find out about you?" "My escapades with wild women," see? Oddly enough, that doesn't clarify the situation at all. That doesn't make him like you any better, or anybody else. That doesn't keep him from getting ARC breaks. You've got to follow it up with a second question. Now you've got the missed withhold, see? You've merely identified what the missed withhold was about. You haven't got the missed withhold. Takes some additional step. All right.

"When did we nearly find out about it?" Now you could follow that through a little bit further if it wasn't blowing well with "who?" you see? "Who nearly found out about it?" "When was that?" You get the concatenation of questions – the series of questions – that
would deliver all of this data into your hands. You're looking for moments in the HGC's, D of T's office. You're looking for the instant when the PE Instructor all of a sudden paused. Fellow realized that he'd better cut this short because actually, he's gonna miss his ride home, see? This thought suddenly strikes the PE Instructor, you see? He's liable to miss his ride home, you know? So he'd better cut this short. So he's looking over the class and he fixes his beady eye on one person. Seems to lose track of what he was saying, don't you see?

Said, "Well, all right. Now you understand ARC and we're going to have to conclude the talk this evening. And so, good night," and hurriedly walks out the door. Now, the person his eye accidentally lit on in those pauses goes, "Eeenk," see? Nearly found out. "Did he know? Didn't he know?" See? "Wa-wa-wa-was he on the ri-ri-ri-uh-uhohhh. What did he guess at that moment? What did he recognize about me at that moment? Which one of my various crimes?" You see, here's something else, see? Now he doesn't even know which one of his crimes have been identified. Maybe the Instructor has been talking about the fact that people with big heads have more brains than people with little heads or something, you know? And this person gets some kind of a rationale about this thing.

He couldn't make up his mind whether he had lots of brains or little brains because he's always realized that he had a medium-sized head. See? Now, that's already got a little mystery connected with it, which is just nothing. Then all of a sudden the Instructor seems to completely look down, seems to completely change pace, and then abruptly leaves. And you know there'll be some people leave that PE class very, very nervous, because they realize when they go out the front door that the police are going to be waiting for them?

What did we nearly find out? Well, it isn't good enough to find out just what was nearly found out. We've got to find when it was nearly found out or might have been found out, but doesn't know if it was found out, don't you see? When and by whom? We got to spot these points. And all of a sudden, why, this person, tah! Everything is marvelous. Everything goes off beautifully, smoothly, and there it is.

Now, you can give me a gold star tonight, at least, for trying.

Audience: Yeah!

Thank you.
THE ROAD TO TRUTH

A lecture given on
1 November 1962

All right. Here we are, lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 1 Nov. AD 12.

I could give you a very masterly lecture now on the subject of truth. Truth. You see, I don't really feel up to it, but that's one of these histrionic-type activities – giving lectures on truth. I've stated it much better in other times and places; I didn't keep any notes on what I was saying. It's very difficult. Go around remembering everything, you know, you get stuck.

It's very applicable to talk about truth. If one knows anything about missed withholds or really got the idea of what missed withholds are, why, you have to get some grip on this thing called truth.

There was a fellow by the name of Pontius something-or-other; I think he went around washing his hands all the time. He had some kind of a fixation on it. Freudian complex. Before Dianetics. And he asked this "propoundous propunderance": "What is truth?" And it was a very good thing that he asked that at that particular time: solved everything.

But the point here is that truth is a very near ultimate. See, it's quite close to an absolute in its most severe interpretation. And if you were to say that something is true and not know at the same time the Axiom that absolutes are unobtainable, why, you would fall into the error of putting positives where there existed only maybes; and that is a very, very severe error.

Ah, there's been a lot of blokes on the track of one type or another, some of them wearing kimonos and some of them wearing togas and some of them wearing sandals and some of them wearing nothing at all, and these fellows were always going around telling people what truth is. Chaps like Plato and Socrates and fellows of various moment – philosophers, religionists, vast numbers of people – have been peddling a commodity called truth.

Well, truth is a relative commodity. And the best approach to truth is contained in a mathematics that you probably will have very little knowledge of and I have very little conversation with – it's almost pretentious of me to discuss this mathematics – but it happens to be the mathematics which is used to connect up your telephone switchboards in major cities. It's how they select out subscribers and so forth; they don't select them out with arithmetical truth.

Arithmetic is a theoretical truth but only so because there's no commodity or definiteness connected with it. It is a truth of symbols as long as the symbols remain symbols, and the only errors turn up when people say the symbols mean something and then they get into a great deal of trouble.
They say, "Two minus two equals nothing." Now, that's a very true statement as long as it remains totally in the abstract and is not applied to reality. As soon as we say, "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples" – I don't know, I think this is a pretty good magician's trick. Let's look it over.

A "no apple" is a relative thing. What happened to this apple? Well, the chemicals which composed the apple are still intact. I don't care if it was eaten or boiled or baked or burned or buried, there is still something of an apple.

We say, "Well, there's two apples on the table, so we take two apples off the table and we have no apples on the table." Ah, well, that's true. That's true, there are no apples on the table – providing time is right. Providing we can accept time as a truth, which I consider rather adventurous, too. Because there were two apples on the table. So we have to say, "If there are two apples on the table and we took two apples off the table, there are now, at this moment of mention – which is coincident with the exact removal of and with no reference to the past or future, and with reference only to this table in this place at this time – no apples." Now we're getting much more positive about this, you see? And yet again, that passes as a truth. Well, it probably is, relatively speaking.

But the idea of saying, "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples" is very, very adventurous indeed, because nobody – no thetan since the beginning of the world – if an apple existed, ever totally as-ised an apple. It presupposes the total as-isness of something. See, it presupposes the perfect duplication of a somethingness. It presupposes all kinds of magic. And yet in the course of fact digestion, study, all that sort of thing, over the trillennia, we have become accustomed to accepting such things as true.

Now, the figure two minus the figure two equals the goose egg, nothing. Well, as long as that is an abstract "think," we can say it's true, but then it's only true because we have set it up to be true. And the second we write it on the blackboard, we have pieces of chalk now which are representing the symbols. We have the symbols represented by a symbol. There's a commodity has entered into it and a somethingness has entered into it and it doesn't go someplace. You ever erase a blackboard? You have to wash it pretty darn hard to get rid of the last problem in arithmetic that was written on it. See, you get all these relative facts, relative truths.

Now, the person who adventures out on the road to truth adventures with great desperateness. And I wish to pull a long, gray beard at that particular statement because no statement about truth was ever relatively truer than that one. A person who would adventure on the road to truth is taking a terribly adventurous step, very adventurous. A philosopher who seeks to teach – discover and teach truth, is taking his life in his hands. And that wouldn't be very important, that he is taking his life in his hands. What is far, far more important than that is he is taking his hands the lives of a great many other people. Therein lies his responsibility. I'm not speaking about me. I'm just speaking about philosophers.

Now, what do I mean by "It's a very adventurous thing"? What do I mean by that? It's because that is the only track you have to go the whole way on. There is no short stop on the road to truth. That is the only track that you have to go all the way on. Once you have put
your feet upon that road, you have to walk to its end. Otherwise, all manner of difficulties and upsets will beset you.

There is no such thing as a relative philosophical truth which is safe if it does not approach the actual composition of the subject matter it addresses.

Now, to be just a little less pedantic about it, you address the subject of this universe in the subject of the physical sciences – the sciences, and you're going to find that there are many weird things in your path if you are going to simply address it through the savants of the various (quote) sciences (unquote). Heh! The insouciance of these people, you see, to actually use the word "exact science." It's an incredible impudence.

You walk into the chemistry department, you find one construction of an atom. There it is; it'll be sitting up there someplace around the department or the laboratory, and it'll show you the exact relations of molecules, one to another, in any given element. And there it is; it's all in model form; it's put together with wires – and students can go and look at that, and they're all very fine. And that student will be perfectly all right unless he goes over to the physics department. Because in the physics department they have an entirely different model and that is the same molecule of exactly the same element.

This is marvelous to behold because these two departments are, each one, departments of "exact science." And yet they are very often across the hall from each other. The student gets very confused. He goes into the chemistry department and if he doesn't say, "The atoms are composed this way, that way and the other way," he's gonna flunk, man! And he goes across the hall and here's an entirely different model, has no relationship to the first model, and that is the atom of the same element that he's just been studying. And he's going to get flunked in physics if he doesn't say it's *that* way! I think that's very fascinating. These are exact sciences, are they?

In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* at the turn of the century, there's an article there about time and space which is highly informative. A very wise man wrote that article. And he said he didn't think many people will ever find out very much about time and space until they studied in the field of the mind and got the conceptual basis which preceded time and space. Now, that's in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* at the turn of the century.

With that much wisdom confronting them, you would have thought that the exact sciences then would have pursued some interest in where all this came from. But their mud theory got in their road; they got all stuck up with it, you know? And there was that mud theory. And, oddly enough, it isn't even a new theory. It is found – oh, I think, about three thousand years ago in India, is the origin of our modern, "exact science" mud theory. And I think it originally was described "and it was mud from there on down." They got tired of explaining all this.

Now, there are the boys with their exact sciences and their exact truths, and they're playing with fire. Actually, it may be called "exact science" to them, but when they start telling people that these are truths, that these are absolutes, and then make a model of the atom one way in the chemistry department, and make it the other way in the physics department, I think it's time for somebody to decide they didn't know what they were doing.
The world right now is in most of its trouble because of the (quote) advances (unquote) in the field of physics. In the field of physics they know how to blow something up but not how to keep it from blowing up or retard its blowing up at a distance. See, they have all the overt weapons but none of the preventions for those weapons. I consider this very fascinating because before you build an atom bomb, you should have built a sane man. A sane man precedes the structure.

Now, you have a subject known as workable truth. If you put glue on one piece of paper, you can make it stick to itself or another piece of paper; and that's a workable truth. You can use that. Post Office Department uses it to keep stamps on envelopes and – all kinds of uses for this, you see?

If you dig a hole through a mountain, you can pave the bottom of the hole and cars don't have to drive over the top of the mountain. Don't you see? And a whole series of workable truths go into the construction of this tunnel and this roadway.

Those are workable truths. And this gives the "exact sciences" (quote) (unquote) a very bloated notion of themselves, because they deal with workable truths.

Now, in the field of man, the first workable truth that anybody will try to give you is that "Nobody can do nothing about him nohow," see? "Nothing can be done about it." No truth exists in this field. "Man is an animal based on chemistry." Where the hell did that come from? It's an animism of some kind or another. It's some kind of an odd theory or philosophy that grew up in a revulsion against the control by religion of men's faith.

Psychology – psyche-ology – is a study which is peculiarly religious and is entirely and completely so up to 1879 when a fellow by the name of Wundt at Leipzig, Germany, concluded that men were animals and had no psyches. And he has taken off from the point of no psyche as a theory – but just mud – and has gone forward and you have your modern psychology. Don't let anybody tell you that modern psychology is a product of the physical sciences. Psychology, in general, is totally a product of man's religion of yesteryear; the only place it's been taught has been in seminaries. You get faculty psychology is taught in religious universities. You get Saint Thomas Aquinas, 1200 and something, writing textbooks on the subject and so forth. This was entirely a religious affair.

Well, nobody moved in on it sensibly; somebody moved in on it in a spirit of revolt, just like religion has been blown up here and there down the track, as the years have rolled on, by the advances of the exact sciences, so-called. There had been an awful war in these two things. So the exact sciences have now entrenched themselves in a total falsehood in the field of the mind, at the same time developing a totally unworkable psychology to back up the exact science of blowing up the planet. Isn't that an interesting area to dead-end?

Well, that gives you some of the liabilities of embarking on the track to truth and not going toward truth.

Now, Buddha – Gautama Siddhartha – nobody should say any hard words about this man, because he told everybody he was just a man, he was trying to set men free and he was
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trying to help people out and so forth. And all that was perfectly true. And he discovered how
to exteriorize without being able to stably exteriorize, without discovering any of the rules or
laws of exteriorization, without making it possible for anybody else to exteriorize at will.

How many hundred million people, since twenty-five hundred years ago until now, did
Gautama Siddhartha totally condemn to utter and complete slavery by not walking down that
road all the way?

Because that – those half-truths have been used and used and misused and abused and
booby-trapped and monkeyed up and so forth. That's merely because he didn't go all the way
down the road, don't you see?

Now, knowing this sort of thing, it takes a rather brave man to walk in the direction of
truth because he knows very definitely that he must go on down the road. If he knows any-
thing at all, he realizes that the traps of existence and the upsets of existence are composed of
half-truths, and that all work to amuse or enlighten or something is susceptible to being em-
ployed in the field of enslavement.

The slave makers always use it; it serves as the mechanism to trap by the two-way
flow, don't you see? Somebody comes along and want to set everybody free and naturally the
reverse flow on it is to trap everybody. One has to recognize this as an action.

Well, we take this fellow, Aesop. You've heard all about Aesop; you've read about the
fox and the grapes, and you read about all kinds of Aesop's fables of one kind or another.
Now, I'm sure that you are today a much more moral person, and much better for it.

The only trouble is that the original manuscripts of Aesop were recently located and
there's not a moral in the lot. They are just amusing stories about animals. There is no final
lesson in any one of the stories. Every one of those lessons has been added to Aesop's fables.
And we today are accustomed to think of the moral as a sort of an Aesop's fable thing, you
see: he tells a parable and that teaches us to be good. And that wasn't what Aesop's fables
were; they were simply something to amuse people and lighten the tedious hour. I think it's
quite wonderful. It even enters the field of fairy tales.

Now, all of this is extremely – not apparently very pertinent to what you are doing, but
in actuality it is, because in the microcosm of a single human being, of the single person, you
have the pattern of the macrocosm of the universe. And one could deduce that the universe
exists from a series of basic postulates and proceeds on down the line in development from
those postulates. You could even spot the goal of gold, the goal of lead. You could even spot
the methods of livelihood of quartz, serpentine schist, hornblende, to name some combined
elements – the rules of what they do. It's not that these things are alive at all; it's that they fol-
low a certain dictated behavior pattern.

I was sitting looking at a fly this morning while I was eating breakfast. And he washed
his face in exactly the way that all flies have washed their face for a long time. And he fixed
up his wings in exactly the way flies fix up their wings. And I thought, "I wonder how many
hundred trillion scrillion quadrillion flies have washed their face that way." And I thought to
myself, "By golly, it's wonderful the way some postulates stick." [laughter]
You get dead matter, the world of insects, lichen, moss, man – it doesn't matter; you're actually looking at the same cumulative structure based on certain intentions and dedications. The whole world of chemistry could be reanalyzed on the subject of postulates and intentions. The world of physics could be similarly analyzed.

Instead of sitting there wondering how many "microjilts" are supposed to be imposed into the ohm, an electronics man would much better spend his time, if he really wanted to make some progress, in an effort to analyze the pattern of intention which goes up and constructs a certain power behavior. What is this? And if he could grasp that, then he would grasp electricity. But he shirks his duty by the simple reason that the first statement made to him, as he walks into his polytechnic school or as he joined his Boy Scout troop – doesn't matter where he connects with this stuff called electricity, he always connects with it – and his first postulate on it is "Nobody knows what electricity is."

And this is said to him as though it means something. I think that's wonderful. In fact, everybody knows this statement, but exactly what have they said? Analyze what they've said. They've made a remark. They haven't said anything. They've just remarked something. They haven't even given anybody any reason why nobody should; they haven't told you nobody could.

They just say nobody knows anything about it. Of course, everybody is willing to agree that everybody is stupid, so they let it ride.

That's the craziest thing I ever ran into: "Nobody knows what electricity is." I imagine that's taught that way in Japanese today; I imagine it's taught that way in Swedish, German, French, Italian, to say nothing of English. It'll be soon taught that way in Africanese, Ghanaese, or whatever they talk down there. I can hear it now: "Now, this stuff that goes snap, crackle and pop – you see it here, you know; goes snap, crackle and pop. Well, now, the first thing you should know about this" – they always say this, you see – "the first thing you should know about this, is that nobody knows what it is."

Well, that effectively keeps one from entering any road of truth; that just puts one in a bracket where he can be shocked, blown up, exploded, fried, where he can run out of batteries, where he can go out in the cold morning and start to start his car and not have one start. The direct and immediate results of this statement are everywhere around us today.

Well, that isn't a road that has not been walked down; that is a road that is effectively barred. Everybody said by inference that you can't walk down that road. That's the wildest thing I ever heard of! And yet people have been telling people they couldn't find out about truth for a long time.

And the only reason I really make fun of Immanuel Kant is the outrageousness of his premise. I've even used some section of it – to my shame, but I've really used it – but it's nice stuff to explain with. You say to somebody, "You don't have to know – to begin this subject and to look it over and get some result in it – you don't have to know the totality of everything before you can begin on it." You know, in other words, you don't have to have walked the whole path before you start to walk the whole path. Well, to that degree, "the unknowable" has some use.
But Immanuel Kant didn't use it that way; he used it entirely differently. He said there was the knowable and there was the unknowable; and he said the unknowable ain't never gonna be known by nobody. And what I want to know is how did he find out about it? [laughter]

And yet people at this minute are sitting in universities in the world listening with reverence and awe to those outrageous words: that there's an unknowable that nobody will ever know anything about. That's one to really tangle with, man. It's outrageous even by philosophic examination. If you can't ever sense it or experience it or be in time with it or have any clue of its existence, then how do you know it exists to not be known about?

Now, I think you will find that there is a considerable effort on the part of man, wittingly or unwittingly – aberratedly, certainly – to say that certain roads are closed and that those roads must never be opened. "It is very bad to know about the human mind." Well, let me tell you something: if you're alive, you know something about the human mind. And I'll tell you what's dangerous: is never to find out any more about it. That's dangerous!

And man today faces that danger. And in just the last few days – just the last few days – the cobalt 60 was very close to spreading its fallout far and near over the steppes of Russia, and "made in Moscow" (or its suburbs) was about to be scattered, trademarked on scrap iron, all over America.5 Because of what? Because it is so dangerous to begin to know anything about the human mind.

Now, people recognize that it is dangerous to some degree, but don't really realize what really is dangerous. Because they know of the existence of something, not to know all about that thing is dangerous. And they are conceiving that they don't know anything at all about it. And let me propose that to you as the most idiotic premise in the field of the human mind.

There's little Joe Blow down here. And you say, "Do you understand women?"

He says, "Hell, no. No man'd ever understand women." He says, "You can't figure them out. One day they're this way; one day they're that way."

You ask his wife, and you say, "You understand anything about men?"

She said, "Yes, they're a pipe. You know what they're doing. You know what it's all about. Except you never get your way."

What are they talking about? What are they talking about? They're talking about knowing something about somebody's mind, aren't they? Somebody's behavior pattern, aren't they? In other words, they're aware of the existence of think, figure, calculate, in other beings. Well, that has already started on the road to research and knowledge in the human mind; and it is very dangerous to go no further.

So where do we get this thing if you embark upon a line of truth as a special action only proposed or done by a few select individuals. No, it's the shopkeeper and the bus driver
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and everything else. They've all started to know something about it. But it would be very dangerous indeed. In fact, it will cause their deaths not to know any more about it than they do.

I mean, that's such an acceptable fact to you, it doesn't even seem to be a startling fact. Not knowing any more about the mind than they do will bring about their demise. They will die from this! Everybody says, "Yes, of course." You see how accepted it is? And yet it's quite a startling fact. They're going to get an ultimate extinction through starting upon this stupid line.

But let's take a specialized case where a group of individuals decide to go for broke on the subject of knowing about the human mind. They're going to make a clean break; they're going to go through this, and they're going to go down the line, and they're going to know all about this, and somebody amongst them is going to tear the answers up left and right, and dig them out from underneath this and that and the other thing, and they're really going to make some progress along that line. Listen, the more they know, the less dangerous it is.

The really dangerous entrance point is to suppose that people think, and know nothing more about it than that. That's dangerous! Not to walk off that point further in the direction of truth, is a dangerous action.

But any philosopher who singles himself out, or any engineer or any research person who singles himself out as the person who is going to be spotted as the person who is walking that track – now, that becomes very, very dangerous if this person doesn't walk the whole track. See, that's selectively dangerous. You share in some of that dangerousness.

It's been so booby-trapped that everything is very suspicious of anything being known, because people who have jumped up and said something is known, have very often lied. Now, if they have pretended to know more than other people on this subject, they have then committed overt. And if they have then turned up some little piece of bric-a-brac and have never gotten any further than that, but spread this bric-a-brac in all directions as "the true wisdom," they have committed the overt of committing perhaps millions or billions of human beings to slavery. And I think that's a considerable overt.

So there's no substitute for walking the track. You've got to go on down that road, particularly in a spot such as mine. You got to bring this off, man.

Now, there's never been any doubt in my mind about bringing off this particular study. This is not something I have engaged in any doubts about.

I've sometimes wondered whether or not the time factor wouldn't upset things, because we also have another time factor involved over here called a "world situation" and I've needed a few clear years, and that has sometimes worried me a little bit.

But the fait accompli was pretty easy to envision, because we'd already made the seven-league boot strides necessary to put us way on down the track toward the end of track anyway.

But now, if you have a reputation for knowing, you enter into a mechanism known as the missed withhold. And as you go down this track, separate from and distinct from your fellows, as being one specially gifted in the subject of knowing about the mind, you have en-
tered into, now, a peculiar liability that has nothing to do with the reaction or liability for simply treading the track of truth. That has nothing to do with that. This is a reputational action. People think that you know the truth and to them the only truth that exists is themselves. It's a first dynamic truth; their conception of truth is their own aberrations, misdeeds and ideas of right or wrong conduct.

Now, every philosopher has more or less been engaged upon a selection of ideas of rightness of conduct and wrongness of conduct. Particularly the Oriental philosopher has been engaged upon this point. It is totally missing and totally absent from the Western philosopher. He doesn't much talk about the rightness of conduct. He talks about behavior patterns and he talks about social sciences, and he talks about other things. He doesn't even talk about ethnology; this is an almost unknown commodity to him except as he applies this, maybe, to some savage race down on the banks of the Bongo-Bungo. He doesn't realize that ethnology is equally applicable to a savage race living on the banks of Forty-second Street. He actually doesn't approach this subject very closely. He talks about behaviors and he wants to get away from this.

Well, one of the reasons he wants to get away from this is he's totally blind to the possibility that there could be an exact right conduct. See, he speaks of a behavior pattern, not a rightness of conduct, whereas the Oriental philosopher, wishing to lead people in the direction of better ways and that sort of thing – Lao-tse, Confucius, particularly – these chaps are fixated on the idea of right conduct: the right conduct and the wrong conduct.

And it's to a point where, in Japan, if you drink out of the wrong side of the tea bowl, you know, you've practically had it; you're socially ostracized. There's another island country where if you don't cross your knife and fork in an exact way in the middle of your plate, nobody ever invites you to dinner again. These are rightness and wrongness of conduct, and it's adjudicated in those particular ways.

The crux of the situation is that all behavior is built – all considerations of behavior, all considerations of the O/W mechanism, are primarily based on ideas of right and wrong conduct. Back of the O/W mechanism is the idea that right conduct can exist. This is the only saving grace of the human race or of any race of beings. It's a rather touching thing if you get down and think about it: the idea that right conduct can exist. It's quite remarkable.

Of course, right conduct according to whom? It's the group mores, your survival factors are put together on this. Your Polynesian with his taboos was trying to maintain a very compact population in an area that raised very little food and therefore was incapable of supporting overpopulations and so forth, so he invented a taboo system, and he made a whole series of rightnesses of conduct. Actually, survival is your monitoring factor of rightness of conduct.

But it is not that an individual acts for his self-preservation and commits overts because of his self-preservation. That is too direct a look. He commits overts because of survival. It is his rightness of conduct, see? It's a slightly split-hair difference, if you follow the thing.

The behaviorist would try to tell you that it was – he is a – there is a school of activity known as behaviorism; I didn't refer to that. They try to say that it is totally and only and al-
ways a first dynamic existence, and therefore it isn't survival, it's self-preservation. And by this, they miss the whole boat. They don't even put their foot on the gangplank. They hardly even walk up to the right dock, you know, and they go right on off into the river. No boat there. Never intended to be one there, either. I mean, that's really missing the boat. Because right conduct is always a group activity and is never an individual activity.

No matter how much the individual speaks about integrity to himself, it breaks down eventually into a group activity because his ideas of his own rightness of conduct are based on the group to which he belongs.

So we get the third dynamic aberration of right conduct as underlying all O/W, underlying even missed withholds. The only thing senior to it is the pure, pure mechanics of existence: There is a thetan and a thetan does these things, you see? Your very early Axioms are quite unrelative as truths. They're just about as close to truths as anybody will ever be able to push it, see? They're right up there pushing the Axiom "absolutes are unobtainable" so close that there is hardly any distinguishing it at all.

But the aberrations which he then engages upon are his efforts to discover right conduct: What is right conduct in self? What is right conduct in others? What is wrong conduct in self? What is wrong conduct in others? And, of course, from lifetime to lifetime he lives in different groups and his sets of mores change and change and change and change.

So there is no road to truth on the subject of right conduct. You just study nothing but what is right conduct and then take what the group says is right conduct and you're not going to wind up with truth.

Now, if you realize that it's a search for right conduct and an effort to adhere to codes of right conduct and breaking of codes of right conduct, which then bring about the aberrated condition, then you are walking a road to truth.

Now, let's get this subtle difference; it's quite important to thee and me. Borrowing liberally from the Book of the Winds and Book of Changes and so forth: Confucius, he say, "Young man who support elderly parents, he good man," see? Well, that's perfectly all right, right up to the moment when somebody says, "This is truth," because this is not truth! This is only a species of right conduct; it's only a belief of right conduct. In other words, it's actually an entrance of arbitraries into conduct. And therefore, if the entrance of arbitraries can be considered truth, I think we've all had it.

That would make all the laws passed by the US government, the English government, the Chinese government, true.

Particularly today, the US government is always trying to legislate truth into existence. I think it's the most marvelous activity; highly complimentary. I mean, fellows trying to lift elephants with their little finger should always be patted on the back and so forth. But I think it should also be pointed out to them that those elephants are a little heavier than the stress-analysis structure of the small finger.

They're always trying to say their laws are true. They no longer consult the customs of the people in order to pass their cotton-picking laws. And man, how crazy can you get? Where are you going to go for law? Because any law professor I ever had that was worth his
salt and was a good Joe always made this practically his first point: Laws are evolved from customs of the people and are eventually solidified in the form of Legislation and become a law of the land. A law which does not so progress either operates as a total tyranny or is totally unenforceable.

You want to know what's a tyrannical law or a law you can't enforce? It's a law that doesn't evolve from the customs and mores of the people. That's unenforceable. Can give you numerous examples of this sort of thing. Prohibition: Somebody came along and said, "It's evil to drink." I don't know what the population of the United States was at that time; must have been upwards to a hundred million people. And there were only a few of them who agreed with that. They waited till some ten million men were in uniform, or something like that – or maybe it wasn't that many – and couldn't vote at that particular time, and then they passed this law into existence. And these fellows came home and found out that it was illegal to drink and they didn't agree with this.

So Prohibition was a mockery. I don't know how many lives it cost, how much revenue it cost, how much property it destroyed and so forth, and finally even the great and mighty government threw in its sponge – said, "Lap it up; we can't do a thing about it."

In other words, not the whole Army, Navy, Coast Guard and everything else – nobody could enforce this thing. Nobody. It wasn't borne out of the customs of the people. In other words, it went straight in the teeth of what people considered as right conduct. In those days, if a man was a man he held his liquor. What if there was no liquor to hold? He had no definition for a man. [laughter] In other words, you just pull the rug out, man. Pull the rug out.

Well, this concerns you very vitally. At a very – I very seldom talk to you at a high level of theory – but actually does concern you considerably. It does, because all around you, people are determining truth from what people say right conduct is. See, they say, "Well, you're supposed to do this and supposed to do that and supposed-to's, supposed-to's, supposed-to's, and these things are true."

I'll give you one of these data – one of these data that's very, very interesting – a datum concerning kleptomaniacs, developed in the field of psychoanalysis. "When a kleptomaniac can't steal anything, he always burns down the house." That's a scientific datum in psychoanalysis. You think I'm joking, you know. I never actually throw a total punch in this particular line till I can get these textbooks and open them up and start actually reading them at random.

You want to really have a ball sometime, get somebody like Karen Horney, textbook, and sit down with four or five – well, fairly sensible blokes of some kind or another, and just start reading them, with a straight face, from any point in the book forward. Anything I've ever said in the field just turns pale. You see, I'm a moderate in this line; I don't like to exaggerate. But they won't believe you. If you sit there with your face toward them, the back of the book toward them, and actually just read out of the textbook, they will not believe that you are reading the latest and best school of psychoanalysis. They'll think you're pulling jokes. They'll think it's just nothing but solid gag from one paragraph to the next.

I finally one day saw an engineer – to a group of engineers that were being treated in this fashion – actually, just in a rage, get up and go around back of the fellow who was read-
ing it aloud, and jerk the book out of his hands. And he didn't even want to read it! And that engineer that pulled the book out of his hands had to actually be forcefully held up against the wall and the book had to be shown to him, and that the person in that chair was actually reading exactly what was in that textbook on the subject of psychoanalysis. And when he did, at that moment the engineer, for the first time in his life, realized there wasn't a science of the human mind extant on the planet. Up to that time the reason he paid no attention to Dianetics and Scientology: he thought there was a science of the mind.

Now, that's one of the primary things that you run into. People have a whole bunch of data over here which are what they're supposed to do, and these are right conduct – and that to them is truth – and what you're not supposed to do.

For instance, the law defines sanity as the ability to tell right from wrong. I consider this marvelous. In what land? Well, don't ever try a Zulu in an English court. And don't ever try to try an Englishman in a Zulu court. Because there's going to be some things messed up, going to be some withholds missed.

Now, here's your peril (your period of peril is past, to be alliterative): It was over a period of time as to whether or not – taking you as a unit of truth – you, individually, could have your state of understanding of yourself and those around you materially improved by study and processing. Now, if anybody will sit still long enough and if the auditor will do the right things at the right time, why, this is going to happen today; this is going to happen.

You could also carry it out to very nearly an ultimate, very close to it. You can get the fellow back to a point of his total realization and recognition of exactly what he has done and where he has gone – in other words, clearing – and exactly how he's done it, and how it formed up, and so forth. And if you were to take raw meat and push them up to a three- or four-goal Clear, why, they might not tell you for other people, they might not be able to articulate it (which is the main trick, after all), but you hand them a book of Axioms and they say at that time, "Of course. What are you showing me these for?" Or "Oh, yes. Yes. Oh, yes, of course, of course. That. Oh, yes, yes. That, right. Of course, naturally. Yeah, that's right, that's right, that's right, that's – of course. Yeah, that's pretty good." And mostly what they're saying is "pretty good" is "That's fairly well stated. Yes, I'd say the same myself if I could." All they're doing really is expressing some kind of an agreement. You're not teaching them anything, because they now have a subjective reality on it.

We've got a reverse-end look on this thing and we're starting at the point which is hardest to start, as everybody is stupid as hell on the subject, see? And originally and basically that included me, see? So you see where we have went to.

Now, we are essentially in the business of individuals and you must never forget that. On the road to truth, you are in the business of individuals. I could give you a long and tiradious lecture on the subject of the third dynamic and how it gets loused up, but I don't think it'd serve anybody's purpose. Just let me say en passant that most organizations, as they exist on Earth today, exist, in their first instant of genus, on the fact that they could not handle an individual, one individual. The failure to handle that one individual then brought about, not their demise, but their construction.
All organizations on this planet today can be evolved from the first moment of failure to handle one individual. They couldn't handle him, they couldn't understand him, they couldn't reach him, they couldn't help him, they couldn't solve his problems, and so they set up an organization to do it. That organization directly and immediately evolves from the failure to handle that individual.

Now, this doesn't tell you that this is true of all third dynamic activities. This only says "Earth," and this only says "aberrated third dynamic activities." But it's an inversion. You're on the lower scale. You're way below the first dynamic. They couldn't handle the first dynamic, so they developed an organization not to do it.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. An organization tends to grow up even around me, to this degree. Yet we're the one organization or the one activity on this planet at this time that doesn't follow this. But it gets pulled in toward it every now and then, as you – every one of you – know, to your experience. At some time or another, an organization in Scientology has not given you an answer or sent you a book or done something or served your needs at that particular moment or purpose. See? Well, it's all based on this thing. It's just not enough MEST or time or space or speed or something of the sort, in order to have delivered that service. But we are the only group that would be capable of doing it and that do succeed in it. We are handling the individual.

And you will never, in your whole history, handle more than an individual. I don't care what you're trying to handle or if you've set up a government for the planet. You will only be handling one individual; not one individual multiplied many times. Russia shoots individual and loves the masses. I think that's quite marvelous. How did they get that way? Well, it's a total aberration on the subject. You follow what I'm saying now?

Now, you can do this if everything you do do, does serve the individual, individually and peculiarly tailored to his needs so that he is not overlooked in the process. But you set up an eddy and an upset every time you have failed to handle one individual. You handle one individual and everything is fine; and you handle – you fail to handle an individual and you will set up an organization to try to do it. You'll set up all kinds of things to try to do it! You'll set up all kinds of brutal laws and jurisprudence and everything else to try to do it! Where you have failed to handle an individual, you will set up all sorts of O/W.

In Scientology, we're probably the only organization that has any capability at all of going in the direction of a clear third dynamic, and we're going in that direction. We use O/W today to park somebody till we can handle him. We never forget we're handling an individual. And I never forget I'm handling an individual. I'm not handling "people," ever. I'm handling you and you and you and you. Because you are truth. I don't care what you look at as truth to begin with or what you will look at as truth at the end of the line; if there's any truth to be found, you're it. If there's any truth to be known, it'll be you who will know it. And beyond that and outside of it, there isn't any truth.

Now, you see what I'm talking about as the road to truth?

_Audience: Mm-mm._
Now, don't you worry about missing withholds on Joe and Pete and Bill as they come into the PE class. Don't worry about that. You won't suffer from it. People won't do bad things to you because you don't know all about them instantly. As somebody just said to me, your confront is very high. A Scientologist's confront is way up and very often when you look at somebody you almost cave him in, because he says, "What-what-what does he know about me?"

Well, your only mistake at that point is not to reach him as truth. You are confronting, that moment, a road to truth and you've got to travel it because you've already started to! You have looked down it!

There is many a pc you'll start to process, or many a human being you will try to tell about Scientology, that you will say, "Why did I get up this morning! It must have been – I knew something was going to happen, because when I put on my left shoe I found it was designed for the right foot. And from that moment on, I could have taken warning and simply gone back to bed. And I didn't. And here I am arguing with this person in this PE Course. And he's saying, 'I understand Ron doesn't believe – doesn't believe in God.'" And you're trying to make some kind of heavy weather out of it or make conversation out of it or trying to fend off this accusation or trying to straighten it up or handle it – you're going to find yourself at that moment on the road to truth.

Well, I'll tell you the wrong thing to do, is unload – jump in the ditch. That's the wrong thing to do. Your success in the future totally depends upon your ability to walk that road and not to jump off of it because all of your disasters anyplace will stem from that exact instant when you failed to walk that road and turned around and did something else and set up an organization to handle this jerk. You see that?

Audience: Yes.

There's this guy. He's saying, "Well, Ron doesn't believe in God. And I understand this. I heard this every place. So how can – you can say he's a truthful man?" See, this guy knows what truth is. You have faith in the big thetan, see? It's kind of a 1984 in... with a cross above it, you know? And that's truth! He's been taught all his life you must have faith in this thing. He's been taught that as right conduct. He sees somebody isn't instantly following down this, and snapping and popping and making the sign of his particular cross. I know of several crosses and how to make several signs of the cross, but we're not making his sign of the cross. So therefore we are not truth.

See, he's got "right conduct" mixed up with "rightness of conduct is the source of aberration," and these are entirely different remarks. He doesn't realize he's nuts! That's one of the first things he has to find out. Well, you're going to find there are many ways to teach him this initial step, and you will fail and you will succeed and you will do this and you will do that. And listen, you will only be wrong – and I'm not now talking about right conduct of a Scientologist; I happen to be talking about survival in the early Axioms at that level – you will only fail if you don't try, if you don't make some stab at it. Because if you make some kind of a stab at it, you'll be surprised; he won't go away even though if you didn't handle him in that first fifteen seconds and you put him on the shelf to pick him up somewhere on the track.
You'll be surprised. This happens to me every once in a while. I processed somebody one day; he was lying in a sickbed. I thought he was going to die. I thought I flipped the whole thing; I thought it was gone, sunk, that was it. Never processed such a lousy session in my life. You know? I couldn't even get the pc practically to answer the auditing command. I got him to say it a few times, you know? And I finally patted him on the shoulder and said, "Well, I hope you'll be all right," and so forth. Tried to put in a little hope factor before I walked out of the room. The man was dying, see?

I actually felt bad about it for – you know – a little bit bad about it for several days. I couldn't get through to the guy. I couldn't do anything for him, you know, and so forth, and there it was, and his whole life all busted up, and that sort of thing. I almost fell off the top of the HASI steps at Notting Hill Gate – and that was a long flight of steps, if you remember. There was this guy, hale and hearty, just having finished another intensive. He'd been alive and well for two years, and he all dated it from that moment of being processed by me.

You'll many times think you fail when you haven't. The only mistake you can make is to try to go backwards on this road to truth. It's not possible without completely caving in. A very, very dangerous thing to do.

So this fellow stands up in the PE class, and he says, "How can you people know anything about truth? I understand Ron doesn't believe in God." What are you going to say? What are you going to say? What are you going to say at that moment? Took you by surprise. You didn't even think he was going to talk! Well, at least be inventive enough to say, "Well, you know, I think you ought to write him about that. Post box out there in the hall. Next question." [laughter]

Well, at least you've made a start. At least you've done something. The wrong thing to do is to back up and construct an organization which handles masses and never handles an individual. Because it is very certain that if you fail to handle this guy who stands up in the PE Course, if you fail to push home your confront on your friend who says he hates you because you might have missed a withhold on him, if you don't say to him, "Well now, just count off the number of times I've nearly found out something about you, Joe. Count them off" – you're not even asking him what you nearly found out, see? – and press it home. The guy finally says, "Well, aziziz-da-da-da-umm," you know? Shatters him! You say, "Well, I failed!" and you probably didn't. You only fail if you didn't try.

So don't worry about the fact that you know more about them than they know themselves. They only stand up to be handled. The only way you're going to build up some kind of a clumsy, stupid mess of a nonfunctional Scientology administrative system will be totally and completely based on the one guy you didn't handle; the one case you didn't solve. Your retreats are all based on that.

Now, I can only tell you from this point of view that every once in a while somebody kicks the bucket and goes totally beyond reach. That doesn't make me feel good but I know very well we'll pick him up later. That's all part of the road to truth.

Various things happen, various catastrophes occur, people get mad at ... You would be utterly amazed how many people write me today who were furious about me four years ago! Utterly incredible.
Now, there is no truth in the mass of things; there is no truth in moral codes. Truth isn't to be found there; only agreements. But in the final analysis, there is truth to be found and there is a road to truth. You have that within you and every time you look at a human being you see it in him. And as you know what it is about, the more you know about it, the more you understand it, the less these factors will trouble you.

But even the little fellow in the bakery shop who's doing nothing but wrap up bread has already started on the road to truth. And his only stupidity is he hasn't got enough sense to keep going.

So don't worry about you being on the road to truth and that it's a very adventurous line or me being on the road to truth; shucks, we're almost there.

Behind us lies the most thorny, messed-up track you ever saw in your life. Wouldn't navigate it again for a – for a box of biscuits. But the truth of the matter is, well, we're there; that road's behind us. Possibly take us quite a while to sit down and find out where we are, now that we're there. [laughter] But that's allowable, too.

But we'll only retreat from our position to the degree that we don't realize this fact: that you can't start a case, you can't embark upon clearing a planet or an individual diffidently without to some degree seeing it through to a final conclusion. And your only disasters will simply stem from your failure to follow that road all the way through.

Think them over and mark them up sometime along the line and you'll see how true those words are.

Thank you very much. Good night.
THE DIFFICULT CASE

A lecture given on 13 November 1962

Thank you.

Well, we haven't seen you for a long time. I took pity on you. I had a lot of material of one kind and another, and I put it into bulletin form last week. I wrote six highly technical bulletins last week – the better to teach you with, my dear.

Okay. This is what?

Audience: 13th of November.

Thirteenth of November, AD 12, first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Nobody has given me a list of goals found or not checked out or anything recently, so I can't give you much of a report on that. I can, however, read to you a very interesting - nonapropos to the lecture I'm going to give you – a very interesting letter which I have received. Undoubtedly it's a personal letter, and I thought you would all be interested in this.

He says, "Dear Ron." We, by the way, are a new address. We're a new address here. We're Saint Hill, England. [laughter] After a while, anybody addressing anything to England will simply write "Saint Hill," you see? [laughs, laughter] Only they'd better not write "The government of Saint Hill up to London."

Anyway, this letter follows: "Dear Ron, As the fellow that won the door prize at the congress, I would like to have some more... like you to have some more reality on me and I want to tell you my view of how things have gone. I am sure you have the auditor's reports.

"Prior to the congress, I was in a particularly bad, withdrawn condition, but I went to the congress with a purpose. After Jim found my goal, I was in a wonderful, euphoric condition. I was dramatizing my goal, but the most significant thing was a complete separateness from bank. The second most significant was a thousandfold increase in communication with people.

"I made arrangements with the Center to start listing. I went Clear on 16 lines in forty hours. During this time I felt increasingly better and more stable. There was a low point at the end of fifteen hours. I wrote a letter describing my case and the auditing. I went out the bottom for three days until I cognited on what had happened. Your advice on not discussing your case in any fashion is absolutely right. My reality is that pcs during goals listing – that is, listing on the goal – are exceptionally sensitive in this regard. It isn't like any type of case auditing.

"I, of course, got many cognitions. The most important resulted in a change in beingness, a change of direction in my life and establishing definite goals as opposed to sometime nebulous goals.
"After the clearing of 16 lines, there were still little edges of uncertainty – doubt on my stability and wonder about reaction to my environment. The next week – I went Clear on 29 September on 16 lines – we proceeded to do the 114 lines. These went free in three hours. The uncertainty and doubts, and so forth, cleared up. In my reality, the final key to Clear was acceptance of total responsibility for me, my body and my bank.

"I have been going back to the Center each Saturday for a check – Tiger Drill and so forth, and a few buttons which might have something in present time on them – but after one or two interrogations the needle cleared. Last Saturday there was nothing. I picked up the cans and according to the auditor read 3.0 with a free needle. I was and am stable in my reality, and all the buttons were clean.

"There seems to be some confusion in the org and HCO about a final Clear check by a Class III Auditor. I have not had the final check as yet, so end-of-cycle is dragging a bit."

That's merely the formality of checkout.

"Now, Ron, about the month since I've been Clear, my environment has gotten very busy and very active with Scientology. I find that my postulates work fantastically quick, easy and without enturbulating problems. I was able to extract my sister from a very messy personal situation that I could not have handled previously. And I was able to communicate with my environment and her without any difficulty and accomplished her enrollment at the Academy as a student in the HCA. First, she took a fifty-hour intensive and made MEST Clear, and this is now an enthusiastic student."

I'll tell you more about that in a minute.

"My wife, Ethel, has completed a fifty-hour intensive and has started listing goals. My family life has never been so smooth, communicative and real. My family responsibilities – all this used to be a problem; it isn't now; it is easy and I love it – my family responsibilities (five dependents) require continuous, sizable income as well as continuing them all in auditing and the HCA. My enrollment in the HCA will be delayed pending the completion of the latter.

"I retire in three weeks from the Air Force, and I will move immediately [laughter] – and I will move immediately into a management position in industry. There I can still contribute to the national defense as well as expedite the progress of my family and myself in Scientology.

"I have, since 1955, occupied myself with Scientology and do consider myself a Scientologist and live accordingly.

"It's a good game, Ron. Let me postulate more good hunting for you and all Scientologists.

"ARC, Bob."

[applause]

Very good, huh? All right. Now the ... Shows you what I can do if I set my mind to it.
Anyway, there's this mention about this girl going MEST Clear. Now, I'm having this looked into at once very thoroughly, but this was done by Fred as an auditor in the HGC in Washington, and he has already given me a very thorough report on this and it was merely a standard Problems Intensive. But it was run very, very permissively, extremely permissively. Not so permissive as somebody in Y Units have been known to do, of leaving the button red-hot and passing on to the next button. But no Q and A of any kind.

It was just cleaning it up, you know. I mean just a standard, smooth auditing job. There were no frills on this thing. And this girl was stuck up at about 4.5 or 5, very rough, very wobbly, sticky needle, inclined to all manner of – well, poor auditing reactions we would call them – and life had been a bit of a this and that. And he just went in with this Problems Intensive. And he did the first twenty-five hours and she got quite a bit of good out of it. So he did a second twenty-five-hour Problem Intensive. And at the end of that time, her tone arm was at 2, her needle was free on all buttons, and nobody could get any kicks out of the meter. I think this is very interesting.

It opens up this chapter to us that a Problems Intensive is apparently capable of producing an old Book One MEST Clear. And it opens up this very suspicious – two very suspicious points for me: is what are they doing elsewhere with this Problems Intensive? How much Q and A? How many lousy assessments? How much no-follow-through? Well, somebody went back from here and gave his wife – who was stuck up at about 5 or something like that – he tried to find some goals, and he couldn't get to anyplace, so he went immediately into a Problems Intensive, and he brought her tone arm down to 2, and everything was looking much better and she was feeling much better and everything was fine. The dirty needle was gone, and all that.

Well, this is very interesting. It may just be that people don't know what a free needle is because there's people who've had as many as three Problems Intensives up in London.

Well, the tone arm comes down and everything, but they don't mention free needles. You understand? I mean this is either a fantastic piece of lousy observation on the part of auditors or there's something very rough about their auditing or something else is occurring that we don't know anything about. Well, I consider this very, very interesting as a sudden breakthrough.

And – some of you know Johnny, he's an old-time Dianeticist – and he heard about this in the HGC, so he says, "I just want to make sure that this is put down as a matter of record," and wrote me about the case. He evidently was the one who got everybody to report it. Now, this needle was inspected by person after person – Saint Hill graduates, see, and it was free, free needle. Problems Intensive – MEST Clear. Of course, that's a Key-Out Clear, but that grades up with what we were doing two years ago with Routine 3.

Now, I want you to put a little attention on this. I'm going to have some more to say about this in bulletins, and so forth. But if you're running Problems Intensives, apparently, they have a capability – when run right and assessed right and done right – they have a capability of producing a MEST Clear. So pay some attention to this. Why aren't they getting them? Why aren't they being reported elsewhere.
I think it was somebody like Johnny, who after twelve years of being around and knowing the answers to things, he said, "Hey! You better tell Ron about this, you know. I want this to be a matter of record, you know." Because he's very interested in special programs over there, and he's doing this health and suppress program angle. And of course, he looks for a lot of these Problems Intensives to be run on a co-audit basis.

So either everybody's been stone-blind or they're varying the procedure of a Problems Intensive or this is just a freak. But I don't think this is a freak because this was an extraordinarily rough case.

All right. You want to make some comment perhaps on the speed with which these lines cleaned. Don't think that this was an easy case. And this is the lecture I'm going to talk to you about here, the first lecture is "Cases, Types Of." As far as clearing is concerned, there are many types of cases.

But this was a rock slammer. He was a rock slammer, Bob. Rock slammer is severely defined not as somebody who rock slams but somebody who believes Scientology is in opposition to his goal or some part of it.

Now, he was not an easy case. He was not easy to assess. You couldn't even tiger drill a goal out on him except at the point of a drawn gun practically. And we picked off his goal on the fly. You know, there it went by on the E-Meter.

And I only got this, is what would be the – here's how we got his goal: I told Jim to ask him – we would have gotten his goal twenty-four hours earlier if this action had been reported to me when it was done – I told him to ask him, "What would be the consequences of our clearing you?" and to be sure and report to me the answers. The answers were reported to me much later than they should have been. I didn't ever see the – the needle was slamming when he first came up to be volunteered and tested, you see. But on what nobody noticed.

And "the consequences of our clearing you" were so catastrophic and so terrible that I merely says – using a term we use now to this effect – "The guy's a rock slammer. All right. List goals which would be in opposition to Scientology." It didn't even have to actually be picked off on the meter as it went by. That was not a fluke. It would have been on the list anyway.

All right. Now... The goal was "to live" by the way. Now, this fellow was not an easy case but he was very, very well audited. He had about three, four Saint Hill graduates sitting on the back of his neck, see. That thing was being piloted through with a very close hand. It simply amounted – nothing clever, but very usual auditing with nothing unusual occurring, you understand? Very usual auditing. Nobody Q-and-Aing. Nobody bullying him. Nobody doing this.

So therefore, we must take up this aspect of auditing: is, there is a case and then the aspect of the case depends on the way the case is handled in most cases. You understand? Now, that's the first, first thing that you must recognize in classifying cases or types of cases or relatively difficult cases. The first thing which you've got to recognize is this one, see: that the way the case is handled – even to the degree of sometimes you entered it unluckily – see, the way the case is handled gives you an aspect of relative ease or relative toughness of case.
That's about the first thing an auditor should learn about cases, that the way the case is handled has a great deal to do with how rough the case looks.

Now, we're talking now completely free of OCAs, APAs, graphs, tests or anything like that, see. Case A, Case B. They're both, you might say, similarly difficult cases. But Case A is handled with great usualness with very, very good, smooth, unexcited, unupsetting approach with a lot of hope factor, a lot of R-factor, and so forth, and runs like an easy case.

And then there's Case B. And this Case B, let us say, is handled with great unusualness. Well, they enter it from the wrong side and it's prepchecked on the wrong buttons and there's ARC breaks and there's present time problems running and they never kept the rudiments in, don't you see? And Case B pretty soon is sitting in the pc's chair self-auditing and getting his own rudiments in and coming down the can leads to the auditor, don't you see? Looks like a fantastically rough case. Becomes in appearance an impossible case. See, break anybody's heart. And yet they're similar cases.

Now, you should recognize that as an influencing factor in determining whether cases are easy or tough. Now, I'll give you a wonderful example of this. Psychiatric classification, psychiatric treatment, behavior in life, all these things have no bearing - within reasonable limits - have no bearing on the ease with which you're going to handle the case, see.

What the person does in life, person's psychiatric classification, neurosis - any of these things, don't you see? I mean these have no bearing on whether that case is going to be easy to handle or tough to handle. You can just throw overboard any preconception about the fact that he's a black five or she's a theetie-weetie, or any of your case classifications. I don't care whether it's our classifications or some, ha! classifications they've had in the past like the Kraepelin category.

You know, everybody thinks that's a joke, you know, and it's not, you know. That's the basic psychiatric classification of cases. It's the Kraepelin code.

Now, it just doesn't matter. This amusing example I'm going to tell you about - I've mentioned it in lectures before, but for other purposes. This girl stumbles in the front door. Some auditor up in Spokane had gotten furious with her in a session and practically spun her in. She'd had a long, bad history of treatment and mental nonsense. And so she stumbled in the front door - and Suzie happened to be doing some Registrar work and at that particular time I was auditing outside cases - and she came in and - it wasn't a question of her buying auditing - and Suzie asked her for her name. And so she offered several names so Suzie could take her choice because she didn't know.

She couldn't remember her name. She didn't know who she was. And, man, you talk about somebody that apparently was in foul shape, you see. Well, somebody would practically have put her in restraint. If she'd ever walked in front of a mental hospital, up to the front entrance, why, they would have sent for the butterfly nets, you see, at once. And so I just grabbed ahold of her. I think I audited her, in all, two hours and a half. I think I audited her two sessions - total about two hours and a half. It was - it wasn't any - it wasn't any purchased intensive or anything else. I just saw the girl and I called her in my office and audited her. All right.
And I really didn't run anything very sensible on her. I sort of asked her what she was trying to do, you know, and what things were. And I gave her a few tests, and so forth. She did anything I asked her to do in the way of a mental put-together, don't you see? And she realized that she was sort of trying to disgrace herself – what she came to realize. I was giving her kind of an SCS. That's what I was doing with her, and I wasn't even escorting her. I was telling her to walk across the room and notice she didn't run into anything. I remember that was one of the processes. And didn't run into anything until she ran into something, you know? It was a great relief to her to find out there were no barriers except where there were barriers. You know, she was getting oriented.

And then she finally found out she was trying to get even with her parents by becoming a prostitute. And this seemed to be a big cognition to her of one kind or another. And I know there must have been a couple of moments there when we shed items of some kind, and – because she recognized things. She all of a sudden remembered her name and all that. And I knocked out a bad auditing session she'd had up in Spokane. And she went out of there walking straight up, and beautiful shape, and she went out and met some nice guy and got married and that was it. Now, the length of time it took to handle the case does not compare, let me point out to you, with the terrible state of the case.

Now, you see, I've done this often enough now and had it happen often enough that I don't pay any attention to the pre-Scientology state of the case. I pay no attention to that at all. Quite fascinating. Now, some case or another which has a tendency of spinning or something like that is hard to spot, but let me tell you, it takes awfully rough Scientology to make them hard.

You see, now, I'm trying to bring this up to you: We're making our own hard cases, see. We get preconcepts of some kind or another as to whether cases are easy or hard. And you'll get some poor case that's got a terrible reputation in the HGC, you see, for being a horrible case. And then the auditors don't quite want this case, and all this kind of thing is going on. And this fellow gets a reputation for being a tough case, and he's a tough case.

Now, I'm not saying that all cases are easy. No, I'm saying quite the reverse: All cases are hard, you see? Basically, there are no easy cases. But let me stress this, that these preconceived notions of the roughness of a case or classifications of a case into this category or that category, "and therefore they're very hard to audit" have all been bypassed by existing technology. You can forget them. If you can get somebody to sit still and answer questions, you see, that's about all you ask of the case, and if you can't, you've got the CCHs. But relegating somebody to the CCHs and telling him he's got to have 8,762 hours of the CCHs before you can audit him, you're just manufacturing a tough case, don't you see?

I remember one girl – another girl one time in the same locale. I was doing a lot of research auditing at the time and I remembered she had been pronounced nutty as a fruitcake. She was straight out of an asylum, everything else. I brought her in and she could control her mock-ups. She could mock up something sitting in the corner and keep it sitting in the corner and do this and that. I told her she was an easy case. And she was. You get the idea?

I didn't say, "Oh, my God, you've been eighteen months in a sanitarium. And, oh, oh, that's pretty bad, pretty bad. Your record's here. Oh, dear. Look what Dr. Flunnelbottom says
about you. Oh, dear. Oh, well. Don't think there's very much we can do for you. You came to us much too late." Evidently, people were on the track before psychiatry, you know, because they're always coming to psychiatry too late, you know?

Now, let's get down to the basis, see. I'm not saying all cases are equal, I'm saying they're all rough. But the case you're going to have trouble with is always a spook and always a sleeper, and you never suspect it and it hasn't anything at all to do – nothing whatsoever to do, believe me – with the psychiatric classification or the psychoanalytic classification or what the OCA said or anything else. That's not the rough case. Yeah, we used to have a hell of a time getting these people up off the bottom of a graph and that sort of thing. Well, you've got the technology, don't you see? You can pull them up off the bottom of the graph. You can sit there and run a Problems Intensive on them, for heaven's sakes; they'll snap out of it. Do various things with these cases.

Now, the very – the case you're going to lay an egg with, see, is the same case you've always laid an egg with. That's just a spook case. And they look sane and they look able, and they lie like hell. And it's just a matter of they don't do your auditing commands. And so you never get the auditing cycle completed with this case, you understand? But this case is already very touchy and if you bear down too hard and you're too nasty and Q-and-A too much if they find – to find that they've done it or not done it, you're going to upset the case and make the case rougher than it is. You harass the pc and make the pc worse than the pc is, see. They respond less well to auditing because you're always in there saying, "Did you answer the auditing command? What did you do with that?" You know, suspicion, suspicion, suspicion, see?

Now, the way to judge this case is simply if after a short period of modern auditing the case hasn't recovered, then... This is honest to Pete, I mean – I sound like an echo of myself. This is a lecture 1953. First time this has been... The case hasn't done your auditing commands or you haven't audited the case. Sounds very peculiar, see. Now, the case hasn't done it. That's all.

Now, these characters will take a command, do something else with it and then say yes or they've done it. Now, there's an old HGC auditor sitting over here. I can see, he knows that one well! You sit there for twenty-five hours, see, and you're saying, "Tell me a time you really communicated," you know, and the case is saying, "Mm-hm, yeah, yes. With Joe and with Pete. Joe and Bill, yes. With Mama. Yes, with Daddy." I don't know. They've got a machine out here. It says Joe, Bill, Daddy, you know; hadn't anything to do with what they're doing. They never heard a thing you've said to them.

See, in other words, this case interrupts the auditing cycle, and that's the only case that you're ever going to find tough or have anything to do with.

Now, let's look at the most extreme condition of this. The guy is sitting there going 纰纰纰纰. See, he's been around psychiatry too long, you know. He can't communicate at all anymore. He's sitting there. He can't even tend himself in the natural functions of nature. He's sitting in the corner of a padded cell, you know?

And you say something to him and you get no response and no execution. Got that as the extreme end of this case, you know?
Well, another extreme end. The guy has no perception. He can't hear. You say something to him, of course, he doesn't do anything.

And there's another example of the foreign-language case who can't speak any English. You're telling a Japanese to make that body lie in that bed and, of course, he doesn't know any of those words.

You see, those are all communication breakdowns.

Well, you understand those. See, that's dead simple. You're not going to stand there like an idiot looking at this bird sitting on a stool in the corner of his cell going buuuuuu, you know. He's had the very best treatment the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, could possibly authorize. Very best. Yeah, I wonder if you realize that they okay all the electric shock machines as perfectly valid shock machines that kill patients. We're going to take care of them. Well, anyhow... We got them on the list over here. Anyway... We already sent them a bill for interrogation and consultation services and we've now got the government crying faintly and nattering and wanting to - it to be itemized and specified or something of the sort before they pay it.

They came around and investigated FCDC so we - I had them send them a bill for $275 for consultation and briefing. [laughter] They're apparently going to pay it. You should realize the magic of billing.

Anyhow, so there he sits with the very best the Food and Drug Administration could authorize, and you'll say, of course, "I would have to take his hand and make him touch the wall, and do it and do it and do it, and take his other hand and do it and do it and do it, and get him into communication with his environment," and so forth. Yeah, you'd recognize it would do absolutely no good to stand there and say, "Recall a time when you communicated with somebody. Thank you. Recall a time when you suppressed something. Thank you." You know? You recognize, see. That's lights, bells, everything, see. You know there's nothing going to happen.

All right. And you take this guy that's stone-deaf, and he's got a great big hearing aid of some kind or another that goes off at fifty-five decibels between his ears, or something. And there's an on/off switch on the thing and it's off, see. [laughter] And you know better than to sit there and say, "Recall a time you invalidated something," see. You know better than that.

And you got somebody who speaks only Igloo, and you know that there's no sense in saying this. Well, that's so obvious that the next obvious thing is you miss: There's many a fellow who sits there who ostensibly speaks English, who can hear, who never executes your auditing commands. That's the one you're going to lay an egg on. This person doesn't execute your auditing commands and doesn't give you a factual report on what's happening in the auditing.

Now, you'd be amazed, because that goes on a gradient on up till it really includes every case at its top level. Every case sooner or later doesn't quite do the auditing command, don't you see? Well, the spook that you're going to have trouble with is the one who just never does the auditing command and is always doing something else.
Now, I'll show you how crazy this goes. The auditor sits there for seventy-five hours of auditing and keeps giving him this command, you see – "Who haven't you ever helped?" see? "Who hasn't ever helped you?" you know; some failed-help process – and sits there, and the tone arm moves and the needle moves occasionally on the E-Meter, and so forth. And then at the end of the intensive, why – the first twenty-five hours – the fellow says, oh, he feels lots better. And the next twenty-five hours he says, "Well, I didn't... It hasn't worsened any." And the next twenty-five hours, well, he's sort of scraping off the floor now.

Now, the auditor's been sitting there giving him commands that whole time. And he has yet to do one. And actually that happens. That happens, and that's the only case you're going to have trouble with. It has nothing to do with diagnosis or... He's got itemosis. He's got an item here, and it hears and then it relays it to him and then he says to this item over here that it should do it. See? He's wired up a set of valences. Pc isn't there at all. Pc's backed way out here someplace, don't you see? Pc hasn't got anything to do with all this.

If you ask the pc about it, if you communicate with the pc at all, why, the pc would just be sitting back there in sort of a comfortable, relaxed puzzle about the whole thing. And nobody's answered the auditing command.

Now, auditors sometimes sense this and they become desperate. And they start pounding the pc and harassing the pc and chopping the pc up and just going up in a small balloon because they know there's something wrong. After all, you're not always wrong. You have been known to have correct intuitive feelings, and you just feel intuitively that this isn't all it should be. You don't feel in good two-way comm with the pc, you see. You don't like the way this soup tastes, you know? You can't quite isolate whether it's got too much salt in it or too much pepper or too much butter, but it just isn't quite right.

And you start chopping the pc up. You start moving in on the pc, you know? You start getting insistent. You start getting this. You start getting that. And the tone arm moves even less. Moves less.

Now, this case is the last one in the world to admit in any way that he has misappropriated the auditing command. Last one in the world. All cases to some slight degree do this and you don't harass those. Well, why harass this guy? Because he's always doing something else with the auditing command.

I'll give you an idea some of the things he does with the auditing command. Some are really gorgeous. He hears the auditing command and that reminds him of something that he ought to do that will make him better, so he does that. He hears the auditing – this is rather uncommon, but is an actual manifestation. Every auditing command the pc receives, he runs through an electronic incident because he knows if the electronic incident changes in character that he will get well. He knows what's wrong with him. It's an electronic incident. So every time you give him an auditing command, then he runs through the electronic incident a little bit further or tries to take the auditing command and apply it to the electronic incident and he's sitting there auditing an electronic incident. And you're not auditing him. You follow this?

Well, you say, "Well, how the – look-look-look-look now, Ron, you've just told us, you know – wait a minute. You've just said ... Look, you mustn't Q-and-A, and you mustn't
jump down their throats" – I've sure inferred that – "and you mustn't harass them, and you
mustn't bother them. Well, how the hell are you going to find out?"

You see, if he's running through the electronic incident, of course, you're going to get
tone arm motion. It won't be very much, but you'll get some tone arm motion. See, he's run-
ing himself through an electronic incident while you're auditing him. And you think the tone
arm motion is coming from the fact that you're auditing him, see. But it's not. It's coming from
the fact he's moving through an electronic, see. So you even get tone arm action and we're not
supposed to Q-and-A and we're not supposed to ask the pc what he's doing particularly. We're
not supposed to harass him particularly. Well, hell, it couldn't be any possible road out of this.

Oh, yes, there is. Yes, there is. It isn't grabbing him out of the chair and racking him
over to the wall and start doing the CCHs either; it's you watch that when you are running the
pc's right Havingness Process. And if you want to be extreme and you want to make a test out
of it, you run a separate process which has something to do with the physical universe around
the pc. And if that gives you a great deal of tone arm action, then you damn well flatten that
tone arm action against the physical universe! I don't care whether you use SCS, Op Pro by
Dup, CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. I don't care what you use, you understand. It'd be a matter of "Pat the
desk. Thank you. Pat the desk. Thank you. Pat the desk. Thank you. Pat the desk." You're
going to get tone arm action, see.

Now, the reason you don't often notice this is because the pc hasn't got his hands on
the electrodes when you're running a touch or a Havingness Process. See, very often on most
– on lots of these processes, pc doesn't have his hands on it.

Now, look. If a pc gets a lot of tone arm motion in the rudiments – and that's not a very
good statement, because there's not much of the rudiments contain – the beginning rudiments
contain the MEST universe, see. But if you were to get lots of tone arm action in the rudi-
ments and damn little tone arm action in the body of session, you know at once that the pc
never does your auditing command. Look at it. Isn't that self-evident?

You say, "Look at the wall. Look at the ceiling. Look at the floor. Look at the wall.
Look at the ceiling. Look at the floor. Look at the E-Meter. Look at the beam. Look at the
floor. Look at the mike." And he's sitting there holding the cans, and this thing starts going
brr-brr-brr, and the tone arm starts going all over the place, and then you're going to move
into the body of the session. You're going to start up this 155-horsepower diesel tractor called
a Problems Intensive, and you're going to get an eighth of a division motion? Now, look, I'm
just appealing to your common sense. This pc is capable of tone arm motion. You have
proved it. You said, "Look at the ceiling, look at the floor and look at the walls and look at the
room and look at me and look at you and... " There you are, see. And you got tone arm action.

You talked about his environment and asked him if he had any problems and you
started getting tone arm action. Of course, that's starting to get a little subjective. Not really as
valid a test, don't you see. But he's looking straight at you, and you say, "Since the last time I
audited you, have you done anything you are withholding." He's looking at you, and he's talk-
ing about present time.

Now, listen. Such people have a span that goes back very shortly into the past. The
past starts closing in on these people awful soon, back from present time, don't you see?
their span of reality on what's going on in the world ceases maybe five minutes ago in extreme cases, two days ago, five days ago. See, in back of that there's no real reality.

So you ask him in the rudiments about the realest area of their lives which is very close to present time. You know, "Since the last time I audited you, yesterday." You're going to get tone arm action. And, brother, if you don't get as much tone arm action auditing the pc in the body of the session as you do in running the rudiments, please realize that we would be clearing people with the rudiments, see, if this were true. We'd never do a body of a session. We'd only do rudiments. You follow that reasoning? Because tone arm action mirrors directly and immediately the amount of change which is being secured on the pc. That is your direct index of how much this bank is changing and shifting, is that tone arm.

Now, when that tone arm is going up and that tone arm is going down and that tone arm is going back and forth, you know you're getting change. And when that tone arm isn't doing anything, you know you're not getting change.

So we start running the rudiments. We get into the Havingness Process at the beginning of the rudiments – where it isn't anymore. Do something.

We all of a sudden notice, as we're starting to break this case down and straighten this case out, we run a rudiments and havingness session. Now, you start going in for a goal finders Model Session and the listing of items on this case – well, you could do a lot for the case that way – but you've immediately lost all your indicators for the case. You start doing a Problems Intensive without ever finding his Havingness Process or anything like that, you're never going to know any of this about the case, are you? It's going to evaporate.

So, you want to find out what this case is going to do? You want to find out what kind of a case you're dealing with?

Find out how much tone arm action is produced by a process which has to do with near present time and the immediate environment. And when that gives a tremendous amount of tone arm action, you've actually got somebody who is drifting far away, because the case that had good reality on the bank, was in control of the bank, would not get that much tone arm action on the present time. You see?

Do you realize what tone arm action means? If you get tone arm action on a Havingness Process, a lot of tone arm action on the right Havingness Process or any contact process or any CCH – if you're getting tone arm action – do you realize that he is actually becoming aware of the walls of the room. Oh, we're not kidding when we say "what wall?" See, this case is really faded out. It isn't bank mass that's causing the tone arm action to go. It's the increasing mass of the walls of the room. Must be. That's all you're having him look at.

Now, of course, we know very well it'll move bank. But look, look, if we have him start looking at the wall and looking at the floor and looking at the ceiling, and so forth, and we all of a sudden see this tone arm go up here to 4.9 and then break down to about 3.5, and then start up again to 4.5, what's shifting it? His concept of mass is being shifted by confronting the environment in which he finds himself. Well, he sure is in no shape to be audited because where is he going to audit from, to?
You're auditing a case who does not have the stability of present time to audit against. So any address to the track throws him in total confusion and he can't answer your auditing commands. He has no point of reference.

Cases are audited against the point of reference of present time.

Oddly enough, the memory of eight million years ago totally depends on knowing it was eight million years ago from where? From where? How come we say eight million years ago?

Now, this guy who is stuck in the electronic which occurred three million years ago and is still in it, will get tone arm action when you get him to look at the environment in his immediate vicinity. Otherwise, he will run a Problems Intensive from a point three million years ago, which is a non-stable point. So you're running a confusion against an instability. And two confusions never made a stability, man. So, of course, he really doesn't know how to answer your auditing command.

You say, "Recall a time you communicated." All right. Recall a time he communicated. Well, if the time he communicated is up the track from where he is, how can he recall it because it hasn't happened yet. So, therefore, he knows he can't do that auditing command, so he does one that he can. And he says to himself, "Well, the auditor just communicated to me. He said so. So, therefore, I will recall the auditor saying something to me." So he does that a couple of times.

He's heard of mock-ups, you see, and he decides that he'd better use this auditing session for something – there's no reason to let this auditing session go to waste. And so the best thing to do is to mock up his psychoanalyst alongside the auditor so as to match the terminals, and if he holds this psychoanalyst very carefully up alongside of the auditor during the auditing session, then he knows he'll have gotten something done. So he trains himself up to say "Mm-hm." Every time he says he has answered the auditing question, he says, "Mm-hm." Or he says some irrelevant object or something of this sort while he is holding this thing.

You'll find some guy sometime or another who's holding the two back corners of the room. That's what he's doing in the auditing session. He doesn't want to waste the auditor's time so he holds the two back corners of the room during the auditing session. He's not doing the auditing command.

And as far as I am concerned, tone arm action on the rudiments and present environment of the pc is the only indicator I know of that uniformly isolates this case for anybody. That isolates it for anybody. You can tell if your TA is moving against the environment.

Now, it becomes very important, then, to prepare a case. And although it's all very fine to have this case come in and sit down and you find some items and the case straightens up like mad, and everything then goes along swindiferously, and all that; you're kind of trying to plow ground with a Cadillac, you know. And the funny part of it is the Cadillac won't do it. You get a Cadillac out amongst the plowed furrows and I don't care how much horsepower it's got or how many cigarette lighters, it's not going to pull a plow. It's going to bust its springs and it's going to knock off its exhaust pipes. It's going to do something weird. Ah, you're just using the wrong vehicle.
Now, basically this gives you an answer on the subject of clearing. Hardly anybody hears me on this or pays much attention on this, but a case that is wildly out of present time seldom answers the auditing command or executes it. And auditing depends exclusively on getting the auditing command executed.

Unless the auditing cycle of action occurs every time the auditor opens his face in a session, you will find the whole thing starts stacking up. If the auditor is saying, to a person with a hearing aid shut off, commands, he knows they're not going to be answered. But how many other of his pcs is he saying commands to who never executes them? Well, the answer is not to harass the pc. The answer is to run objective-type processes, put in rudiments, do things, and watch that tone arm because if that tone arm is moving well – three cheers. It's moving well.

Well, all right, let's move it well, huh? Let's just keep on doing some more of the same. Let's get the motion out of that thing. And when the motion comes out of that thing, then you'll get motion in the body of a session. But your body-of-session processes, when they demand a subjective reaction only on the part of the pc, may have missing present time – that area against which the pc must relate everything. And if present time is missing, why, the pc is not going to get very far. Also, he won't - really won't be able to answer or execute the auditing cycle.

Now, your trouble is the same trouble with a pc that you've had for a long time; that is you don't recognize your auditing cycle is not occurring.

But there is a positive test. Now, I've scraped the bottom of the barrel looking for a test as idiotically simple as this that requires no equipment of any kind whatsoever, and you'll find out that the gradient scale of toughness of cases is directly proportional to the amount of action they get on the tone arm using present time or near present time addresses. You know, like, "Do you have a present time problem? Anybody in your environment you're worried about?" That sort of thing. You're getting tone arm action, man. Huh! See, it's the old-time beginning-rud type of approach and you're getting tone arm action. That's a direct index. The case is as tough as he gets tone arm action on present time or the environment. Simple, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Now, if you want to get a good subjective reality on this, take somebody with whom you have had an awful wrestling match with 3GA Criss Cross and run him on some idiotic Havingness Process and watch the tone arm. Get in their PT – get their PTPs off for the last couple of sessions, see. Watch that tone arm. You're going to see that thing move.

Now, if you want all cases, then, to be easy, then you will audit only cases which have had all tone arm action taken out of the present time environment. And then, of course, all cases would audit easily with 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, why does one girl sit down – rough shape – get a standard Problems Intensive, go down to 2 with a free needle on all buttons; and another character come along and sit down in the chair and all buttons are run, winds up at the end of seventy-five hours and very far from totally straightened out? What's the difference?
Well, one of those auditors was getting a cycle of action – the auditing cycle of action was occurring – and the other auditor was not getting the auditing cycle of action. And therefore, that other auditor should have done something. I don't care what! He's got the CCHs and everybody thinks they're supposed to wind-up-doll and go through the CCHs. All I want you to do is understand what you're trying to do. Not go through some motions. Understand what you're trying to do. You're trying to call his attention to the workaday world in which he lives; call his attention to the walls of the room in which he's being audited. I don't care how you do that. You do that, you run the tone arm action out of that, the guy's sufficiently in present time to get the auditing command.

You've got to get a pc there before you can audit him. And in most cases you're neglecting that elementary step. The auditing cycle cannot occur in the absence of a pc. It just can't. That sound reasonable?

Audience: Yes.

Well, it's very true and that actually has practically everything there is about the relative toughness or hardness of cases. Because basically what have we done? We've gone over the top of the toughness or the hardness of the case. The techniques will take care of it. But the cases which you have trouble with are the cases which, of course, the auditing cycle isn't being completed on. There's something wild going on here of some kind or another.

I can tell you dozens of ways to enter cases and get rock slams and to do this and to do that. But when you ask, "Who or what would feather a nest?" have you any guarantee that you get a list that has to do with feathering the nest? Or do you just get an automatic shuffleboard? Have anything to do with the case at all?

Well, let me tell you, if you have to do that too often and too long, then those lists don't have very much to do with the case. If you've gone on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and you're not even in a vague reaching distance of it, recognize the condition of the pc before you began – what it must have been. Yes, you've improved it. Yes, you've listed lists and you've improved it. But you're actually doing it the hard way.

The easy way to do it is clean up PT, you know. Easy way to clean up PT would be a Problems Intensive with a terrific amount of present time contact. You know, lots of rudiments of one kind or another. Lots of Havingness. Give them things that are very easy to answer. You'll find out the problem assessed is probably day before yesterday if you really did a good job of assessment on it.

And run it, and all of a sudden, present time – needle moves like mad, and the pc moves into present time. Life looks much more this and that. And then the pc's there and you can audit the pc and you can run the rest of it.

That is the basic analysis behind what is wrong with a case that doesn't move fast. It isn't the relative toughness of the items. They're all tough. Why make a distinction? They're all stinkers. Why make a distinction? All the somatics are horrible. Why make a distinction? Sen is ghastly. Why say some sen less than others?

But you start plowing a guy in when he'd get tone arm action on present time, pushing him on down the track, shoving him into hot masses of one kind or another, pushing him
around one way or the other, man, you're going to get *sen* like you never heard of. It's all sen, because you just move him two days ago, and it's so unreal that everything gives him sensation. Of course, he's got sensation. He's in the middle of a confusion because he has no referral point called present time. And having no referral point called present time, how do you expect him to be anywhere but in a confusion. And that is the basic thing that *sen* is: the pc in the confusion. At least give him present time for that. And then you can run him.

Has any of this made any sense to you?

*Audience:* Yes.

Good enough. Thank you.
ENTRANCE OF CASES

A lecture given on 13 November 1962

Thank you.

This is lecture number two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 13 November, AD 12, and I want to talk to you somewhat about entrances of cases.

Now, I'm getting together the material for bulletins, and so forth, on the number of ways to enter cases. And although I took off last week and put in a lot of hours getting the material together for your various bulletins of last week (modernizing and wrapping up material is what I'm mainly engaged in), I haven't spent much time getting cases in a – how you enter them in 3GA or 3GA Criss Cross, and so forth. This is something I have neglected to some degree because there are just too many ways. And it's getting to be a broad subject. It's getting to be one of these very, very encyclopedic subjects. I haven't counted them up, but I can turn on a rock slam on cases with this question or that question or do this with them or do that with them, and so forth.

The main thing that I wanted to get out was your HCOB of November 11th, which gives you straightening up 3GA Criss Cross cases – straightening them up, those that have been run.

Now, you've got a new routine, and this new routine is quite important. It's Routine 3-21. Now, 3GA as such was insufficiently delineated. But the original 3GA was highly workable. So what I did was take all of the additional flurries that I knew of that would function well, new things learned such as Tiger Drilling and that sort of thing and just rolled them into the original 3A and gave you Routine 3-21.

Now, Routine 3-21 will probably work on any case that was well prepared. We can't, however, count on cases being well prepared, by which I mean... I think somebody was just mentioning Presession 2 – Confront and Havingness, you know, Havingness and Confront – that type of approach; CCHs and a Prepcheck is what you would be doing these days. You'd be doing CCHs and a Prepcheck, and so forth and smoothing the case out to that – in that way. And a case that was thoroughly prepared would actually have, to a marked degree, keyed out their present time difficulties.

Now, their present time difficulties is what's going to give you trouble in old-time 3GA. You'd have an insufficiently well-prepared case. The number of hours required would not be given by the auditor. You'd have somebody's skimp it here. Somebody was doing very, very rough CCHs, you know, and so on. And do you know that very, very rough CCHs will build the tone arm up and dirty up the needle? You know, never let the guy execute the auditing command and all this kind of thing, you know. I mean you'd really have to work at it hard, but very badly run CCHs can build your tone arm up and dirty up the needle and accomplish exactly the reverse to what they're supposed to accomplish.
And because there have been frailties in the preparation of cases here and there – bad auditing and so forth; the number of hours that could be afforded and so on – we walked forward into a great deal of developmental work, beyond the point where it was vitally necessary. You get the idea?

I rode this bicycle down the beach many a league beyond the point where I had to get off the bicycle. You understand? This was in the interest of speedup, interest of tougher cases. And I came back to the conclusion, finally, which is an old time-worn conclusion. We find havingness, you know, every six months. Well, it's been six months since we found havingness, you see. [laughter] And I came to the conclusion that this was your better track. Because it doesn't matter how tricky your auditing question is; if it doesn't get finished in the auditing cycle, why, it isn't going to do anything.

Someday you'll learn this. You can nod at me now, but listen: Someday you'll be sitting there, D of Ping a bunch of pcs and for the fifteenth time somebody has come in and asked you for an unusual solution. And for the fifteenth time you've dreamed up a very, very fancy crosscut, short approach to the situation. And for the fifteenth time you give it to him, and you make sure that it's used, and then you find out that didn't do any good either. And you'll suddenly wake up and maybe remember this lecture.

Well, if in some of the cases the auditor didn't even deliver your fancy technique, and in the remainder, if the case needed a fancy technique, the pc didn't execute it. See? First and foremost is the fact the auditor wasn't using it and then second on that, why, if he was, the pc wasn't doing it. So, of course, you got no place in a hurry because the reason the auditor was asking for it is because the pc wasn't doing it in the first place. See?

That sounds like one of these terribly redundant propositions, you see. But the reason the case became an unusual case is because the pc wasn't answering the question in the first place. So for you, then, to dream up a new question to ask the pc is to court the exact same fate as the first question the pc was being asked. See, he didn't do that either. And that is why you make this statement of "When faced with the unusual, do the usual." In fact, get even more usual. Get very ordinary. And by getting very ordinary I mean start patting the walls, man.

Now, the tricky developmental work in Scientology is very much to our credit. And we have learned a great deal, and we have gone forward a great distance by ignoring some of these fundamentals. That is to say, well, all right, we auditors couldn't do a process, or something of the sort and instead of trying to force through and say auditors must do this process, don't you see, we tried to get something additional that an auditor could do, that a pc could execute and that sort of thing.

Similarly, that same thing has happened in clearing. Now, you write out 850 goals and you start in at the beginning of these 850 goals on this well-prepared case and you will find then that it is very simple indeed to tiger drill these goals. And if you hit one, it isn't going to hang up. Well, it isn't going to hang up because when you ask, "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" you don't get the pc instantly protesting. Well, do you see that as a variation of the auditing drill?
You say to the pc, "On the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?" And the pc says nothing, but in actual fact doesn't even inspect "suppress" but protests. You just disturbed him from examining a goal he has just thought of that has nothing to do with the goal which you are tiger drilling. See, he just thought of another goal that his father must have had, and he wonders if that couldn't have been his goal, and you're trying to do "to catch catfish," don't you see. And he's busy auditing three other goals that he has accumulated as you came along. See, he's not in-session; he's not completing an auditing cycle.

Therefore, he will have a dirty needle all the time, all the time, all the time. Now, that's just from lack of preparation of the case. This guy's got missed withholds; he's never been straightened out; he never completes an auditing cycle – all kinds of wild things are going on. And because he doesn't complete an auditing cycle, of course, the needle is dirty all the time. He always thinks of something else. Or he thinks of nothing.

You say, "On this goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?"

And he thinks "To suppress things. I wonder – 'to suppress things.' Do you suppose 'to suppress things' could really be a goal? I wonder if I do have a goal to suppress things. I think a goal 'to suppress things' would be an interesting goal to have. See, I used to squash beetles and so forth and so forth ...

And you're going on and you're saying – you're saying, "On the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been invalidated?" and he's – you say, "Ah, that reads."


And you say, "Yes, has anything been invalidated? Something's been invalidated. That reads. What is it?"

And he says, "Nothing's been invalidated."

And you say, "Well, yes. Yeah, there – there is a read here on the meter. There. There. There. There."

Actually, all the time you're doing that, there's no more thought going on, there's no more effort to look, there's no more effort to confront, there's nothing happening. You even get an automatic circuit going sometimes, where you say, "Has anything been suppressed?" and the pc says "No," and then you bear down and you say, "There. There. There. There. There. What are you looking at? What are you... "

"Oh, well, that. Yes. Well, of course, I suppressed the goal."

See, any kind of an action of this character. You have to drive it home. See, you're not getting across to this pc. What's the immediate result of all this? Well, you're not able to tiger drill the list. That's the immediate result of all that.

But now, let us say the case is well prepared. Let us say the case's needle has smoothed out and the case is doing all right and present time is quite real to this case and everything's fine. Now, could something still be wrong with this case so that you couldn't do 3-21? And the answer's yes, there could still be something wrong. The goal is not on the list or, if on the list, is so unreal to the pc that if you confronted it, it would never answer up.
Now, let's take this in *extremis*. Let's just say, all right, it's impossible to fix up a lot of these cases. You — with beautiful preparation, smooth them all out and spend 150 hours smoothing them all out and preparing them, because people are going to be clamoring at you, asking you to do things about this or that, in environments and atmospheres, and their present times are all enturbulated, and they're going to ask you to find their goal, and that sort of thing. Therefore, you need a technology which overshoots the elements and the elementary things which I've been telling you. And in that you have 3GA Criss Cross.

The end product of 3GA Criss Cross is to so seize upon the pc's attention that the pc couldn't possibly do anything else but give you exactly what is sitting in front of his face. He can't do anything else but answer the auditing commands. This is far, far too interesting to him.

Now, the tip is that interest follows the rock slam. Where you have a rock slam you have interest. Therefore, you follow the rock slam. You also have the goals channel and you also have the consecutive set of pairs which lead actually from the dimmest beginnings of this GPM forward to the tiniest terms and oppterms in present time. In other words, they're pairs and they come all the way forward. And the route between these pairs is traveled by the auditor from present time clear back to the earliest beginnings. He does it first by finding the goal and then does it by finding the items which have been built up by the existence of this goal. In other words, it's a path, it's a track which is marked by a rock slam. All of its mileposts are designated by rock slams.

Now, you can pretty well overwhump almost anything in the pc if you can get on the trail of the rock slam. Now, you're going to be asked to do miracles; you're going to be asked to do cases that are improperly prepared; you're going to be — asked to do this, you're going to be asked to do that; going to be asked to audit cases in noisy environments; all kinds of things you're going to be asked to do. And you can do that only with very, very powerful procedures. And the most powerful procedures that we have now are — is a combination of old 3D Criss Cross and some of the item-finding steps of later processes. And this we call 3GA Criss Cross.

Well, it has certain rules — certain rules. And I've just given you one of them, and that rule is that the pc's interest follows a rock slam. And if the pc's interest follows the rock slam then the pc will be in-session. You see that? In other words, this is a sort of a forced in-sessionness. This pc has no business being in session, don't you see. In many cases the pc — you know, it's kind of a "What wall?" situation. And yet the pc will follow the auditing cycle, the pc will answer the questions. He has no other choice. Do you see that?

Now, you'll get it — sometimes the pc is in very, very great protest of mirds. And either the mirds have been abused on the pc, grossly abused every time the pc originates, the auditor gets in the mirds; this is the fastest way to spoil a pc ever invented.

Pc says, "I just thought of another item."

And the auditor says, "In this session, has anything been suppressed?" See?

That's the way to cure them — cure them of being audited. You can use mirds, then, to drive somebody out of session. But you start in — you start in and even though you've used
mid ruds very carefully, even though you've used them very well, even though you have been extremely careful of this pc, you've handled the pc very nicely, you haven't cleaned cleans, you know, and you haven't neglected reads, and you haven't gotten missed withholds and all this sort of thing... You've just been going along just dandy and yet the pc's still protesting the mid ruds. Yeah, isn't that – isn't that interesting? I mean, you're following the rock slam channel right on down the line, but every time you depart off the rock slam channel you get a stack of protests about mid ruds.

Now, realize what you're looking at. The rock slam channel is so enchanting, is so interesting, the pc has no choice but to hand out answers and complete the auditing cycle as long as you are only on this subject, as long as you are only calling off these items – there's only – you're only asking for these items or you're only calling off these items. The pc gives every evidence of being in-session. But you suddenly pull off, just to the short distance of the session itself, you've asked the pc to confront present time. The pc says, "Yo! Nope! Mm-der-brrp! Screak!" Smell of brakes. See what happens?

Now, you can't say that every pc who does this, does this only because he's in indifferent contact with present time anyhow and is improperly prepared. You can't say that because in many cases pcs have had so many cleans cleaned and so many reads missed and nobody's cleaned up the missed withholds and the auditor – in spite of listening to all my lectures and reading all of my bulletins on the subject – still doesn't know what a missed withhold is. They still exist.

All right, what have we got here? Well, we've got the other alternate that the pc has been beaten up with rudiments and so forth, and mid ruds and so on, to a point where they do have a protest, don't you see? Pretty hard to tell the difference. The pc has been artificially put into a condition where he is responding with the same degree as the pc of great unreality. You follow this? I mean, you can always audit a case into a hole. See, this can always happen.

Now, you notice this, then, that as long as you're asking the pc... You found the Prehav level "smoke," and you want "Who or what would smoke?" And man, you ask, "Who or what would smoke?" and it's right, you did your assessment right and everything. The pc is actually just dealing them off the top of the deck, see. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang – "That would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and..." He hasn't actually any opportunity to do anything else. Because you're dealing out the circuit he would normally operate with. You see that? Sneaky.

You see, in the absence of havingness, when his havingness is low, his circuits key in. You understand that old mechanism. You know, all you've got to do is run somebody's havingness down and you key the circuits in. All right, somebody who is in different contact with present time has all of his circuits in.

What are these circuits? These circuits are GPM items or their cousins or sisters or aunts. So naturally, with his havingness down, he's got all items in. But you can still audit him. If you're on the rock slam channel, you're on this channel of circuits. You see this? You're actually auditing the circuits he would normally be dramatizing. So, of course, they can't dramatize because they're being audited. So you do get an auditing cycle.
And all of a sudden you pull off of this and you – you got your last three items, and you call his attention to present time. And you say, "In this session, has anything been suppressed?" and you have one god-awful time trying to clean this up. And you just can't – you can't quite get anything clean. Everything is just kind of gluu-umm, zrrp-um, non-registering on the meter and goes off the meter and on the meter and off the meter and on the meter.

Well, what's happened here? Well, a roughness of auditing could do this, too. Let's say you were busily charging down the line and supposing some kind of a blunder like this happened – it'd never happen here – supposing some blunder like that did happen. "Who or what would smoke?"

"Well, a big man, and a little man, and a little man trying to look big, and uh..."

You say, "Well, I don't think that's right."

And he says, "What?"

"I don't think it'd be a little man trying to look big."

"Why not?"

"Well, that one gives a funny wobbling motion to the needle. So it couldn't be that one, you'll have to give me another item."

If you did something like that crude to him, see, all of a sudden there he is, and he's all of a sudden plunged into the middle of this item. And he'll dramatize it and he'll do all kinds of wild things and your session will just go to hell in a balloon. And you haven't got much of a prayer of getting this pc back into action if this pc is also allergic anyway to present time and its environment.

Look at the difficulty you're running into. You've got a pc who isn't well acquainted with PT, a pc that under the best circumstances would be in high revolt against being put into present time and now cause a hell of a flub of some kind or another, which would put any pc into revolt against anything you said and you practically spin him! You see? There you've compounded the felony.

So all these things like 3GA Criss Cross are given to you with the understanding that as you do them they are done with considerable expertness, because they can actually overcome and bypass the unreadiness of the pc to be audited on them, and you can get away with it. See, you're auditing in depth on a pc that couldn't get his big toe wet without practically dying of pneumonia. So it takes tremendously skilled auditing.

The natural defenses of the mind, so called by somebody who had withholds, are instantly overwhelmed. You cut right straight by those. This fellow will go out and plunge into the Arctic Sea and swim several miles and come up shining at the other end, providing you don't run alongside and jab him in the back with a boathook. You see? So it takes a very flawless brand of auditing to pull this off.

Those are the exact mechanics, by the way, from which these cautions about "untrained auditors shouldn't run these upgraded processes" – see, those are the actual mechanics behind it. These things actually will reach far deeper than the pc could ever reach.
Now, if he hasn't got an auditor there but the auditor is just saying things to him and he is being pushed in over his head anyway and he suddenly triggers and does follow out the auditing cycle with no auditor present and then all of a sudden something bad happens, well, the guy just sort of goes down for the third time, don't you see?

So a person who is unskilled using these processes – well, you get something like happened in Johannesburg before we really raised the devil. There was practically nothing but wrong goals in the Johannesburg area. They're just catching up with them – how many – and they're just stacked. The way goals were being found down there by this character was... He's talking about making Scientology a racket in South Africa, see? Well, what kind of a racket do you call this? Somebody comes in to get his goal found and he's going to pay a lot of money to get his goal found. And he walks in, gets put on a meter, and the guy just reads a list of goals at him, and the first one that rocket reads he says, "Why, that's your goal," never checks it out – and sends him out to get it listed. Well, that was what was happening, man. That's why the old man suddenly took a few heads off.

There's wrong goals all over the place, see? And one girl throwing up every time she turned around and has been for months, you know; couldn't keep anything on her stomach. Pretty wild things happen. Just criminally bad auditing, see.

Well, that sort of thing can happen with these. So therefore, we lay down all these provisos, and we say, you know, it takes very skilled handling and you do it just this way and you have to be trained and all that sort of thing. Because you actually can bypass this.

Frankly, if you did Goal Assessment by Elimination – by elimination; that's old 3GA; it's not the 3-21 where they're done by Tiger Drilling – if a pc was pretty ready to have his goal found you would find his goal by elimination. But if he wasn't ready to find his goal, you know, if he wasn't ready to have his goal found, why, you wouldn't find it. You see that?

Now, when you get into 3-21, if the pc isn't ready to have his goal found, you can find it. You can find it by tiger drilling those first 850, providing the goal is on the list.

Oh yeah, you can whipsaw him around, get this thing to rocket read and prepcheck the thing and so forth. But, man, he has no more – he has no great reality on it. To walk down this track amongst the great black boulders which will cave in on him in all directions, he looks upon as something which James Bond would approach with trepidation. And he says that's pretty tough. He looks at the first three or four as something that could only be performed at a circus by a hardened acrobat, see. And you're going to make him walk down the whole track to the vicinity of this goal, and it's just huh-uh! See?

Well, he's too stuck on the track, he's too overwhumped, he's too this and he's too that. And the odd part of it is that when you get to 3GA Criss Cross, you can do it, and you can get away with it and you can bring him out. But recognize, for God's sakes, what you're doing! Please recognize that you are short-cutting and saving on the preparatory steps, that you are taking a pc who isn't ready to be audited on "Touch that perambulator," and you're going to make him walk the death mile straight down to the middle of hell, see. Dramatic as that. It looks much worse than that to the pc, when he starts looking at this, man.. And you're going to make him do this. So therefore, it's pretty smooth, pretty tricky auditing that's required.
Now, the number of ways that you can get him to walk the death mile and start on that street that has machine gun emplacements in each window embrasure – to say nothing of the mines under the road and the diving Spitfires, and so forth, overhead, this is – they're quite incidental, see – are many. And one of them, the earliest, is just to ask somebody to put down his idea of the dynamics and assess it. I mean, that's the earliest and most simple version of it. And then oppterm – represent it, the earliest one – represent it and get some sort of an item and then list some goals against that as the oppterm and you would wind up with it.

Now, there are very many refined methods of getting this and getting the slam. In each one of these cases you had to get the slam. The next one up from that is, "What isn't part of existence?" You got him to do that. You even snaked him up into that's – what does he wish wasn't part of existence, threw that list away and wrote, "What isn't part of existence?" got some sort of a list there, and when you null that list out you're going to find something that's slamming.

And if the pc couldn't do that, then you say, "What – who would – who or what have you detested?" And he's got somebody he detested. And you represent that and you're going to wind up with a dynamic list and so forth. And if the pc couldn't do that – you didn't find your rock slam – you got your next one "Who or what would you prefer not to associate with?" And you're going to get something out of that and then there's a way of tackling this with Problems: "What problem would you rather not face up to?" That, however, is a package all by itself. I wouldn't use it in that particular lineup.

And these are all various methods of getting a person to turn on a rock slam, which, of course, is his entering interest level. And he's so interested in going down that line that he doesn't notice all those machine gun embrasures. He just says, ouch! when the bullets hit him, and he keeps walking. Got the idea?

In the presence of a good auditor he keeps walking. He doesn't get lonesome. He doesn't get hung up on the track. And he doesn't get the right item taken away from him and the wrong one handed to him. And a lot of other little refinements helped him to do this.

So here he is and these are all methods which get him there. And you've got now an additional method which I think you'll find is pretty darned reliable and that's "Roll Your Own" Prehav.

This is a version of the old Primary-Secondary Scale. And that of course, is just take any standard Prehav Scale or any Prehav Scale or any I will write – one of these days I'll get around to writing a special Prehav Scale for specific reasons, you know, like types of scales – and you find a level on that and then get that level represented. And of course the pc will lay on a silver platter the exact level that he's supposed to have there providing you came anywhere close to it on the original scale.

In other words ' he will give you the Prehav level of whatever you're asking for and it will be tailored to his perfect understanding because he gave it to you. And this wipes out Prehav Scales of... Let's see, the English language, I think, has a quarter of a million words; therefore a complete Prehav Scale would be that proportion of a quarter of a million words which consists of verbs. And you know, I think that's too long an assessment.
So this gets you out of these very long assessments. You don't have to do these long assessments. It wouldn't matter if you took the full Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale, even with its few additions and did that, and rolled your own with that. You would wind up with a very reliable level.

Now, the original idea on this is not as workable. You simply made yourself up a little series of the gradients of overts and the gradients of withholds. You just made yourself up a little scale, you know. You know, like "Would you keep to yourself?" you know. Or you know, "Would you – would you rather not others weren't after you?" you know, I mean, that as the withhold, and run that up to putting down some little item like, "Getting after everybody you run into," you know, "Everybody and everything you run into." Maybe just six or seven of these, you see. And you assess those and find the one which sort of sticks with you the most. And what you're doing there is an old Flows Assessment, if you recognize it.

And you use that and roll your own from that. And just ask him, "Who – if somebody was trying to attack everybody and everything in sight, what would they do?" And you'd get a whole bunch of list. And then you assess the list he gave you, and you wind up with a highly accurate Prehav level.

Now, if you've done that you probably will wind up with a rock slam. That's your – that's a very specialized method of getting down into the rock slam channel, getting the proper thing, getting it going – just using the roll-your-own level. And you want to know who or what would do that – whatever it was, whatever you found out, see? You want a who or what would do that. You make a long list of those things, and they may be terminals, they may be oppterms – we couldn't care much which. And you wind that up and you just do that list and you're going to get something there that rock slams. A high probability is that you'll land right in the middle of the rock slam.

Now, there are various ways that you could handle that. I've been working with this lately and you know, you can do, actually, any list by simply calling it off once. You don't have to say "committing overts" or anything else, actually. You don't have to turn on all that rock slam. If the thing is going to rock slam, it's going to tick. So just take everything that's in. Just do it by elimination, and tiger drill the last few the way I was showing you. I'm just talking about the wording of the – of the assessment. You can do it that way. If you have qualms about it, why, by all means, "Consider committing overts against..." and "Would something commit overts ... ?" whatever it is. But you can actually just call it off once, bang, bang, bang, bang.

And if it's going to rock slam, it's going to tick. Then when you've got it there, when you've got the last few, why, you'd say, "Would so and so ..." after you tiger drill them, you know, you finish the Tiger Drill and you say, "Consider committing overts against ..." and you get your slam, you see. Your slam can develop in that particular way.

This actually, by the way, isn't as reliable as doing it the other way. I have goofed on this when I didn't goof the other way. But I still have confidence in it and I'm still – doing it that way and getting away with it. Auditing is what you can get away with. And if you don't have to put that many words into nulling a list you can of course null the list a lot faster. You just go down the list, "Tiger, Waterbuck," you know, and see if it reacts, just calling them
once. Because the item is going to do nicely, thank you. It's going to react well if you're right on the track. So anyway, you get down to the end of this list, you go over it, you select it out, you've got an item.

Now, what the hell is an item? Now, it's the protagonist or antagonist in the game, which pursues from the fellow having had a goal in the first place. It's the dumbbells. Now, in actual fact there's another pair of dumbbells on it. And I haven't figured out what to do with these in assessment, and I don't know if they're needed, but they're the "not" pair. They're there, pinned onto it electronically. And you quite often can find this "not" pair. N-o-t, you see. You've got, one of them was, "Who or what would smoke?" Well, actually, there's another list, a sleeper, back of that list, you could say, "Who or what would not smoke?" – just arbitrarily add your not – and you'd get a brand-new list and you'd get a brand-new item sitting out there, see. It actually isn't a pair. It's principally a pair, you understand? In actual fact it is four. There are two dumbbells lying there. But the other two you could ignore.

Now, auditing is what you can get away with and 3GA Criss Cross is what you can ignore. What can you safely ignore? Because, of course, if you start 3GA Criss Cross on this basis of finding the rock slam channel, listing it, finding a slamming item and then do an opposition to it and find the slamming item and then do an opposition to the item you just found and then do a represent for the first item and an opposition to it, and a represent for the second item and an opposition to it, and a represent for the third item and an opposition to it.

Well, you – it's something like they do in Baltimore. They have a tremendous number of white stone steps in Baltimore. It's one of the dirtier, dustier cities you ever ran into. So they have nothing but white steps in Baltimore. We're not sure why there are nothing but white steps there, because it's such a dirty town. But they scrub these off every morning, with an enthusiasm which has often held me in great awe. You see, they sweep them off and then they scrub them off and then they lather them off, you see, and then they hose them off and then wipe them off. Of course, a half an hour later they're dirty. But it's such enthusiasm. And, actually, they wouldn't have to work that hard. They just wouldn't have to work that hard to accomplish it.

Now, you're not trying to clear somebody with this 3GA Criss Cross, but the funny part of it is if you did it expertly you'd wind up doing so. You could clear somebody and never find the goal. The goal would be the last thing you found. You understand this? It's – you're clearing a person backwards.

You theoretically could keep finding items that rock slammed and finding them nicely so that you could keep going and you would eventually wind up with the bottom of the channel. All this is very interesting. You recognize that there's a possibility in that direction. But it would be very hard and there'd be a lot of guesswork about it and you'd make a lot of wrong guesses, and you wouldn't have the guiding constant common denominator that you're going with, which is the goal. So it's easier to go down the channel a short distance until the goal is available and then pick up the goal and continue to list and null with the goal.

Now, this is trying to get the case discharged sufficiently so that you can do something with a goals list. Now, if you kept discharging the case and at the same time disorienting the case even further, you of course are going to get further and further from finding a goal.
see how that could be? Instead of discharging the case all you're doing is enturbulating the case.

You keep finding items and handing them to the pc that didn't slam. I'll give you ways of doing this. Tell the pc that's his item and he never cognites on it, he's just going to get fuzzier and fuzzier. He's going to get less and less real about things, see. There's less and less happening. You follow how you could go at this? You're going to get less and less likely to find these goals, you see. You're going to find wrong items, you're going to find items that don't slam, and he's just going to get buried and confused.

Now, I had to decide what you could get away with. And my first guesstimate was more closely based on what I myself thought I could get away with, as it normally would be, and that was simply to get a couple of items and you'd get something else. See, it's as simple as that. I mean, if you're going to have to go to all this nonsense just to know what your goal is – you get the idea – why, then of course, the most you'd need would be an item or two and you could list some goals against it and that'd be that.

Well, that didn't turn out to be too workable, so we stretched it out to about three items, don't you see. Then we started listing goals after three items and unburdening it, and I finally woke up to the fact that we were leaving pieces of the package behind us unidentified. And that this was raising hell with several pcs.

We were actually into the GPM. We were actually handling pairs. And even though these pairs were the pair of the detested person... Ah, but the detested person had a terminal that detested him that was just that much in present time. It's sort of like picking pebbles off the beach so you can get to the boulders, don't you see. Well, all the pc could tolerate at that stage of the game is the pebbles. So he's not quite able to confront pebbles and he's worried by the fact that there's a pebble left behind him. You found this detested person. This detested person is Joe, see? See? All right, detested person – Joe. So now from that you get the dynamic list and you get the dynamic, "spirits." And now you get the item that spirits represent, and you wonder why this pc isn't progressing well and why you're really not having a good time of it in trying to add up these goals and list goals and tiger drill them and that sort of thing. Hell, he's worried about what would oppose Joe! See, he's clear back there.

See, you've gone into this factory and you've showed him everything and you've ex-postulated and you've pointed to the machinery and the dustbins and the wastebins and the employees' room and the guard rooms and how they file everything and so forth, and you look around and you say, "Hey, hey, where are you?" You know? And you go back. He's just inside the main gate. He doesn't want to know all those things you were telling him, he says, "What place is this?" See? He wants to know who hates Joe. So you get the idea there, because you've left an unmatched – an unopposed pair.

So, to be on the safe side doing this because it helps any case, why, you make a rule about it. And you've got that in November 11, AD 12, 3GA, straightening up these cases; well, you always make a pair. If you get something, you oppose it. That's just your rule. And if it's still red-hot, you represent it. That's actually all you need to know. It isn't a question of representing, always. If you get something that slams you oppose it. Well, if you got something that was a terminal and you oppose it, of course you're looking for an opptermin, looking
for something that's agin him. And then you've got a terminal, you've got an opposition terminal. If you got an opposition terminal, you've got to get its terminal, don't you see?

Well now, this isn't all that smooth. Actually, after the person has been cleared, he has it all straight. But this, oddly enough, doesn't do you a bit of good. And you sometimes will find yourself in this weird squirrel cage: You find this item and it's a terminal. And you've gotten it by opposing, let us say, the detested person. And you've got it, you see, and it's "a slave driver." And the pc says, "Well, you've got that now, you know." There it was, opposing the detested person, you've got this "slave driver," and we're very happy about this and now we've got that packaged and... Pc doesn't seem very responsive about this, and so forth and the auditor evaluate, evaluate, and the pc's being pleasant and propitiative. And the pc ventures and he says, "You know, a while ago there when we found uh – when we found uh – 'ships' – 'ships,' you know, we found this item 'ships' – we were doing this a while ago, you know. I think that's what 'slave driver' opposes." See, that's three down the line, see. He's all mucked up on this subject, in other words, and you've got to pick your way through it.

And the test by which you pick your way through it is what is still slamming. You can always make something slam again if it's going to slam. You can say, "Get the idea of withholding from it," if you've been running overts with it all the time, if it's going to slam again. Now, if it's going to slam again, why, it hasn't been opposed. I don't care if you got the opposition to it – now, hear me now – I don't care if you got the opposition to it and you wrote it. That's what you did. You're always supposed to be auditing a pc. I'd like to call that to your attention. And although you opposed it and you wrote up, "Who or what would oppose Joe?" and you got "a slave driver," when it all winds up and you start looking these – these items you've got on the line plot again and you find "Joe" is still rock slamming, you have not opposed "Joe." You have probably opposed something else.

And you could do the pc a world of good, if you've got several items around, and say, "Well what..." you know, "Here's a – here's 'a catamaran,' and here's 'ships,' and here's this... And what – which one of these does 'a slave drive oppose, if any?"

"Oh, ho-ho-ho! 'ships!'"

Yeah, but you now have the burning question of what opposes "Joe?" You haven't found out yet. So you've got to do something about "Joe" now, again, because "Joe" is still slamming. Do you follow that? You haven't got the rest of the package.

Now, these two, you see, are aided and abetted by others. There's other mysterious ones hanging out in the shadowy darkness. There's all sorts of stuff around. There's no lack of quantity of items. If you think you're going to find four or five items and the pc's Clear – ha-ha-ha! You see, he accidentally goes Clear on 10 or 15 thousand items but in actual fact he has probably blown closer to 150 thousand. You see this? He only mentioned these few. Or he only ran these few. So you think you're going to get six packages and then the pc should be Clear, you got another thunk coming. Because it's quantitative, man; this GPM is quantitative.

But similarly, in your contemptuous eye as the auditor, you know you could confront all that. You know you'd have no trouble of confronting this, so why should the pc have any trouble? Well, you're not in his bank is one of the reasons. And you've sailed on by a pair and
you haven't made a pair. You haven't got a terminal and an oppterm sitting back there, and that's going to start pulling the pc back to it, and that's going to keep the thing – keep the thing snarled up.

I don't know if you heard any of the lectures about the – what the GPM does. But the GPM as it comes up in these pairs then starts making question marks and crisscrossing itself and tangling up and the bottom starts fitting up against the top, and *pluuhh!* You keep on fooling with it and eventually it'll come straight, and all of a sudden it'll make sense. But remember, it only straightens out because you've got the pc to recognize the matter, energy, space and time that the item consists of. In other words, this item now has been recognized, and it has been placed where it should be placed and he sees what it is opposed by and so forth. In other words, he's gotten sensible about it.

Now, this whole thing goes back to the earliest laws I developed in the field of the mind, back in 1938. This is out of "Excalibur." And that is that things are composed of identities, similarities and differences. In other words: identification – can't tell the difference; similarities – nearly-alikes, you could tell them apart if you looked hard; to differences – any fool can plainly see. You see that a chair isn't a roof.

Now, the GPM is in a state of a total identification when you greet it. And every one of these items is every other one of these items. And when you list, you are bringing about a similarity from an identity. You've got a complete identification, A=A=A, so you list this thing down. And when you've got this listed down, you have already, by listing it, brought about a step of achieving a similarity where you had an identification. Now the pc knows they're similar. And now, by causing him to find the item they were all pinned to in the first place, differentiation takes place and the thing starts blowing apart. Now he finds out what ailed him.

Now, you take a rock slammer. You're busy testing this rock slammer and you say, "You come in every night and you tear all the files apart and throw them in the waste basket and so forth and do other progressive things with the organization. We think you slam. We think you're a rock slammer. And we think you'd slam probably on Scientology." You recognize the moment that you put him on the meter and isolate the fact that he is a rock slammer, he goes a lot saner at that moment. Did you recognize that? If you did it – if you did it calmly as an auditor, not accusatively, he all of a sudden – he was mad at the whole environment; now he knows what he's mad at specifically. Now if we find who or what was mad at whatever he was slamming on – Scientology or Scientology orgs, something – we would have a pair. And this would tend to blow. See, but if we just found out he was a rock slammer, we'll do him some good.

Now if we find out who or what is rock slamming on it, of course the slam deteriorates because what makes the slam? A slam is the meter manifestation of a games condition. It's the unsuccessful effort to withdraw from the thing he must attack. So you get a games condition and that games condition is the manifestation called a rock slam.

Well, it takes – the Norwegians say it takes – one stick won't burn, and it takes two to make a fight. One stick won't burn; takes two to make a fight. That's absolutely factual. No more sooth was ever soothsaid. It takes two items minimal to make a package.
Now, if you wanted to find the rest of the immediate package, you would have to find out what wasn't against Scientology and what Scientology wasn't. And of course, this immediately – by the positive – negative polarities of the electrical current that goes through this thing – you'll find out that this would discharge like mad.

But you recognize that the moment you have found out that a person is a rock slammer and the person sees that he's a rock slammer on something, you realize, that he has to that degree ceased to be a rock slammer. To that degree, he's ceased to be a rock slammer. Now, we find out who is rock slamming against this and, of course, you've started to neaten this thing up like crazy. And of course, he's much less likely to be a rock slammer, you see. And all the time – the fact of testing this is discharging the condition.

See, a rock slammer is only bad off before he's been detected. See, at his worst state – he's at his worst before you find out. But just as soon as you find out on the meter, he finds out, too. So he's got all kinds of things explained now, don't you see. Makes sense. Well, he knows now what he's fighting. He doesn't have to fight the whole environment, he's not fighting the waste baskets and he's not fighting the files and he's not fighting roofs of that particular line; he is fighting Scientology. "Oh!" you see, kind of "That's my target. Oh! Oh, well, that's silly. Well of course, yes, naturally I can see how I would be, yes, that's true." Now find out what's fighting Scientology and of course, you've shed this little valence that is fighting Scientology directly, and he realizes he isn't fighting Scientology but that psychiatrists do and he had a kind of psychiatric valence, something like that. See, it deintensifies.

Now, if you went on by and simply tested him as a rock slammer, and then never found out what defied something, a lot of his attention is hung up and he's unable to put his whole attention on the next item he's got to confront. And you haven't improved his confrontingness to any great degree. And the more rock slam you leave behind you as you walk this track, then the less attention he has to put on the items ahead of him. And having no greater – not enormously increased ability to put his attention on things, his confront therefore has not improved up to a point where he can confront. So by leaving items behind you, you get into the interesting conditions of the rock slam diminishing, dwindling and getting lost.

Now, why did it diminish and dwindle? Why does it disappear? Why does it turn phantom on you? Why does it do this, why does it do that? That's because you've left items behind you and therefore left his attention tied up somewhere near PT in some fashion or another, and he just hasn't got the ergs, or whatever attention's composed of, to confront what he now must confront to get a slam on the next item.

See, he only slams on those things which can become real to him. The beauty of an E-Meter is, is it spots the things which have a potential reality to the pc. You're going to find item after item after item on lists that don't rock slam and the pc will list them – oh, God, you're running the goal by this time and you're listing the goal and so forth, and the pc still comes up with "a pullet." This is still going on the list. You look back on the list, he's been putting "a pullet" on the list since the detested person. Never slammed before, and all of a sudden, why, you're about twenty items down on the goal itself, see – you're listing for the goal – he puts down – he says, "A pullet," you know. Crash, crash, crash! Tremendous rock
slam. Always previously he was not really up to confronting "a pullet," so, of course, it never rock slammed. You see that?

So you'd better get all of the things the pc can confront. And if you've got available parts of his – of his line plot, which aren't opposed, you've got – you've got availabilities of confront and you can capture some of his attention and give him back some of his reality, and get him up to the point where he really will be able to confront his goal.

So I can define then, what you're doing this for. Why you're doing this. You see why you're doing your 3GA Criss Cross, is you're releasing sufficient attention of fancied opposition in the environment so the pc can have the environment and you're going backtrack from the referral point of the environment. In other words, by finding items you increase the amount of attention the pc can put on the environment. And he'll get less and less confused and be able to come up with his goal. And of course, he's getting closer and closer to the identity of his goal, his goal is less barriered out, and you'll be able to list and find his goal.

Now, the number of ways there are to find a goal after you've had a hatful of items – these things are getting too numerous to go into very rapidly and easily, too. You realize that you can take a goal that fired, which is "to dance on eggs" – let's take this goal that fired, "to dance on eggs." It only fired three times. You realize that you've got a good opportunity, without prepchecking that for the next thirty-five hours, to find out if it is the goal. You look it over, it doesn't seem to be very lively, except it rocket reads once in a while or it rocket read. You know you can do a represent list on that goal – a represent list of goals. This is just "What goal would represent the goal 'to walk on eggs'?" or "What goal would be like it?" "What would be a similar goal to this goal?" Got the idea? And you get these goals pulled apart.

Some pcs are listing on goals with one word wrong in them. They just don't go free. Well, that's an awful good step. The goal "to catch catfish," they've got their goal, "to catch catfish." You say, "All right, give me a list of goals similar to catching – this goal 'to catch catfish.'" "What goal would be similar to the goal 'to catch catfish'?" See? And you just make a list of those things and go over those things rapidly and you'll find out there was a comma out of place. Something like this can be done. Or it was a near thing. And some pc will sit around for a long time and he'll say, "I wonder if there's really a third word on the end of my goal? Suppose there really is? Suppose there really isn't?" see? Well, this step gives him an opportunity to find out.

In other words, there are just tons of ways that you can find goals and go out for goals. You could get a whole bunch of terminals, and they all seem to have – these terminals all seem to be in rags. He's got terminal after terminal – pc's terminals – you know, and they all seem to have rags connected with them in some fashion or another. So just turn around, write them all down and say, "Now, look. Look, pc, see all of these guys here, so forth – well, what kind of a goal would such people have? And give me a list." You know? You know? Just read them off there, and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on and one will fire. Got the idea? It's crude, see.

Because he's got such an idea now, these are all reliable items, you see, on the terminals line. What's the goal of them? Of them? See? And you'll find out there's a great similarity.
amongst them. You take one single item on the terminal side, he'll give you a goals list for that and it'll have the goal on it.

There's all kinds of ways to find the goal. But unburdening must improve the pc's presence. It must improve his alertness, must free up his attention. Otherwise, don't do it at all. You'd come off much, much better by just giving the pc some Problems Intensives and some CCHs, don't you see?

All right, this is how you get into – into the case, into the channel. This is how you use it. I'm giving you a very, very rapid summary of showing you just about where we are. This is a lecture – more an orientation than a bunch of data, don't you see, although there are some new things here. I wanted to give you the data very specifically on some of these bulletins. I've given you how to straighten out wrong goals, and I've given you somatics, how to tell terminals from opposition terminals, and I've given you this straightening out line plots and dirty needles and incomplete lists.

Boy, you guys, some of you make me laugh. You never expect a needle to go clean; list five items – what's the missed withhold? The item, of course! Give a dirty needle every time.

And then the whole of Routine 3-21 – your Routine 3-21 will be something that you will use far more often than you think right at the present moment.

So there's dozens of ways that you can approach this particular thing, we're there as far as technology is concerned. Adapting it to the individual cases, trying to get people listed out and straightened up and smoothed out and all that sort of thing – all this requires is good auditing. It takes time, it takes careful craftsmanship, it takes doing the usual, it's keeping your pc alert and in PT and between sessions, making him better all the time. It takes a lot of things. And this grade – you can climb this hill. What I'm trying to do is teach you to climb the hill, teach you to get somebody else to climb the hill. And I personally feel I'm being very successful at it and think your Instructors are having very excellent progress out of it. I never felt better about a course in my life.

What the kids are doing who have gone out of here, hardly without exception is absolutely miraculous. My God, what's happening right now – two Saint Hill graduates in Johannesburg and another one in Cape Town – would make him gasp. They've really got things on the run. The only thing I'm worried about is they're doing their own co-auditing after ten o'clock at night. And that sounds kind of poor. But they can't plan it any other way and at least they're getting some auditing.

Okay. Well, I hope that brief summary of things will be of some use to you.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Well, how are we, tonight? [laughter] Doesn't that sound cute. Of course, that is referring to you and your valences.

This is lecture one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What's the date?

*Audience: 15 November.*

Nov. 15, AD 12.

[part missing]

And there's another item that's posted on the bulletin board, has to do with one R. – I think it is – R. M. Nixon⁶. You notice that on the bulletin board? And John [part missing] is attributing the fact that we clobbered Nixon to the fact that he's clobbered. I don't know to what point this extends, but it's interesting that that is the first political figure in the United States that we really have clobbered. Of course, we hit him hard.

Mary Sue isn't here. Mary Sue isn't here, so I can tell you that actually I hit him because he hit at Mary Sue. It's almost that corny. But this fellow was using the United States Secret Service as a sort of a private Gestapo. And he'd been doing this all over Washington and so forth. So I just didn't think it was good political – I didn't think he had the right political color, somehow or another. I thought that ...

But you notice this sort of thing happening, that after country A has defeated country B, you will see not just the spoils of war but the customs of country B showing up in country A. Very interesting thing, here, you see?

Now, actually, almost anybody unwittingly will take on the color of his oppterms. That's horrible to behold, but true! Now, I want you to become very expert with that bulletin on somatics – last week's bulletin on somatics. For this reason: is, people tend to rank themselves individually as the cowboys in the white hat. And the oppterm as the cowboy in the black hat. And the only thing that tells you which is which, is whether it turns on pain or sen. You see? Turns on pain, when you chant it one way or the other, as per that bulletin, why, you get – that's a terminal. And if it's – turns on sensation, why, of course, that's an opposition terminal.

---

⁶ Editor's note: Richard M. Nixon, 1913-1994, president of the United States from 1969-1974. He was vice-president under president Eisenhower 1953-1961. In 1962 he ran for governor of California but was defeated. He retired from politics for several years before he reemerged and became president.
Well, they're quite distinct. But remember, as in the case of a rock slammer, you have separated them. You have already differentiated it for the pc. And now he sees what the score is. But some people also work this in reverse. They consider themselves only the cowboy in the black hat, you see, and the enemy always is the cowboy in the white hat. All of which is quite amazing. And they will get terribly tangled up. And if you get an oppterm on the terminal side, or a terminal on the oppterm side, the consequences of it is great confusion.

Now, when you get one that turns on both pain and sen, you mark it in the middle of your line plot as a combination terminal. They're quite legitimate, and it merely says that you got hold of a deteriorated package. It isn't that this package has collapsed. It's that we now have a new terminal which has the attributes of both terminal and oppterm. You see, it's a sort of the end of the road. Pain and sen turn on with that. Well, that's a combination terminal. Recognize it. It's not a package which has just pushed itself together, it is a new thing which belongs as a lock on both the oppterm chain and the terminal chain. In other words, he's picked up a new identity which had both their characteristics.

When we get into national life – to revert to what I was talking to you about – you get the succeeding generations of politicians performing as combination terminals. You see, you're looking there at combination terminals. The war happens in generation A, and then in generation B we tend to get a combination terminal, see. So the US busily defeats Germany and there'd be a tendency up where – somewhere up the track to – somebody to have a democratic fascism. This all logical, see, we have a democratic fascism. It's perfectly all right for democracy to exist as long as we're capable of also operating the Gestapo.

Well, it's that sort of thing that I tend to keep an eye on. But of course, you may not realize it, but you're all members of a secret society. You've been a member of it for a very long time, most of you. And it doesn't matter whether this shows up in your oppterm line or not, sooner or later, why, you pick it up on the track. And that's the "SPG." The "SPG" – it is very nice. And you're authorized, you know, to enlist anyone as a member of the "SPG." There are no dues, only performance is expected. And the "SPG," of course, is the "Society for the Prevention of Government." Of course, any time you natter about your income tax or something like that, you to some degree are preventing government, don't you see. So you willy-nilly are members of this organization; you might as well go in whole hog, you know.

I find it quite interesting that man hasn't realized yet that government is the source of his wars, see. They haven't taken that one extra step. Man as a whole. But the other day I was quite interested to receive an invitation to become a member of a board of people who were being recruited, willy-nilly, any way possible, to make a consultation panel that should get together and figure out what should be done with governments and man and atom bombs, and all this organization, this society, that's putting this out is doing – it's quite interesting; it's quite interesting – all they've decided to do is just get a bunch of fellows together, see. They haven't postulated any solution. They're trying to get together a bunch of fellows who will correspond with one another and meet with one another, in the hopes that these boys will come up with some kind of an idea or a solution. And all they're taking responsibility for is putting all these people in contact with one another. And they've picked up a few hundred people around the world, and they're now busily trying to get them into communication with one another. That's all they're doing, see.
Well, they haven't stated it, but they realize themselves that this idea of government, you see, is – must be at the cause of it, because they haven't approached governments. I thought it was very interesting, see, that somebody would actually take this effort. Apparently they're spending quite a bit of time and money on it and so on, and that is the total purpose of it. There is no other purpose, except let's get these fellows together and get them talking to one another and get them writing one another and they may come up with a solution. And then we'd be very happy to publish the solution. That's the totality of it.

Now, of course, I was worrying about this a few weeks ago. How come government would get into this kind of a mess? Well, naturally, war and antagonism and that sort of thing gets these things going. And then some very pure government – is doing a very good job – tackles some government which is doing a degraded job of some kind or another, and afterwards we get a combination terminal, you see, and the thing isn't – the first government wasn't quite so pure, now, you see. Now we get this compounding up the line, and combinations of this sort of thing, and we eventually get what we now got.

Now, the essence of this thing is that I wondered why was it that government would occupy so much of people's attention and newspaper space, and I suddenly realized that government has a salesman but the individual does not. See, the individual does not have a salesman. You're supposed to personally erase yourself, you know, even in common social courtesy. You don't have to go as far as the Japanese, you see, but you self-negate. You know. You mustn't blow your own steam or sound your own horn – that sort of thing, you know. But governments have spokesmen. And every politician that runs for office is selling the idea of government. And that is the chief idea which is being sold. And it's sold now by radio and television – completely aside from soap boxes, and so forth. And everybody is supposed to get out and buy this idea, certain number of times, and vote, and all that sort of thing, you see. It's a heavily sold idea.

And of course, a democracy has got it worked out to a fine-feathered fury, you see. Everybody is persuaded that they choose their leaders, you see, and therefore it's the people's fault, which of course makes no government. If the head of government – it isn't the head of the government's responsibility to find out what's going on and do the right thing, but the people's fault. But the people have no say about who's the head of government, really, you see. That's a mess.

Anyway, it's the only supersalesmanship that is now going on. And man, it is supersalesmanship. Everybody is selling this idea. So of course you get more and more and more and more government. And you're going to get more and more and more and more government, see. So eventually the individual becomes nothing, the government becomes all. And you get some sort of a communistic, socialistic super-mess of some kind or another, where nobody must spit without asking permission of the government and, you know, have a license to breathe, and all that kind of thing. And I worked this out. You might think that government is one of my oppterms; doesn't happen to be. That's why I can still think on this subject.

It's interesting to me, though, that you collide with government on this single front and basis. The only time you find something wrong with the idea of government is because you are selling the idea of the individual. Unwittingly, willy-nilly, whether you have ever ex-
pressed it to yourself or not, you are still selling the idea of the individual. I consider this quite interesting. Now, because you can make things better by handling the individual, of course, you fall into the channel of workability. So you see this as a workable action. You see that this is a workable channel. So you don't even beat the drum and say individuality is everything, you know. You don't have to. But you are to some degree pushing this forward because it is a line of truth.

You want to make some group better. The optimum way to make some group better is – you can't stand back and process something called a group – you've got to get ahold of the members of the group, one after the other, and say, "Where's the wall?" Because the only people you're going to get to talk to in that group is the members of the group. Don't you see? You recognize that as truth, and therefore, it makes you a promoter of the individual.

Now, this, of course, will make you get in the road of governments. You see how this works out? You immediately will get in the road of governments, because they're selling the idea of THE – that's underscore – with Old English and Old American and Old German capital letters – THE government, see? The government must be all. The government must own everything, you see. And you're in the road of that, because you simply say, in your action, that you're going to process some individuals. Well, this is giving individuals attention, and probably a government can't take too much of that. And just the fact that you give some individuals attention will cause you to go against the governmental line.

Someday, somebody will swoop down and say that you're a wild-eyed revolutionary. And I just wanted to make these few remarks so that you'd understand wherein you are a revolutionary. You might not realize that treating the individual in a totalitarian world where the government must be all, is in actual fact almost a revolutionary action. Whether you intend to revolt or not – I don't even intend to revolt. It's beneath my dignity. But somebody'll say, well, you – they kind of feel that you might be in revolt, and so forth.

If you ever want to get along with a communist, I'll give you a little tip. You're scattered all over the world and someday you'll be talking to a communist. I hope that he won't have guns in his hands at the time you're talking to him and have overwhelmed the particular society in which you exist, because that is the last dregs of individualism. All he can think of is self-criticism in his highest level of psychotherapy. Of course, he's trying to wipe out the individual. And if you're ever talking to a communist, I can give you the perfect answer, the perfect answer to his communistic arguments – is just tell him you're an anarchist. You don't even have to know too much about what anarchism is. Just tell him you're an anarchist, see. And an anarchist isn't somebody who throws bombs, that was the way the capitalists handled them back around the turn of the century. He's simply a fellow who believes that no government should exist.

And you take the poor communist, and he's drilled up, one-two-three-four, his arguments are perfectly laid out, they're all wonderfully grooved, he's been taught them by rote; how to handle the capitalist; how to handle the social democrat; how to handle the royalist. You see, he's been taught all these things, and he's there giving you more or less the common denominator of those arguments, and he gets just about so far, and you look at him innocently
and say, "What are you talking to me like that for? You probably don't realize that I'm an anarchist."

And watch him shift his gears, you know. It's one of these... He can't even make a racing shift out of it, you know. Gear teeth spitting out of the crankshaft, you know, and everything going to hell. And long ago, why, they realized that the anarchist was probably their greatest foe, and they had to cultivate him, and they have fantastic overts on anarchists all over the world, because, of course, their overt is against individualists, you see. And you will get one of the fanciest songs and dances, after he's wrecked the transmission, that you ever wanted to listen to, as to how government is really necessary.

See, he's been talking about tearing down the state, tearing up everything, trying to – you know, destroy it all and so forth – and then you say you're an anarchist – he has to shift gears, and tell you, "Now, look, some government is necessary." You see? And you immediately make the poor guy become a conservative. [laughter] And he has to shift from the wild-eyed revolutionary, of course, to the long-jawed conservative.

Of course, I never branded myself as an anarchist, but I have told anarchists that I thought they were far, far, too far to the right. And that was – kind of settled the argument – too conservative for me. Ha-ha! Of course you don't know where to go with that argument, you see, because there's nothing over there but a cliff!

But the funny part of it is the communist, because of this collision of term-oppterm, the first thing he's got to destroy is the individual. And anarchy has always been rampant in countries just before communism took over. And they're the one political breed of cat that the communist respects and fears. That is the one thing he fears. He will always try to get the anarchist's cooperation. He isn't likely to stand anarchists up in front of the firing squad, not of course until he's taken over completely, see. But if he feels any security – insecurity whatsoever in his push, he'll always butter up an anarchist, see; always very careful of anarchists, you see. Very, very careful.

Down in Spain, during the Spanish Revolution, and so forth, why, there were anarchists all over the place, you know. And the communists were pushing them on and patting them on the back, and of course they'd eventually get rid of all the anarchists, you know, out of public office and that sort of thing. But they never could quite come up to... See, it's a matter of too many overts. The thing is almost becoming sacred to them.

But you watch these evolutions of government, it becomes very amusing. I didn't mean to give you a talk about it, but you have a world here which is tipping over this way, and tipping over that way, and it's kind of hard to understand some of these things. What are these fellows after? What are they doing, and so on. You find many communistic principles are safely ensconced now in US law, you know. The principles of taxation, principles of ownership of property and that sort of thing are going more and more and more into US law. And they're taken straight out of the textbook of Karl Marx.

Not me saying so – I said so one day and the Wall Street Journal picked it up, which is quite interesting – that the tax laws now used by the United States are taken directly from Karl Marx. This is all very, very fascinating, but it gives you the idea of terminal and oppterm, how these things then become combination terminals and mix up in general.
Makes it quite a fascinating picture. Because things won't get straighter in the political arena. You can forecast that they will become progressively more confused. And it'll always be that way.

In the absence of processing, in the absence of somebody straightening out people, in the absence of somebody informing people, they will just become more and more tangled up; more and more confused. Lord knows what political philosophy would emerge out of this, but you could predict it. You could take those political philosophies which are opposed to those political philosophies, take the common denominators of the two – probably the worst points of both – and it'll become the combination terminal which is tomorrow's politics. If you ever want to forecast it, just take a look at the GPM and apply it to mankind on the fourth dynamic, and you probably will have a fairly reliable answer.

It's rather awe-inspiring. Fortunately, it takes sometimes upwards to a hundred years for this wheel to turn, you see. Sometimes two or three hundred years for it to turn completely, but you can see what will eventually be in charge. I said that and you thought I meant a joke – actually it is the least desirable characteristics of both terminal and oppterm, and you will get the combination terminal that will become. A rather sorry look. But it's on the basis of that which is least admired tends to persist.

And if you can imagine the worst characteristics of the United States and the worst characteristics of Russia, see, combined, and the good characteristics vanished, why, you will get a superstate that will ride up the line someplace or another and is likely to materialize, unless somebody like us comes along and shows 'em da road. Say, "What you goin' down for in that coal pit? Why don't you walk out here on the grass?" Unless somebody does that, that was – that's exactly what would occur.

The situation in handling cases – I've been talking about the fourth dynamic, that gives you a look – when you look at the third and fourth dynamics – at the eventual fate of any individual you process. This is in the argument to the refutation that people give you that you have to do a lot of livingness and if you did enough livingness you would eventually come out with some new, high, desirable state. Well, I'm sorry that that doesn't seem to hold good. To get the data you would clear somebody up so that he could carry on a bit further without it happening.

But supposing that without processing you could find a terminal and oppterm in the individual. Well, you know, you didn't relieve it in any way, you just located these things, you see, in some fashion. Not in any way that was therapeutic. If you located his chief terminal and his chief opposition terminal, and then you took the least desirable characteristics of both, you'll get the combination terminal that this person will become in a few generations.

That's a gloomy look, but it happens to be an accurate one. Now, a lot of you have had terms and oppterms found. And of course, those that were found first were nearest to the top of the stack and therefore would be the ones which were most likely to produce the next pair. Well, they will actually produce a single unit, ordinarily, before they produce anything like new terminals and oppterms. And if you take your first terminal and your first opposition terminal, and then figure out what's the worst characteristics of both of them, you have got a life
of yours somewhere in the future mocked up that you're not going to have to live. I know that sounds like it's gloomy and pessimistic and so forth, but there it is. It's not. It's quite accurate.

And as your GPM flies off, if you sat still long enough to watch it go by and added it all up, you'd find out that this had been taking place rather consistently. The amount of horsepower and freedom which is there to be freed is fantastic. Because you never touch a case that isn't in a tremendously deteriorated state.

Now, when we made the first discoveries – I'm talking to you now about rock slammers and cases and oppterms and so forth – of the tremendous power exerted over the individual of his basic postulate that created each section of the GPM, when we first ran into this, we had a tendency to recognize it as something brand-new. Something brand-new.

And I know it's in the first book – that is, *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. It talks about the individual and his basic purpose. It's quite a discussion of that in there. I hadn't – wasn't aware of the fact – Suzie was reading *Dianetics: The Original Thesis, 1947*. I wasn't aware of the fact that it went earlier than that. But it goes back here to the definition of the first dynamic as written in *The Original Thesis*, on page 14 of the Wichita printing of that. And apropos of nothing particular here we find, startling enough, all eight dynamics on page 14 and 15, and all completely defined, and so on. All properly numbered. This wasn't rewritten for publication – this was published back in 1951. And we get the definition of the first dynamic, is: "The dynamic of self, consists of the dynamic thrust to survive as an individual, to obtain pleasures as an individual and to avoid pain. It covers the general field of food, clothing and shelter, personal ambition and general individual purpose."

I'd forgotten myself that it was woven into the woof and warp of the subject right from the start. Now, this general individual purpose is on top of any mass or general purpose of, you might call, the basic... Well, theta has, and follows, certain general laws. We find these in the Axioms.

A thetan does these various basic things. But he also splinters off and postulates some portion of them or some specialization of them. And he postulates this all off his own bat, and then tries to go forward with this as an individual purpose, aside from the basic Axioms. And he tries to go forward with this, moves onward, trying to effect it and builds up a tremendous amount of accumulated mass and all sorts of oddball items, you know: terminals, oppterms, combination terminals, upsets of various kinds or another. And he builds up a section that we call the GPM and then he will postulate something else, and then he builds up another section of the whole GPM, and then that finally dwindles out, and he somehow or another gets himself free of that – that's – I don't say he gets himself free of it, he sort of, you know, he gets out of it someday. He gets blown up thoroughly enough that he forgets it utterly. Let me put it that way. And he makes up a new individual purpose and goes on from there.

Well, actually all these things are in controverson to the basic laws of this universe and theta and the purposes of thetans and so forth. And if there is any reason why it builds up mass, it is because it's an alter-is of the Axioms. Ever think of it that way? See? Fellow's being an individual, but he's being an individual with an exclamation point! He already is in some kind of a games condition with his fellows and the universe at large, and being in this state, why, he decides to be even more different. And he postulates what we're digging up as a
goal. His basic purpose, his goal. And then this, of course, is counter to the behavior patterns and former agreements and construction of the universe as contained in the Axioms, and so he is individuated out from that to that degree that he now has pitted himself against the whole lot – the whole works. He's flown in the teeth of every agreement he has previously made, which I consider quite adventurous. But that's all right.

What we're finding out when we talk about clearing – we're finding out as we turn on somatics in the individual; as we find items in the person; we find terminals and oppterms; what we're finding out is, is he hasn't gotten away with it. Do you see that as an interesting sidelight on the situation?

There's the GPM and it's killing him, see. He's got a goal, he's got an individual purpose and he can't even execute it.

Find it very difficult even to execute his own individual purpose. Well, of course, to execute it, he's flying in the teeth of all the agreements. And then remember, he's part of these agreements, you see. He's part creator of these original agreements we call the Axioms. So he's called himself a liar to that degree and he is now departed out into the zones and areas of superindividuality and there we go.

Now, as the individual goes forward, postulating a new goal, he of course is flying in the teeth of and alter-ising all of his former agreements. So now he gets up to a point of where he explodes out of the bank or something of the sort and he says, "Well, the bank is over there and I'm here," and he now postulates, again, a new individuation. He postulates a new basic purpose for himself. And he lives that one on out and it accumulates mass and then he adds it to the first mass and somehow or another one day, why, he manages to get an unstimulated environment, or get blown up or something of the sort, and he suddenly says, "Well, all right, I'm free of all that and that's all gone and that's all passed and so on." He manages to get quite free of it, in actual fact. And he postulates a new basic purpose for himself, you see, and then that's in the teeth of all of his own basic purposes and then that's all in the teeth of all of the basic purposes which he agreed on with everybody else to have anyhow. And you see, so it doesn't take too long for that one to get in a ball. That gets in a ball much more rapidly, actually. It's much easier for that one to create a GPM section.

So he's actually going on a shorter and shorter cycle track. The cycles of the track are becoming shorter and he's finding more and more things that he can't do, and more and more things that he can no longer confront, and one day he says, "How come it's all black?" – will be practically his sole comment on the thing. He won't explode out of this mass again, don't you see? This fortuitous circumstance which momentarily freed him from the GPM that he'd already racked up, well, he's just so dug in it just doesn't happen.

Now, the person who is sitting there saying, "Well, I don't really want to be Clear," is just being a ruddy idiot. He's almost beneath an auditor's contempt. If he had the data before him or he'd looked it over, any subjective reality on it at all, and then he said no, he doesn't want to be Clear, or he doesn't want to be free of this, or he doesn't want to be on the straight road again, or anything like this, the guy's an idiot! That's all.

Now, somebody who gets very angry at Scientology and won't be processed again and has got fantastic personalities getting in his road – how he just can't possibly be processed
because the Central Organization's Org Sec Sec, or something like this, has blotted the stationery of the last letter that was written to him, don't you see – has caused this terrible ARC break. Wow! He ought to be glad there is an Org Sec Sec, even though he says – even though the Org Sec Sec says to him whenever he walks in the office, "You blankety-blank-blank." He ought to say – not necessarily take it, but certainly, that from somebody who is perfectly willing to help him on his road and out of his mess... Look, he's got this stacked up against, not the next two hundred trillion years, really, he's got this stacked up against an oblivion, an oblivion of total pain and sen.

You want to look and find out what hell is, what's this thing they're talking about? Usually in religions they'll have some metaphorical method of trying to communicate. And if they were ever talking about a hell – this is hell. See, this is hell. They recognize there's something waiting for them in the future. They try to shorten it up, you know, and say it's the next life and this time you die and you'll go to it. Well, that's just enthusiasm. But sooner or later the individual does reach that hell.

Now, it's very interesting for somebody to persuade people into believing that he can offer them heaven, and that there is a heaven. I imagine down through the Dark Ages, at one time or another, why, I imagine I must have gotten drunk and kicked off or kicked off while I was drunk, and maybe spent hours going around trying to find the Pearly Gates. I imagine that I've done this. I have no clear recollection of it. I have clear recollection of sneering, but not of doing much looking.

But it's often occurred to me: how about this Joe that has bought pie in the sky, you know. He just bought it by the slab, you know. And he kicks off, you know, and he backs up through the window with the whole GPM dragged after him, you know, and sticks to the walls and does various other things, and sits down and waits for the heavenly messenger or something, you know. Or for somebody to blow a couple of toots on an air horn. And supposing at that moment, why, somebody in a Jaguar came by and pushed the button on their horn. Why, he'd be sure, you see, that's Gabriel. Imagine the bird; he wanders around and caroms off the trees, and looks for Pearly Gates, and that sort of thing. That's why I've always been very careful to have black gates on houses and that sort of thing. [laughter]

But the essence is this guy's been sold, see. He's been sold a bill. And he eventually says, "Well, I must've had my map wrong," or something. He comes back and picks up another body and then somebody starts talking to him about pie in the sky and they're going to save him and he's liable to go to hell. Well, he instinctively knows that he is going to go to hell. That much of it's true. If he lives long enough, he'll be in hell, don't worry about it. And so he'd just as soon have some heaven. And eventually he gets to the point where he can't be sold heaven. See, anytime you say, "You can be free," he gets it tangled up with the number of times he's been up knocking on somebody's wrought iron, thinking that was the Pearly Gates, you know, and nobody let him in, and no harps or halos being issued today, you know. I imagine they get into some awful confused areas, probably wind up over here at Hobbs Barracks, in front of the – [laughter] in front of the Uniform Issue Department, or something like that. You can imagine. They get tangled, see.
Anyhow, you don't know what confusion they get into, but they get into this confusion: that they begin to regard the real thing as pie in the sky. So you say to somebody, "All right, well, I can straighten you out," and even though he's sitting in the chair he sometimes has a very wide reservation. He's been straightened out before!

Sometimes down in Spain they used to straighten them out with pine fagots. They fixed them up. If they confessed at the last moment, why, they let them die without putting ice on their chest as they burned them at the stake. I think that was what they gave them. And they said they would be saved and wouldn't necessarily go to hell. Yeah, the auto-da-fé, the way they used to slow down the person's death with wet clothes, and that sort of thing.

Rather gruesomely got restimulated out here the other night when we did a Guy Fawkes celebration for the kids. Little Arthur was complaining about it, he wanted to put the clothes on one of his dolls or his teddy bears and we insisted on burning them up, and he was rather provoked about the whole thing. He probably was being more smart about it than we were.

Anyhow, this fellow's been saved in innumerable, painful ways, which have wound him up a great many cul-de-sacs and blind alleys with his feet full of tacks. And so you walk up to somebody and you say you're going to clear him and save him and do something for him, you see. And you're liable to restimulate all this. It comes out in "reasons we can't clear you," you see. "What would be the consequences of our clearing you?" Actually, no matter what he says, it's sort of based on these failures.

Now, you get somebody who has really been made to fail on the whole track, with magnitude in exclamation points, and he's going to – he's going to fight it all the way. He's going to have a lot of trouble. He's going to sense all the time something is wrong. Right up to the time you give him a reality on the fact that something is happening.

The kindest way to handle such a person is to give him a fast reality on the fact that you mean business. Not by pulling a magic fire out of the top of a vase and giving him a bunch of overwhump, and that sort of thing. He's seen that before. But actually doing something for him subjectively that he can realize that he is on a road to truth.

People that this has happened to, to too great a degree have always got one eye sort of squinted, just a little bit, waiting for the payoff, see. There is liable to be a trick involved with this, and so on. And frankly it makes an auditor's life rather uncomfortable sometimes. The pc is sitting there and the pc has no trust. His trust level is just shot, you know. And therefore, he doesn't answer the auditing commands, he alter-ises them, he does this and that with them. He knows he'd better not put himself in your power, because too often when he has kicked off he's gone looking for those Pearly Gates and he hasn't found any.

But the trust level – the trust level on what we are doing, of course, generally is not very, very good. The healing sciences today are frankly almost beneath contempt. They aren't doing anything very much for anybody. They're pretty good plumbers. They can normally set a bone or do something like that. They're not bad at things. Sometimes they can do plastic surgery and so forth. These things are nice. Mechanically they're not bad.
But just go in to one of their offices sneezing, the most awful things are liable to happen to you. You know, probes going up your nose and all this sort of thing. You know. You're wildly allergic to one of these wonder drugs, you know, and they shoot you full of it and you break out with the hives and... It's marvelous, you know. They have very few specifics. Of course, they're handy to have around when they work, but it's no great general level. It's almost fantastic, the degree of clutch which this type of healing has on the environment, until you realize that the environment always accepts it as just sort of a fake anyway. They don't approach it with any trust anyway and so on. Well, it's the type of society you're going up against and this pc you're auditing is bred in that kind of a society. So it's no wonder he doesn't follow your auditing commands.

You see, he sort of pretends to. He's like the maiden with a large cold bath before her. And she doesn't even put her big toe in. See, she wants to get the temperature of the water by intuition. And it takes quite a little bit to build up against that. You get the most remarkable kickbacks. It is that single thing which is the hardest thing for an auditor to go up against – is just a very bad trust level.

Now, the mechanics of how it got that way are very valuable and very important to you, but don't overlook the fact that its importance, the importance is actually great in that your dissemination is stopped by practically nothing else. There's hardly anything else stands in the road of dissemination, except that, just that low trust level.

The people that scream that we're quacks and bums and rats and dogs and fakes and all that sort of thing are usually themselves operating in this. The only people that really get enthusiastic about it are yelling at you as an opterminal situation, don't you see, in a very remarkable way. The psychologist, of course, must realize – must have realized long ago; the psychoanalyst must have realized long ago, that they had little or no freedom for man and quite often deteriorated his condition beyond all recognition. They must have realized this a long time ago and yet they're the first to call us fakes, you see. The birds with the dirtiest hands are throwing the most mud. And it's always a good way to identify the situation. That is a general factor.

Now, this individual has already fought the physical universe, and the basic laws of the physical universe – after agreeing to them – he now alter-ises them and, of course, those laws concern matter, energy, space and time, so he starts accumulating matter, energy, space and time, and that's what puts it in his bank, you see. Then he makes an individual purpose, which has nothing to do with these other purposes, don't you see? And he tries to go up against them with this individual purpose, and this, of course, accumulates more mass than you can count. And now he's going to think up another individual purpose and that goes against his first individual purpose and all the purposes behind him. And now he's got a third goal that he postulates up there. Oh, this gets very, very interesting.

But all that's true, but it must have been based originally on a very low level of confidence and trust anyway. He must have had a very, very low level of confidence to have gone to all this trouble. See, he couldn't possibly have trusted what was going on. He must have thought that it was detrimental, or he wouldn't have taken all this trouble to have individuated from it.
You find most pcs are mad at the physical universe, to some degree or another; they'll find some complaints against the physical universe. Well, let me tell you, the physical universe is going to stay here for that individual, until that individual... Now, here's something I've never told you before, but it follows sequitur. It's actually understood in the sixty-four Philadelphia lectures of 1952. I've never mentioned it in connection with modern clearing.

And that is this: That after you get goal number one... Now, you see, we're numbering goals backwards, just for the sake of nomenclature. We don't know how many goals the fellow has postulated for himself, so we can't call this – the first goal we pick up – as "number thirty-four," don't you see, or something like that, because we don't know what number it is. So we're calling that the first goal. I'm talking about the first goal he postulated after the Axioms. And after we get back to that – what was, for him, the original individuating goal – you think you're going to have a total OT. Well, actually you're not, you know. You've got the Axioms.

Now, you're going to back up, up the Axioms. Recognize that? Now, sooner or later, this pc's going to start talking to you about the Axioms. You could carefully have hidden from a pc all lists and conversation concerning an – Axioms, and then clear him on up the line, he'll sooner or later start telling you the Axioms. Well, at this time they're getting ready to blow. But his agreement to those Axioms, his contribution to that degree, is of course, you know, the greatest probability, his first basic trap. You may have to get back to them and run them. See, they may not blow at all. Sooner or later he'll collide with them going backwards. And those are all individuating purposes from the basic purpose.

It's a funny thing, but you have to go a long way back to pick up more than the first dynamic. You start picking up more than the first dynamic waaaaay back on the track, see. A fellow's usually on an – even on today – he's on an inversion of the first. And you'll find out there are about seven dynamics going to invert on you, you know, reverse the inversion process, before he gets to a straight first dynamic. And then when he gets to a straight first dynamic, he's got to go quite a ways before he gets sight of the other dynamics. There's what you're tackling. There's what you're running up against in the bank.

We're the only people who can go up against opposition terminals or masses or something like that and get away with it. Only a Scientologist is safe in his attacks. See that? A hell of a thing, but it actually gives you an unlimited license for overts. You can always run them out. Nobody else can. Interesting, isn't it?

But here is a basic thing that lies in every pc, whether this pc is a rock slammer or otherwise, it's a deteriorated trust. Not only a trust in his fellow man has deteriorated, but also his trust in organizations, in group activities, in any effort whatsoever to do anything for him – he has to some degree or another deteriorated at his level of trust. And he's sort of nervy about it. He gets very nervous when you start going in that direction, because he knows that's always been dangerous to him. And you're reversing his experiential track, so he's going back into areas that he thinks are dangerous. And thinking these areas are dangerous, he's sort of nervous.

Now, this applies to every pc you process. It's just your skill as an auditor and the smoothness of your Model Session and the positiveness of what you're doing and the fact that
you can produce a result in the pc on which he has a reality. And he realizes you are going in the direction of freedom. Now the funny part of it is he may be sufficiently low downscale that the fact he is going in the direction of freedom, it looks so good that he can't have it. And you get into another *rickle-rackle,* you know. He won't let himself have it now, because it's too good, you know. That's unobtainable and you know he – so on... It's like you pushed a three-story cake at a little kid and said, "It's all yours," you know. And he'll stand and look at that thing for hours! He won't touch it. Can't believe it, you know. Probably made out of cardboard and paint. Very suspicious.

Now, if you add to this, this other idea, that if you existed and if you freed man and if you did things for the physical universe, then this person couldn't execute the first and foremost goal or individual purpose that you're going to run into in processing him, see, the first one you're going to pick up on him, that he couldn't have this and he couldn't do it if you or freedom or anything else existed – you got a rock slammer.

But I just want to make it clear to you, that when you look at a person who is fighting the auditor or Scientology or the organization or having a hell of a time and can't tell why, and it's – he's just getting all messed up about this thing, and you look at this person; recognize that that distrust is not just built on this individual goal that you're going to run into as goal one. No, that's not built on that. That is built on a quicksand of distrust that goes earlier than that. Of course he's got goal after goal that goes before that, and he's got stuff, stuff, stuff, stuff. So his level of trust, of course, is very poor to begin with. Then you pop up and you say, "Well, yeah, I'm going to clear you, I'm going to clear men, I'm going to do things for people," and this is all contrary to his basic purpose that you're going for; is the first goal you're going to find – you got a rock slammer. That rock slammer is already built on quicksand that everybody's made out of.

As soon as your auditing deteriorates and becomes less than perfect, as soon as you start fumbling and mucking it up and failing to deliver some reality of some kind or another to a pc, you rekindle, or permit to remain – if it's already going at full blast, which it usually is – all of this morass of distrust that has been generated by all the pie in the sky the fellow has ever been promised. A man's reality on hell and his certainty on hell is far, far better than his reality on heaven, because heaven has never existed and hell has.

And all you got to do on this track is flub a little bit. Actually, you have quite a broad margin of the amount of flub you can flub. You don't have to be absolutely down the line, you're not whipping at it on a total perfection, you see. But you let this case drift too far without a good positive result – you let this fellow go hours and hours and hours of sessioning without any kind of a win – you're not keying in just his basic purpose, you're keying in the whole background of "there is no heaven." And you pay the penalty.

And the longer you take to produce a result on a pc, the more difficult it is to produce that result, just because of this distrust factor which I've been discussing with you.

Now, I don't know whether rock slammers deserve it or not, and I probably ought to keep this to myself and never give you the solution to the rock slammer. We're being very hard on rock slammers, and we should recognize... Actually a lot of people who are simply
nattering after they've been processed for a while, will turn out to be rock slammers. You know, there are a lot of people around who are below being rock slammers.

Your intuition for an individual, that this guy is not all right and he doesn't mean all right, is actually more reliable than your E-Meter where it comes to this, because you may have to process him for some hours before you find out he's a rock slammer. You recognize that's not a vital test, see. That's not totally valid as a test. It's rather conclusive when it does occur. But that it doesn't occur absolves nobody. See, it's sort of like the heaven-hell situation. You see, hell exists, but heaven probably doesn't.

Similarly, people probably aren't, until they're proven to be. But you couldn't say that nobody is. You can't say positively that this person isn't. You get the notion there? Because there's no absolute test of absolvence, except the person's ability to measure up and your feeling about the person, their progress in processing, when you add these things up, why, you say to yourself, "Well, this guy can't possibly be a rock slammer."

Well, what about this? What about this rock slammer? What about this manifestation? Well, all it is, is his degree of overt in your direction and his weird belief that if you or whatever he's rock slamming about exists, then he will never be able to achieve his basic, individual purpose. He believes this, so he fights you. Realize that the first moment you find it out and he finds it out has a tendency to pull its teeth. You never really see a rock slammer going full blast after you found out he was a rock slammer and he knows it, too. Quite interesting. Just the fact of discovering the fact and he discovers it the same time you do. He didn't know it before. Sometimes he won't believe you, but he's got a pretty good idea.

Now, I don't know whether a rock slammer deserves it or not, for me to give you this other tip. If they cause anybody any trouble, of course you can always forget this. But it's just this: all you have to do is opposition what they're slamming on. Say they're slamming on "an auditor," you know, just the whole subject of "an auditor," all you've got to do is write your opposition list to "an auditor" and you'll – you've – just all you've run into is your first package in present time. And it tends to blow up in smoke. Frankly, an auditor capable and able, with 3GA Criss Cross, would not really require any time at all to straighten out a rock slammer. I don't know, two, three hours, at the outside. You see, you've got the list and find the item. And actually, the case folds up as a rock slamming case, as such.

But, of course, this person can have goals listed against any terminal, you can list a goal against any terminal that rock slams, and you can list a goal against any oppterm that rock slams, see. You can list a goal against an item that rock slams. If it's an oppterm, you say, "What goal of yours would be impossible to achieve if this thing existed?" you know, or something like that. Lists headings already exist for that. You can use that terminal directly. Sometimes you just get the guy's goal laid on the line.

But even if you've got the guy's goal laid on the line – this was the only other point I was making – even if you've got this person's goal laid on the line, opposition it. Get your opposition to whatever he was slamming on. Now, you can always – let's say you have some person in an organization or in your group and this person's been causing quite a bit of trouble and you take him and give him a rock slam test and you find – don't find a rock slam, you only find a dirty needle on Scientology. You tiger drill it for a moment and it doesn't clean up.
That thing's going to develop into a rock slam someday. All you've got to do, actually, is opposition it. The person's whole viewpoint on the subject of Scientology will shift. This is a very easy one to handle, in other words. You shouldn't worry about it too much. It means more than it appears to mean. And probably you would neglect it, ordinarily, that elementary step. You would use the rock slam to find the person's goal and you would go on. You shouldn't do that, because the person will give you a lot of trouble. Not as much as they were before, but if you opposition it, the trouble will evaporate. You see?

So the whole case, anyway, is built on quicksand of distrust, and when it comes up to the fact that we are the oppterm and we're the cowboys in the black hat and he's the cowboy in the white hat – the way he looks at it – and to us we're the cowboys in the white hat and he's the cowboy in the black hat, you recognize that you can blow this whole thing up rather easily. You realize the rock slammer most consistently goes out and becomes a squirrel, says he practices Scientology while doing psychiatry or something, see. He gets – he makes himself into a combination terminal, promptly, because he realizes instinctively that he's crazy as a loon to be attacking us.

But you can solve this, and it's pretty easy to do. I hope there's some data in what I have told you that gives you some assistance in handling cases.

Thank you.
Thank you.

All right, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, November 15, AD 12. A lot of things I could talk to you about, by the well-known ton, actually. Very hard to select any particular point to discuss because we're pretty well there technologically. All of these points have to be talked about more, have to be sorted out more; there's got to be more data on these things. I'm at a point where I'm getting ready to condense old tapes into bulletins and that sort of thing. I'm in a very patch-up state, you know, of making it all neat.

But a lot of data continues to appear and naturally would. Once you've climbed a mountain, why, you idle around and look down the mountainsides and you can find a lot more ways you could have gotten up the mountain. There are always more visible ways. So you can look forward to all manner of stuff like this and speculations. The one thing you mustn't forget is how you got up the mountain in the first place and how you can get people up the mountain. And you start getting too many alternate routes going up this mountain and the next thing you know people start falling in crevasses and so on because the road isn't mapped.

But this first thing I'd like to talk to you about is – it's sort of hard to choose which is what – is a method... This method, by the way – I have not found a goal by this method; I'm just going by data known. This method is an experimental method. But I'm about to plow in and use it like mad and I'm sure that it will work, as you will be sure in just a moment, too.

And that is, one of the reasons you don't like to see long goals lists these days is because it takes quite a little bit of time to tiger drill every goal. And it's sort of hard to go over long goals lists and so on, whereas an auditor in the past was perfectly willing to cover 250 or 300 goals, and didn't think this was very much. You suddenly give an auditor a list of 300 goals and tell him he's to tiger drill those 300 goals and he tends to blanch. Because he's actually looking at quite a little span of auditing. And particularly if a case is not ready... This lecture isn't totally concerned with 3GA Criss Cross, therefore I've just given it some notes, and it's just some notes on current processing, is about the only title you could give this lecture.

Now, he's going to take an average of a minute per goal to get these three hundred goals down, see? But if a case is running very hard and if a case is terribly burdened and should be unburdened before it's audited on 3GA Criss Cross, you're going to have two phenomena occur. While you're doing a goals list, you're going to get a dirty needle.

Now, understand the – remember your somatics bulletin of last week. Dirty needle is a persistent activity, and a dirty read is the instant manifestation of a dirty needle. And so when
I say "dirty needle" I mean the persistent dirty needle. I meant to straighten that out with you tonight because I think we've got an auditor who's got them mixed up. He thinks if he gets dirty instant reads on the ends of goals that then this list has a dirty needle. No, no. No, it's those reads that occur during and amongst and after and before and they're all going tickety-skricket-scratch, and you can't read through the stuff, you know, and so on. It's like trying to tune in Tokyo on a crystal receiver, and it just won't do it. Now, that's a dirty needle, which makes a quite different manifestation than a dirty read.

You know, your dirty read – it just goes instantly bzzzt. There's a little brrrt to the needle. So what. That doesn't mean anything at all. That – the most that means – well, it – you can get "Fail to reveal," "Careful of's," "Invalidates," things like that can do it. And goals themselves will sometimes give a dirty read and so on. That doesn't mean anything. Most it means is your rudiments are out for the session. That's the most it means. And if you're getting too many in and they have all got dirty reads, well, the pc's just got a missed withhold, that's all that's wrong. You'll get used to this and get it sorted out, now I've called some of this to your attention.

No, I'm talking about the persistent static on the needle. That's a dirty needle – persistently staticky. And when you've got a dirty needle and you're trying to go down the list, we used to call it the pc's needle pattern. Only sometimes it's much more serious than just a pattern. Any pattern means something is wrong. Pcs shouldn't have patterns. The pc isn't prepared and the pc hasn't got his rudiments in if you've got a needle pattern. You don't audit with needle patterns. You go around auditing with the belief that there is such a thing as a needle pattern and you'll get in trouble right from the beginning, because of course it merely means that the pc is improperly prepared; it means a lot of things. Some pcs have very, very filthy dirty needles before you find the first item. That is just at the drop of a hat, why, the needle dirties up, and so on.

Well, to that degree – to that degree, you have an awful time getting in your rudiments so that you can get a clean enough needle to list and assess something, or assess the Prehav Scale so that you can find some level to get an item from or something like that. There is your toughest struggle.

But you'll find out that if after you've listed a list and started to null a list, that you have a dirty needle – not dirty reads; you have a dirty needle, a distinct pattern – and you try to get in your mid ruds and you've got a dirty needle still, and that sort of thing, you just – you'll learn better than to box around with a dirty needle with mid ruds. You'll just realize that your list is not complete. And after you've gotten skunked a half a dozen times, maybe you'll remember I told you this. They read with a dirty read. Every item you read reads with a dirty read. There's nothing rock slams. You get down to the end of the list; you've got several reading with a dirty read, you tiger drill them, and it goes bzz-bzz-bzz, and there's nothing in. Oup! Nothing slams. You've gotten nowhere.

Well, the first manifestation you get of that is, given rudiments in and pc prepared – if it has a dirty needle, you see, if it's a dirty needle situation as you start to null – you've got an incomplete list.
Now, there's two things you can do. You can list from the wrong thing to list from. You've done a Prehav assessment and it's wrong. This pc can't be approached on "What isn't part of existence?" In other words, your A of that bulletin of last week that gives you the steps of assessment – your A is just dead-wrong. This is a gone dog, you know. You've listed this pc way over his head. You've said, "Well, I know what's wrong with this pc: he blames everybody." And you couldn't get a Prehav assessment anyhow, so you just took, Blame, and say, "Well, who or what would you blame?" or "Has he done something weird?" And you listed this thing out and so on, you go back and start nulling it, why, you're going to get a dirty needle all the way, and it wouldn't matter whether you extended this list to China, you're not going to get an item on it. Do you see that as a liability?

Now, supposing you take off fortuitously in the right direction. When you list the list and an item does and is going to occur on that list, you'll find out when you start to null it you don't have dirty needles. That's the first list you list on a pc, and that's every other list, too. But it even takes care of this phenomenon of the – of the case that's chronically a dirty-needle case – at the drop of a hat he turns on a dirty needle, see? You take it from the right source, you list that list, you start to null it and you don't see any vestige of a dirty needle – you have got an item on that list, you have cured his dirty needle. Follow that? You understand what I'm talking to you about?

Audience voices: Yeah.

Yeah. In other words, this even takes care of your first thing. In other words, your jump-off from part A of that bulletin on what – what's the line you're going to list, you know? "Who or what would you rather not have anything to do with?" See? All right, that's correct. And you've listed your list. When you go to null it out, if the list is complete, and everything else, you're not going to have any dirty needle on the thing. And then that follows for all additional lists.

When you've listed from the proper question and you're going to have a slamming item on the list and that question is proper, the only reason thereafter that you will get a dirty needle, and the mid ruds don't put it in, see, and you just have to practically rack the pc up one side and down the other. You just chew him to pieces with mid ruds if you keep going like this. You're never going to get rid of the dirty needle. It'll just stay out two items and it'll be back again, you know? And you give him the mid ruds and the thing is – your needle's nice and smooth now. And then you say, "Waterbuck, tiger," it's dirty again. Your list is not complete. There's no item on the list. The missed withhold on that list is the item. It hasn't been put on it.

So there are two – two variables there: Either your list isn't long enough to include the item or you're not listing from a proper question that gives you the item. Either way you're going to be in trouble and have a hard run of it from the pc – with the pc, you see? You're going to have a tough time of it.

Now, because there are two variables it makes it a little harder on you, because you don't know which one is really out. And – but by trial and error consider that one is out and then consider the other's out. You understand? I mean, you just take it from some other question. Consider the first step, the question there, as wrong. So you take another question. Man,
when you've got the right question, you list that thing down, you list it to a complete list, there's an item on it; the whole characteristic of the pc as far as the meter is concerned looks entirely different. This is the easiest running pc you ever saw in your life.

One of the reasons some of you have trouble trying to find items is, is you've never asked the right question to get the item and have – then have never completed a list long enough to include the item and then never null down to the item. And of course, you always are going to be in trouble. You is a gonna say, auditing is impossible, there isn't any way at all to audit. You can't enter the case, you do nothing for the case and so forth.

That just stems from two sources: (1) the question you're listing from is improper, or your list isn't long enough to include the item. See? It's just those two things. There's the only two things that can be wrong on any list that you're nulling. So this also applies to goals.

You get this pc to write 850 goals in Routine 3-21. Now, you've been asking me for a long time, what do you do with these goals. Well, I hated to tell you, you have to take 850 goals and tiger drill them on down to the – to the raw depths, see, because this looked to me – like an awful job to me. I spent about fifteen hours on a pc doing this. And I consider this is quite a lot of work. Because it was a dirty needle all the way. I didn't know this rule at that time and that was why I was continuing on down the line.

But this rule of the complete list and the right question applies to the goals. Except there's one other rule you get with goals: If goals go out hard on Tiger Drilling, why, the case is too charged for you to be assessing for goals. You're not asking the right question to get a goals list and you're not writing a long enough list to get the goal on it. You see, all these things apply. You actually have two manifestations: You've got a dirty needle on a goals list, you've got a dirty needle, and goals go out hard when tiger drilled. In other words, you sit there and you ask them questions and "Suppress" and you ask them "Invalidate" and "Careful of" and you ask them and ask them and you ask them and you ask them, and they give you more answers, and the thing still reacts, and you get the suppresses off, you get this off. And you say, aah ...

You know that can go on for three three-hour sessions on one lousy goal that will eventually go out in the end? Well, consider what it is. It's just too heavily charged a case to find a goal on. See, that's an additional manifestation. You find goals going out hard, you'd better start finding items. See, that's your rule. Goals go out hard, don't spend the rest of your life... By all means wash out the goal that you're working on, otherwise the pc'll dramatize it or something. But goals go out hard on the pc? Well, get yourself going on a new lineup.

Now, the experimental action here that I was talking to you about... None of this is – none of what I've just been giving you is experimental at all. This other one is this: You can tiger drill a goals list all the way from the beginning to the end, but the truth of the matter is, that unless a goal has been tampered with – we found the pc's goal and it submerged; see, we found it and prechecked it, it disappeared from view – it's going to come back in someday if we keep working at it and so on. That's the liability, see: that a badly handled goal will disappear from sight and you can't get a trace of it again. That's a liability.

But let's take the pc, now, whose goal has not been found. Well, you could do this with a goals list – and this is the experimental step, and you can see at once now you won't care
how long a goals list the pc has – you just go ripping down the list saying each goal once. Just
go down the list, bang, bang, bang, each goal once, you know? Pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow,
pow, pow. Don't even tell them they're in or out. And those that react – those that react, put a
slant on them. Just mark those that react. Don't mark the goals out, because it's liable to give
your pc a bit of an ARC break or something. You can also use that, too – I will tell you how –
if you did want to mark them out.

But you go down the line, you're going to find, 850 goals – if your rudiments are in
and if the goal is on the list, why, you're going to find that that goal – the residual at the end
of your list, reading them all once, may be as few as 40 goals. See, the theory is this – that a
goal, if it's the goal, will be somewhat charged. If it's somewhat charged, it's instantaneous in
its reaction and it'll fire the first time and the only time you read it, see? So you just make sure
you don't miss any reads and just go on down the list reading each goal once, pow, pow, pow,
pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, see? Keep your eye on that meter. See, don't say it's in or it's out. And if
the thing quivers, why, give it a slant mark. Too many stay in, your mid ruds went out.

Now, that gives you a condensed goals list. That gives you the best chances out of this
list, and on a short list, of course, you only get two or three staying in, or one or something.
That's the one you tiger drill. If you got a reaction on it when you went down it the first time,
you tiger drill it. You relegate your Tiger Drill, then, to the residual. The goals that remain
after you've read them once.

Now, that kind of opens the door to an interesting view, here. We don't care how many
goals the pc writes. And we're going to take care of all the pc's goals lists. Just take care of
them all. And the pc's got goals lists, well, do this with them. Goal may be on it.

Now, if you're not scratching them all out, of course you're not invalidating the pc's
goal. Funny part of it is you're liable to turn on a somatic reading that goal just once, so you
want to be very careful for the pc to tell you if he gets a pain. And about the bottom of every
page of goals remind him to tell you if he gets a pain. This is quite important. Because the
pain runs deeper than the meter. Pain goes deeper than a meter. And the funny part of it is that
even though the pc's goal has been manhandled, the probability is that a little attention to it
will turn on pain before it shows on the meter. It's dead as a mackerel on the meter but you
can make it show a somatic on the pc. That's quite interesting. So you want to tell the pc al-
tways to give you the hot dope if he got a pain.

Now, allow for the comm lag of the beast. Allow for the pc's comm lag. He probably
didn't wake up to the pain, until two or three goals have gone by. So the pc says, the goal the
pc says the pain occurred on – the way the old song went, "Ain't necessarily so." It may be
three, four or even five goals earlier than when he noticed it. It's quite remarkable that if you
read a series of five goals from a goal which bears pain, and the pc is not advised of it in ad-
ance, you may be at goal three, four or five before the pc will say, "I had a somatic." You
say, "What one did it appear on?" And he'll usually point to the wrong one. He'll point late.

So what you do in that case; the pc says, "Ow! I had a pain."

You say, "Well, where did it turn on?"

"Well," he says, "just as you read that goal there, 'to shoot game wardens'.
You say, "All right. Thank you." Now, just count back up from that several goals, go upstairs, and say, "Now, let's watch for this somatic again. I'm not calling you a liar or anything, but we want to move into it the same we did before, see?" So – so just read him that, and now read them three – just read the thing three times. This has run it long enough for the individual, you see, to find out if it's turning on a somatic. And then see where you are. You might have passed over that goal.

Now, if you were marking all the goals out that you didn't get a reaction on and you mark the pc's goals out, he'll ARC break within a page and a half. You could use that to find a pc's goal, too. You could! You could say, "That's out" – X. You're going on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa.*

Pc says, "Rarrarr."

"What's the matter?"

"Well, I just never had such a lousy auditor in my life, and it's too cold in the room, and everything is going to hell in a balloon."

Do the last page and a half, see? For good measure, do the last two pages. Now, don't – don't underestimate this. The ARC break is *exclamatory,* man. It'll be the wildest ARC break you've seen in many a day. Some pcs whose goals have been passed over on some list and nobody has found them to this day, have been ARC breaking from that moment forward and they're almost impossible to audit. Did you ever put your two and two together and recognize that somebody's goal was probably ticked last November, and this November they are still yapping? And that's how much force and power there is in the situation, see?

One of the things you want to inspect on a chronically ARC breaky pc is when somebody did a goals list and where is the list. Pc won't know the goal, but he'll be ARC breaky about it. Which is quite, I think, remarkable. Talk about mental mechanisms! So you actually could use that mechanism. Mark them out, read them once and mark them out, read them once and mark them in, you know? If you mark his goal out, man, page and a half, two pages later, you're really going to hear about it certainly by that time. He'll just be getting worse, you see. He'll be smoldering for about a page, you see, and then nattering for a quarter of the next page and then about halfway down the next page he explodes. Most gorgeous thing you ever cared to watch in your life. Not reliable to this degree: you can't count on it having been found last November and the pc still ARC breaking. He probably gave up ARC breaking on it by February and he's been in apathy ever since. He's not necessarily demonstrative on this subject, because he can go below antagonism – as anybody who knows the Tone Scale can see.

All right. Now you've got – you've got yourself a situation then where you can take any quantity of goals lists and if you're worried about how you find a goal after you find items, I just refer you to lists 1 to 10 of the original 3GA, see, on the Criss Cross steps. Those lists with their headings, see. If you were (an oppterm), see, or if you were part of (oppterm), why, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? See? What goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? If you were a mason, why, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? And so he gives you a list, see. You don't even care if he writes them in session or not. Well, you can always take this list and you can rip on down the list of thirty, forty goals, something like that – just read them once, see? Find out if anything fires. Nothing fires, aban-
don it, see? One fires, tiger drill it. Starts going out hard, wish you hadn't started tiger drilling it. [laughter, laughs]

Now, you understand, you're not looking for a rocket read on that first elimination. You're not looking for the rocket read. You're just looking for something in. Now, it'll do all sorts of things. A real goal seldom rock slams, but it – they've been known to. And they tick, they stick, steep falls. They just react on the needle – usually your first manifestation on most of them.

So therefore, any time one of these stays in, you simply mark it in, and you've got – you've got a goal that you can go back to. Now, I don't know that I would stop right there and tiger drill it. I don't know that I would necessarily do this. But you'll find that you're doing this on a lot of short lists. There are thirty, forty goals, and so forth. And I'd tear down the lot. Because you might get into trouble, tiger drilling every time something flicked. It'd be sort of a bad course to pursue, because most of your short lists, you're only going to have two goals left in – going to have two that reacted slightly.

Now, on all assessment, when the mid ruds are out, you can get a persistence of read, so that every time you say something to the pc it stays in. And I look at some of your elimination – I mean, some of your elim... your lists – nulling of your lists, and on the first one: in, in, in, in, in, in, in, that one's out. And then in, in, in, in, in, in, in... Wake up, man! The pc invalidated about the second one in, way up above you someplace. Of course, everything is in since. See? You're not – you're not doing an elimination of goals or items, you're doing an elimination of mid ruds. See, that thing has been out.

Now, the more complete the list is, the less tendency there is for that to happen. You know, so the pc gets an invalidation of something. Pc says, "Oh, that wasn't it." Your next one – he says it to himself, see; he doesn't say it to you.

And the next one seems in and the next one is in, and the next one in. In, in, in, in, man – I never see more than three in's in a row and I start blowing up. See, I start saying "Ha-ha-ha-ha! Well, now, what happened there?" I'll even hand the list to the pc and say, "Which one of these things, now, did you invalidate? Which one of these?"

And he'll look up the line, "Well, it's that one. Oh, yes. Yes, yes. I thought so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Thank you so much," I say sarcastically. And then do the next two again. They're all invariably out.

Now, if your list is complete, this will happen to you very seldom, and your needle won't be giving a continuous dirty manifestation and all that sort of thing. And you really can sail if you've got a complete list and your mid ruds are even vaguely in. The most it takes, if you've got a complete list, to keep your mid ruds in, is, "You want to tell me something or say something?" to the pc. You notice you have three consecutive ones in.

I got – I've gotten fooled. I have cleaned up the mid ruds, straightened everything up, had the pc ARC break, straightened it all out – I was cleaning cleans, you see – and you know, and the pc didn't have anything to say and go back to the list after everything is all straightened out and find out that those three are still in. Is my face red, see! That should hap-
pen, you know? I had five, once, consecutively stay in. Almost blew up the session. So of course, the next time I had five in I said well maybe it could happen and then when I went around again found out that none of the five were in. The first had simply been invalidated.

All right, now you're going down a column and the pc says, "Oh, well, none of these could be me. This has no relationship to me whatsoever. And I just hope nothing reads, because it hasn't anything much to do with me. And if I sit here carefully enough, why, we'll be able to get through this." And you go three consecutive pages of Xs. Well, long before you get to three consecutive pages of Xs, it should occur to you to ask the pc "Suppress" and "Careful of." Not all of your mid ruds, just "Suppress" and "Careful of." Should long since have occurred to you.

I don't let more than about eight or nine Xs go by before I throw a "Suppress" and "Careful of" in there just to make sure. Then imagine my embarrassment to have a totally complete list, an absolutely flawless reading needle, no rudiment even slightly out and the only one which was going to remain in at the end was the item. Drives you mad, because of course you think the pc is suppressing all the time and you just sort of grit your teeth and hope, you know? It's an interesting rolly coaster.

Anyway, this gives you an opportunity – this method of elimination of goals; just by reading on down the list of goals once – it gives you an opportunity to get the pc to list lots of goals. And you can tell the pc, "Why don't you list some goals. If you were an (oppterm), you know, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?" you know? And you've gotten four or five oppterms, so get him to list a raft of them. You know? List against each oppterm.

And then, of course, terminals – that's dead easy. You just say, "What would be the goal of a (terminal)?" See? "What goals would a (whatever the terminal is) have?"

You've got several terminals there, all more or less the same breed of cat, the same sort of thing, and you say, "Well, this sort of terminal now – what sort of goal would this sort of terminal have?" You know? And you get yourself a goals list. Lots of ways you can approach this.

You probably ask yourself, "Well, I know we find items, items, items, items, items; but when do you ever come in and find a goals list, see?" Well, the reason I haven't told you very much is because there really isn't any good answer to it. You can just get yourself a goals list most any time. And the reason I hadn't given you a lot of packaged ways to get goals lists out of it – well, it's just because I felt bad about all this Tiger Drilling of great long lists and I knew I had to get down and solve that.

In the first place, a pc, knowing his auditing is going to be tied up by all this Tiger Drilling, becomes very loath to give you long lists of goals. But if that isn't going to take any time at all, why, you've got it, you see? Pc doesn't mind how many goals he gives you if it isn't going to take any time to scoop them up, see? It's very therapeautic for a pc to write goals. I mean, they do just fine. You can sit down and say, "I wonder what's my goal?" and tear off a couple hundred and feel beautiful. It's very good. You can straighten out cases. Nothing like getting rid of a wrong goal if somebody's been run or hung with a wrong goal or something like that. You straighten it out, they really start shining.
But – oh, you get somebody off the street, raw meat, and you say, "Write me up some goals you might have had in life." And they give you a long string of them. Gosh, they feel wonderful. They think this is great. They think this is the most. Quite interesting. Mustn't overlook that in the shuffle.

But because we didn't want to do all this Tiger Drilling by the hour and the pc didn't want all of his auditing time all devoured by it, why, I myself was rather loath to advise tremendous things. I thought I might come up with some method of copying the goal off in an awful hurry in some tricky method to avoid all this Tiger Drilling. Well, there is no method that will avoid it except find the goal, see? That avoids all further finding of goals, you see, on that particular GPM and that's the best way to avoid it, is to find the goal.

Now, the funny part of it is, supposing you went into the pc's goals list, and you read the first page of his 850 goals. Just read them, once at a time. Find out if any of them are in. One of them's in. Tiger drill it. Goes out hard, man! Don't do the second page. Don't do the second page. That case has got to be unburdened before you go any further. See the idea?

All right, now supposing we had – we took the first page, and we start tiger drilling the first page. Pc up till now has been in pretty good condition. We start tiger drilling the first page of the 850 list – dirty needle. Dirty needle. And we straighten it all up and we get the mid ruds in, we polish it all up and we read two more goals; we got a dirty needle. You might as well get off that dead horse. He's going to fall flat on his face in the middle of the pavement. That goal isn't on that list. Never seen it fail. That goal is elsewhere. You've missed it. It's not on that list. You're not going to run into it on the consecutive list of goals which you're now going to do. It's an incomplete list; it hasn't got the goal on it. So the idea of incomplete list still hangs out there.

I did a beautiful job of this one time. When we were over in Washington, I did a gorgeous job of this. I thought the pc's old goal was not the goal. Did this time after time, actually – twice, very notably – man! Found the pc's goal was not the – thought the pc's – couldn't get it to read, to react, see. So did a couple of – found an item and listed goals against the item, and goal number one on list six rocket read and did beautifully. And after some four or five hours or something like that, of – it just evaporated. It was gone! Never saw such a thing in my life, you know? It left me just bug-eyed. Because, boy, was that goal reading beautifully! I told everybody I'd found the pc's goal. Well, I had, actually, but hadn't realized it.

Pc all of a sudden – things aren't going well, needle's dirty, and you know, everything is getting goofy and so forth. But still I drilled it out and it rocket read, oh, marvelous! Couldn't get it to stay in, you know. It kept going in and out and couldn't get it to read well and most of the time it didn't rocket read. Pc all of a sudden comes up and says, "That is the end of my goal. Every goal I have put on this list – these lists for you, actually is the end phrase of my goal." And it was, too. The pc had written nothing but modifiers for their own goal. Fascinating.

And with that realization and using "in auditing on the goal," using that phrasing – I today, would have prepchecked it, you see, and it would have come in faster and I wouldn't have made this error, by the way. My goodness, that goal came up and fired just gorgeously. And there it was shooting rockets all over the place, you know? And what I'd been running
hard and what was rocket reading, was the last – an additional phrase that could have been on
the goal, but wasn't – a sort of a modifier, only it wasn't that either. It looked like a totally
independent goal all by its lonesome. You get the freaky things that'll happen when somebody
has already found the pc's goal. You get that? The tail of the goal still reads but the beginning
of it doesn't; but the tail of the goal isn't on the goal anyhow and you wouldn't use that to list
it anyway. Oh, my! Complicated.

Anyway, as we go looking over this vista of finding goals, you can list all ten of those
lists against any reliable item. You can list all ten of them against any item. You just take the
best item the pc's come up with and list lines one and six against that best item and the pc will
probably lay his goal right in your lap, see? That's after you've done an unburdening.

But how about before unburdening? How do we find out if the case has to be unbur-
dened? Well, you take that first 850 list, read each goal once, mark those that are in, in, and
go back and start tiger drilling them. Won't take you too long to do that – frankly, won't. Just
going to read it once and see if it reacts. Don't miss any reads. And you'll be able to cover an
awful lot of goals in an awful hurry.

Pc comes back in, gives you a whole bunch of goals, you know, they've got as a –
they've got as a "tiger" oppterm, see. Give you a whole bunch of goals against a tiger. And
they've got a "filibuster" as an oppterm, see, and a whole bunch of goals against a filibuster.
They come in, give you this goals list and so on. There are ten goals on it. All right, fine. How
long does it take you to read ten goals? None of them rocket reads and nothing upsets the
needle, you can set that aside very nicely and quietly right now.

Now, here's the clue: Reading something once has minimal restimulation. You can
usually give a pc an auditing command – one auditing command, without restimulating them.
You can actually give them up to three without killing them. Beyond that, you're in trouble.
You've started to process somebody for sure, after the third command. You are now running a
process. But you can always ask them once. Therefore, you can go over a goals list and the
only thing that would be hot enough to restimulate a somatic would be the pc's actual goal, in
most cases, although you'll trigger somatics that are – on goals that are close to it. So watch
for the somatic while you're doing the read once, see? The end of the run – if your rudiments
are in and so forth – at the end of the run what have you got? You've got 40 goals out of 850.
Start looking them over.

Maybe – maybe when you got up that morning you found your shoes in the right
place, you didn't get shocked while connecting up the water kettle, the car started – you know,
just a wonderful lucky day. And you're reading down this list of 30 goals the pc has brought
in to you and so forth and number 20 has a rocket read, and you tiger drill it up and it reads
and reads and reads, and it reads every time and everything is fine. That gives you then a vast
opportunity to take a crack at a lot of goals. You see the benefit of that?

Now, I'm going to give you another method of goals finding. This is another method
of goals finding known as the Prepcheck. A lot of people sit around not looking. They do not
look. That is their motto. And just as I told you the other day that it was very, very mysterious
that a MEST Clear had been made with two consecutive Problems Intensives – it was very
mysterious that this hadn't been reported from elsewhere – why, we've had another one.
They have run into a problem up at HASI London, a very bad problem, it's worrying them. After a few Problems Intensives the person keeps saying that such-and-so is his goal and they want to know what to do with it. [laughter]

Well, I sent a message back to Ray up there, and told her she had to work it out, that I was tired of contributing all the time. But there was a clue, you see – there was a clue – and that was contained in 3-21. I could give her that hint.

But actually, she should have reported this, because it's only in Central Organizations now that you're getting large numbers of consecutive actions taking place. And a Prepcheck will not only produce a free needle... They haven't noticed this in London. They notice that they're terribly loose. Making MEST Clears, you know – I mean, that – this is a killer, you know? Everybody sweating away, at it – Jim said last night, he said, "Well," he said, "that's right." He said, "A Clear that would not be connected with a goal wouldn't be real to me." And he's right. He's right. You think of clearing somebody, you think of a goal. Well, how about this character who doesn't have any goal and all of a sudden he's free needle, well, that's still a type of Clear. That is the earliest type of Clear. For heaven's sakes, don't ignore it. It has all the attributes of Clear. Of course, the fellow's liable to cave in in two months or two years, or something like that and he'll be fuzzy around the edges occasionally. But for heaven's sakes don't invalidate it; it's a very valuable state, as I think somebody here could tell us.

And trying to stabilize it and get it up along the line and keep it stable and so forth requires that you find the goal and finish it off, but that doesn't say the state doesn't exist. And apparently, wherever Problems Intensives have been run with a fair degree of technical skill, and following down the line in a minimum amount of Q and A, why, apparently they're getting free needle MEST Clears. I think this is quite interesting. And you could say this and the report is not as precise as I would like it – but you could say that after three or four Problems Intensives the person may start handing you his goal. That's a new method of goal finding, isn't it?

In other words, you tiger drill the pc until the goal reads. [laughter, laughs] That's another method of goals finding. Quite an amusing one. Sitting – sitting here at Saint Hill and going nowhere near a Central Organization, why, I'm finding out that they're clearing people and finding goals in a brand-new way and getting all set to use this data and all they're doing is worrying about it.

You see, some of these needles get so free that you can't read them to get the rudiments in. [laughter] It's like this fellow keeps complaining, you know, he says, "You know," he says, "every time I put some of this cracked ice in this glass – every time I put some of this cracked ice in this glass it doesn't dissolve, you know?" And you look in the glass and you find out there's a refrigerator full of perfect blue-white diamonds. And he says, "Well, it's no good – it won't cool drinks." I mean, they're in that kind of a weird situation, apparently.

If your technical was way up in an HGC, and you weren't getting a lot of guys jumping down the throats of the pcs and they were doing all right and they were going along the line... And apparently it's quite vital that the problem be properly assessed. The assessment of the problem is the only place they have run into trouble. They run in two or three areas. I don't know what else they did, but they have assessed the wrong problem and run it crazily and
madly all over the road, see? And run a pc up the tree. That's the only dynamite contained in a
Problems Intensive, is assessing the wrong problem.

But if things were done smoothly and the rudiments were put in and the pc was not
Qed-and-Aed with and was permitted to originate and everything went off, apparently – ap-
parently you run enough of these Problems Intensives, twenty-five hours each, and the goal is
delivered, apparently. That is what you should expect to have happen.

Now, what happens is that the needle's stuck up around 5, you give the person a Prob-
lems Intensive, and the needle will come down to the person's Clear read. You give them an-
other Problems Intensive; it wobbles out one way or the other and then comes down to the
Clear read again, and the needle is very floaty, and you give him another Problems Intensive,
you see, and the needle stops reading properly on the rudiment so that you really need another
meter or something because you can't just read through these free needles. No use for them,
you know? And instead of telling the poor Joe he's a MEST Clear, you start nagging him and
nattering at him, "What do you mean? You're fixing it up so your rudiments can't be checked
out. You can't be checked out for missed withholds and so forth." Apparently you give about
four or five of these things and you – Problems Intensives – and the guy starts putting his goal
in your lap, you know? "Yeah well, this is my goal. Now, what do I..."

And the auditor says, "Well, what the hell are you doing offering me that? I've got
nothing to do with that. You just go on here, answer the next question."

You can see some pc going straight up and a mile south, all ARC broke.

The auditor wouldn't listen to the fact that it was his goal, wouldn't put – even put it
down in the auditor's report, you know? Director of Processing would have nothing to do with
the pc because he wouldn't answer the auditing question, he'd just sat there and argued all the
time about this thing being his goal. Can't read the meter because the meter has a fairly free
needle except for these spurts reads! [laughter] I mean... Oh, you could just imagine this poor
organization. I mean, they're just in trouble from one end to the other. These diamonds won't
cool their drinks. It's very amusing.

Anyhow – anyhow, that opens the door to another way to find goals. And this would
be about the happiest way to find goals that anybody ever heard of. Just – you just keep deliv-
ering Problems Intensives until the guy volunteers his goal. Pretty wild, huh? Must be valid
because that's what's happening in an HGC right now, see?

I don't know if all cases would do this or not, but I don't know if all cases would uni-
formly sit down and be audited in an auditing chair. But the point – the point I'm making here
is maybe if we added to this some Routine 2 – remember old Routine 2? Very badly neglected
now. But supposing we added a Routine 2 button or two to this. It would certainly happen the
person certainly would go Clear, added into the normal buttons that you use in your Problems
Intensive. I know that would happen, because I've already seen Routine 2 going on down in
this direction. It's just rather lengthy and auditors had an awful time finding the right level,
and we didn't at that particular time have a problem – have an Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale. But
now that you've got "Roll Your Own," Routine 2 becomes a rather fantastic activity. See, so it
forecasts there that there's another zone of operation. But still, the best form to use it in would
be the form of the Problems Intensive. That is still your best form.
Now, there's only one thing I know of that's wrong with a Problems Intensive. On the Queen Elizabeth, Reg was trying to assess me to find out a self-determined change. And I looked it over very clear-eyed and clearheadedly and finally determined that, I think, twice in this lifetime I myself had independently, without further guidance, made up my mind, twice in this lifetime. The – I find two points which were purely and completely self-determined changes. I went over this rather long, and looked them all over very, very closely and very carefully. And therefore I can assume that most pcs are answering this question fallaciously and realize that the Problems Intensive has a trick built into it. And realized at that time that it had a trick built into it. And the trick is that you expect the pc to give you a change which he believes to be self-determined and then you find the prior confusion and the determination for that change. See?

That's a trick assessment. But while he was trying to find one of these on me, he kept asking me the question and I kept telling him the truth, see? So we finally wound up with the fact that there were two of these. That's pretty good in one lifetime, I found two times I'd made up my mind totally independently and uninfluencedly. Of course, I took the severe definition of the auditing question. He asked me for self-determined changes and I gave him two, after about two hours, I forget what it was, something like that. We were able to find two.

So there's probably something wrong with the question. And the question probably shouldn't be asked with a trick to it. Now, I've been meaning to put out a bulletin or something and do something about this ever since. There shouldn't be a trick in that assessment, since the assessment becomes that vital. Probably should just be asking a person for changes.

Now, the reason we were saying "self-determined" changes before, and emphasizing that, is because we didn't want to run them into engrams. But in actual fact a Problems Intensive will run a person through and out of engrams. I mean, the button collection now has gotten sufficiently powerful to do some rather wonderful things with his track, you see? And he's not going to get stuck in an engram anyhow, if he doesn't have a missed withhold.

You want to know why pcs suddenly curl up in a ball while you're tiger drilling them sometimes and go into the engram – and it'll happen to you sooner or later – pc just has a missed withhold, and instead of going on and butchering the pc through the engram you should ask the pc for the missed withhold. Get the missed withhold and he'll come right out of the dramatization, which is quite interesting. That's – we've done that around here quite a bit, to our great advantage. It's the missed withhold that pulls him back in to the solidity of the picture.

You get some auditors – all the pc's got to say, "I've got a stuck picture in front of me," and the auditor's going to run it, man. Of course, he hasn't got a prayer of running it, because it's the confusion that occurred before the stuck picture that causes the picture to be stuck, you know? But even asking for the confusion that went ahead of the stuck picture isn't good enough to release that engram. You have to run a whole series of assorted buttons on it.

But if the pc started to dramatize an operation or an incident or a prenatal or something like this, don't keep charging him on through it. Also don't suddenly change the process just because he starts shivering – that's very bad auditing. But let's say the pc curls up in the ball, and goes into a catatonic bluhh state and so forth. Well, you're justified in shifting off to
the random rudiment and back into the process, see? That'd be your only shift, which is all part of Model Session. You're not doing something very different, you're just getting your random rudiment in.

You get your random rudiment in on a dramatizing pc in a session, he generally will drop right out of it. That's well worth knowing, because I hadn't realized till Jim was talking last night ... He didn't have this answer; Mary Sue told him what the score was on it. But he'd been tiger drilling a pc up in London; the pc curled up in a ball and went straight into a prenatal. And this was quite startling. But actually could only – so, it refreshes some earlier data which we had on this. Pc'll only dramatize like mad if he has a missed withhold. Because, of course, his effort to withhold from the session, or with... you know, keys in his going into the incident. See, he actually can't stay in the session and he retreats into the incident, don't you see? It's the withhold that pulls him back into the incident, if you can figure it out – very elementary.

Anyhow, to give you a clue as to your Problems Intensive, use of, the assessment undoubtedly should be based on a question which simply gets the person – changes in a person's life. And you start asking for too many vagaries on this, see, self-determined changes, he starts answering the question absolute, you're going to have a ball. I mean, you're not going to be able to get any. And it depends on this kind of a tricky question. But if you ask him, now, because you don't want other-determined changes, if you just ask him "Times you decided to change," why, you probably have got it pretty close to a dead-center question. I've been meaning to tell you this for some time, when I hadn't written a bulletin on it or gotten around to it at all. Had a few other things on my mind.

And well, it – just ask him for times he decided to change, or his decisions to change; why, you'll wind up with a more reliable assessment. Because the pc doesn't have to tell you any lie then, to assess it. Of course, naturally he decided to change – the house fell in on him, you know? A bad assessment will sometimes wind you up in this kind of a situation and the tone arm won't move. It's, "Will the tone arm move?" that is the criteria of a reliable assessment. If your assessment is good, the tone arm will move. If your assessment is bad, the tone arm won't move.

So in handling Problems Intensives, or in handling auditors running them, why, just lay that point in with a small club and you'll be all set. Keep your eye on that tone arm. Right after the assessment is done, the first action's taken after the assessment is done, using that date. That tone arm doesn't move, you get that guy out of there so fast that the E-Meter turns pale, see? You get him – you get him off of that. You get another assessment quick.

In other words, you want to – you want to know if in the first twenty minutes of run on the first button if you had tone arm action. And if you didn't get tone arm action you get him the hell out of there, man. See, you have to leave – if you're running this in HGCs, you have to run this on a standing order. All right, after the assessment is done – usually done by a goal finder, or the D of P or somebody, see; a confirmation of the assessment or the assessment is done by them – and your first orders after that is, "All right. We've got this date and it's January 3rd, 1941. All right. We've got that date." That took it the – by all the rules of the game, you see, the incident, the decision and the month before and all that. "All right. Now, go
ahead and start your question on this thing. 'Since _____,' so forth, and for the first twenty minutes, why, you watch your tone arm, keep your needle to center very, very carefully, and give me those tone arm reads. At the end of twenty minutes, if you have inadequate tone arm action, you come back and see me fast." You see, that's your guarantee.

Because it's apparently only those pcs who didn't get tone arm action while running the Problems Intensive that got into any trouble because of one. See, this is a guarantee that your pc isn't going to get into trouble running the wrong problem. So what you want to do, uniformly, is watch for tone arm motion and the rules of what is good tone arm motion and what is poor tone arm motion apply as given in an earlier bulletin.

So this is a killer as long as it's done right – a Problems Intensive is. But apparently you tiger drill the pc, and he will eventually give you a goal. Or you prepcheck the pc off the goal, and you eventually had a goal sitting in the chair. I think it's very worthwhile knowing that – that this can occur. Even if we don't know at this moment that it can occur with every case in every place, it is very interesting that we know it can occur. And by telling you in this lecture, giving you some idea of the number of goals that you could cover just by reading them all at once and marking those that were in and only tiger drilling those, relieves you from, I hope, a fear of letting the pc write goals and getting goals off the pc. I hope that relieves you to some degree.

A lot of you are asking, "Well, what do I do with the 850 goals?" Well, what do you do with them? If you're doing 3GA Criss Cross and you find a couple of items and a terminal or something like this, or you want to list the goals against the oppters and list the goals for the terminal, get a little list like this, and you start down that list and you don't immediately have a goal smack you in the face. Well, man, you've got 850 of them sitting back on the original list. You've unburdened the case so it would probably run anyway, got the guy under control, nicely. Just read the 850 list off to him; you're liable to find the goal sitting right there. Oddly enough, sizing up the pc, perhaps if you hadn't unburdened it, and you had read the 850 list of the pc, the goal wouldn't have read. See? Or if you did find it, nothing could've happened. A lot of conditions could have existed around it.

On some pc – looks pretty good, he's riding down well, and so forth – just pick up the 850 list and read it to the pc, one each. Won't take you very long to do that. Mark the ones in. The chances are you'll just be reading down the list and you'll see a rocket read. And if you got up that morning and you made the proper obeisance to the rising sun and put your necklace on right end to, there you are. And you say, "To catch catfish" – pow! "To catch catfish" – pow! "To catch catfish" – pow! You see it go pow again and say, "What'd you think of?" He says, "To catch catfish." Take it down to the Instructor, pc sits there calmly, Instructor says, "To catch catfish," and there it goes. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish." It reads – rocket reads. Bring it back. List it for sixteen hours. The pc goes Clear, find his second goal; it's number two on the list. You – can do this, too! [laughs]

Okay. Well, I hope that's – will be of some assistance to you. Okay.

Good night.
Thank you.

Well, how are you tonight? You mean you are still alive?

*Audience: Yes!*

Oh, gee! That's rough. That's rough. This is the what?

*Audience: 20 Nov. AD 12.*

Twenty Nov. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture one.

All right. You might be interested that a couple of goals have been found this week. I don't know how this happened; must have been an accident of some sort or another. Let me point out something to you: they were there all the time to be found. Horrible! You don't realize what a horrible crack that is!

Now, there is a very distinct possibility that the – with finding these bypassed items you'll start getting some free needles. You bypass a lot of items in listing. Got a rock slam and didn't find out anything about it and there it was, and so forth, see? And once you've got those picked up, why, you'll have a free needle.

Now, a free needle is a needle that doesn't read. It's not stuck. The E-Meter has to be turned on – and when you ask questions it doesn't respond. It differs from an ARC broke needle basically on the aspect of the pc. And if any of you have ever accidentally looked across to the chair across from you there, you will see there's a great deal can be learned from the pc. Really, a great deal can be learned from the pc. I want to point that out to you as one of the fundamentals of auditing. You might have overlooked it. Okay?

All right. Well, enough of these pleasant preliminaries, let's get on with the lecture, huh? Now, I'm not going to give you *the* basic lecture on the fundamentals of auditing. But I'm going to point some few things out to you which you might find of considerable use in auditing. The auditor who isn't getting anyplace basically isn't perceiving the existence of the pc. He isn't perceiving the pc. That's the crux of the thing. Therefore, you can absolutely count on the fact that an auditor who has an oppterm on the third and fourth dynamic – that an oppterm on the third or fourth dynamic is liable to make a lousy auditor.

Why? It's not that he's in a games condition – not that he's in a games condition, that's not the point. It's something else. It's perception. And I want to tell you something about these items you see busily rock slamming. I don't think you know very much about these items that rock slam like crazy on the meter in front of you. You don't adjudicate the rest of the stuff that can be picked up off these items. These items mean a great deal more than simply a rock slam on a meter.
You get rock slamming items, you're getting the pc toward Clear. That is the road to Clear – is milestone by rock slamming items. He isn't going anyplace else, he's going Clear. And it doesn't matter – it doesn't matter how you find these items. It doesn't matter a bit. I can tell you 8,767 methods, almost off the bat, to turn on a rock slamming item. It doesn't matter how you turn on this rock slamming item. You got an item and the pc is on the road to Clear, and that's all there is to that.

And now I've looked this thing over very, very carefully and I have found out that when the pc doesn't get the other side of the package, huh-huh-hee-hee, he's going to stop right there with that rock slamming item you just found, ha-ha! There it is.

He knows now! Now, how does he know? What does he know? What? What? What does he know? Do you ever realize that the way to make somebody feel like they know without knowing anything is just give them a good, swift kick. Now he knows.

As a matter of fact there's a disgraceful comic strip in the Herald Tribune about the army. And it's disgraceful because it brags up the army all the time, all the time, all the time, advertise, advertise, advertise, you know? And it's got a sergeant and it's got a character named Beetle. And seems like this Beetle, who is a goldbrick ...

He's not as good as I used to be at goldbricking, but he's pretty good, in an amateur sort of way. Goldbricking is a fine art, man. It is a fine art. Now, it's that action taken by an individual who, finding himself in a position which he doesn't like, decides to make the best of it. And he can do this so artistically he even winds up with a medal.

Anyhow, Beetle was apparently complaining about all of the rough go and how he was sick and couldn't go out on the obstacle course or something like this, so the sergeant took him out to the door and kicked him, good and hard, down the steps. Good swift kick. And Beetle is sitting there amongst the soup-kitchen stuff saying to his pal, "And you know, I do feel better." Of course, the sergeant had said, "I'll cure it!" just at the moment of impact. So of course he gave him an engram and he feels better, and there's Beetle. I thought that was very, very subtle for a comic strip to pick up.

No, an impact gives a sensation of knowingness. People think they know something. "That will teach you a lesson," is one of the greatest clichés ever uttered. But it is quite fundamental. It's based on this same business. Two automobiles come together with a crash and those that survive it now know better. But they have an actual sensation of knowing something.

Now, the pc is in a mystery sandwich. There he is and the mystery glues him to the GPM, see? That – what's it all about? He doesn't know what it's all about. So you've come down the line and you've found something on which he has impacts and from which he has suffered impacts. His overt and withhold at this point are accompanied by not – a rock slamming item. It does not run like this: "I don't like little girls." See? After that the item "little girls" doesn't rock slam. You got the idea?

So when you find this you haven't got – you haven't got the result of having said this. Nor have you got the result of him having slapped some little girl's wrist. See? Or having taken some candy away from some little girl. I hope I'm making my point here.
A rock slamming item has mayhem with exclamation points behind it. It's got impact like mad! And it's much to his amazement as he runs on down the track and he thinks he's cleaned all this up, to find out that one of his pastimes, you see, was eating little girls after cooking them slowly alive over fires, you see? There was something went along with this rock slamming item.

Now, the amount of drama that I have pointed out to you contained in the overt or contained in the withhold has nothing to do with it. See, the significance, the dramatic story behind the overts of the pc as you pull overts off of him have nothing to do... It's what he considers at that particular time an overt and what he can take responsibility for. And you'll pull as much as he can take responsibility for; you won't pull any more than that.

But there we're talking just about overts – talking about nice little overts that don't have anything much to do with the price of fish. You've got to pull them in order to get a pc on the road. Now, you're talking about overts there; you're not talking about items. Now, a rock slamming item doesn't have drama behind it, it has "banned in Boston" behind it, see? It's too brutal, too inhuman and too this and too that to suffer print. And that applies to any pc you'll audit on the GPM line.

Wasn't the result – this rock slamming item is not as a result of accumulated slappings of wrists, you see. This is wiping out the countryside every now and then, don't you know? That rock slam means something.

Now, in view of the fact that a rock slamming item can impart its rock slam, as a lock can be hooked onto an engram and then read, you see. This lock doesn't have any – going back to Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health – this lock doesn't have any punch in it. He saw a man with a bandaged face, you see? And this clicks on the meter. Why does this click on the meter? There's no impact in it – just saw a man with a bandaged face. Well, that read is borrowed away from – is borrowed away from an engram, which has impact in it. See, force is involved here. But that force can impart up the line so that things without force then tend to borrow some of that force and give you a read, see? What you've got is a restimulation of the force, is what's reading.

Now, similarly you can very often get a reliable item – apparently reliable item – that doesn't have very much force in it, which has borrowed its rock slam. But on assessment you'll find out this person is rock slamming like mad on Scientology. There's no impacts involved in Scientology, don't you see? That isn't because there's any impacts involved or any force involved. It'll be something that's quite like Scientology but it really has force in it. See? And you get that rock slam has been borrowed from this other item. Well, you could get that other item by representing Scientology.

But you take a rock slamer, all you've got to do is oppose the thing you find him rock slamming on. You know, he's rock slamming on Scientology or an auditor or something like that. You find this person rock slamming on that; you want to cool that off or get the case anyplace, you've got to oppose that rock slam. "Who or what would oppose ... ?" whatever you found rock slamming.

Now, if you represent this item you will find out he was really rock slamming on something else. You see, you get the real item that underlies it. But that doesn't matter. Be-
cause he's in the atmosphere of Scientology, it's in restimulation all the time, and you're never even going to get down to pull that other item until you give it an opposition. You see that?

So you could use a rock slammer against Scientology or against a Scientology organization or any of the parts of Scientology – you could use that rock slam just by listing goals against it. "What goal might you have that'd be an overt against Scientology?" You see? You could list goals against it directly.

But look at it: it's a soft item. See, it really doesn't have the violence back of it. It doesn't go very far down the track. Very short-term proposition. So its rock slam is liable to fold up under a little bit of treatment or a little bit of listing or a little bit of that or something of the sort. It's not a good item to list goals against because it isn't firm, because it has no force behind it. It doesn't matter how well it rock slams or how repetitively it rock slams on the meter, see? It must have borrowed its rock slam from something else that did have force in it. See? Do you follow this?

The character of the rock slam doesn't tell you. But the ease with which the slam folds up tells you. Now, some of these rock slamming items fold up – prrrrt! You find them in a session and they slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam. End of the session you can still get them – slam-slam-slam. You pick them up next session it's, pnyeh. Nothing. What happened to them?

Well, obviously, merely the exposure of it brought it, as a lock, into view and so evaporated it. You must have been next door to a rock slamming item. See? It must have been a lock on top of it. Just like Scientology... Let's say he has a long history of burning hospitals – you know, a good military background of burning hospitals – you know, a good military background of burning hospitals. Every time he saw the Red Cross he said, "Well, obviously using that as an HQ," so he bombed it, you see. He just couldn't ever resist. Because he knew that all hospitals were false.

Well, after he's gone on for a long time the mere breath of the idea that anybody's going to heal anything, see – as far departed as the FDA is from the facts in the United States, see – and he'll rock slam on Scientology. But it's a lock rock slam, don't you see? That doesn't make it any less a reliable item. You use it in all ways that you would use any reliable item. But just remember, it's going to fold up awful fast. See? It's a cousin; it isn't the thing.

Now, you've got to oppose it, though. If it rock slammed, if you found it, located it, checked it out and it slammed, you got to oppose it. Because there is some other terminal or oppterm which is right next door to it which is also a lock which will slam as heavy as it. And if you go on down and find something else on the case, you find another oppterm – you found that "Scientology" is an oppterm – now you found another oppterm, below that by "represent," he – you've left some kind of a lock-up over here which the pc is. And it's got some pain in it, and the pc's going to hang right there. Doesn't matter – it's going to be light, it's going to be nothing, see? But nevertheless, it's there. And the case hangs up right at that point.

Now, the case starts in to this rock slam channel, then, at any little point. That – and there's just dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens, countless dozens of ways to get him into the rock slam channel. You can take almost any part of Scientology and get him into the rock slam channel with it. You can take "mid ruds" and get him into the rock slam channel.
You know, every once in a while this pc has a withhold from me and then "session" is consistently dirty as a – "session" is consistently dirty. Get a dirty read every time I say "session." Sometimes it doesn't and sometimes it does, and sometimes there's a dial-wide rock slam. When anything goes wrong with the session, or the pc has a little withhold in the session of some kind or another, we get a dial-wide rock slam. Well, that's an open bid to get the rock slam channel. Get whatever you can that is closest to it, "session," "auditing," something like that, opposition it – anything that'll turn that rock slam on, see? Just fish around till you get something, turn on a rock slam, oppose it, put the two down on your line plot. You've entered the rock slam channel.

You see, if it slams you can enter the rock slam channel. And at the end of that channel is the goal. And that channel leads down between terminals and oppterms. If you figured a road which had large black balls getting progressively bigger on the left-hand curb and the right-hand curb, and as you drove down that road with these great, big, black spheres to the right of you and to the left of you, a pair each time, and you kept driving between big, black spheres, a pair every time; you'd go over a horizon sooner or later down to the end and find a puff of nothing and that would be the goal, see? That's the way the thing maps.

However, the pc, by getting it all locked up and messed up and keyed in and monkeyed up one way or the other has got this roadway pretty well twisted up from where he sits. But it is never twisted up from where the auditor sits. To the pc it looks like the end of the road is at the beginning of the road is at the end of the road, that it's all tied in a bowline on a bight in the middle of the road, that it's all a black mass.

No, no. It is not to the auditor. It is just a road and it's got a black ball on the right and a black ball on the left. And all the black balls on the left are oppterms. And all the black balls on the right are terminals. And these things are always in pairs, and when you find a pair of them they rock slam against each other. And you go down the road and you keep driving down the road, and you drive far enough down the road you're going to run into a goal. And then it's easy to drive down the road because you know what you're driving on. And you keep on driving and you get to the end of the pairs of black balls and you get the Rock and the opprock and everything goes poof! and you've got a Clear on your hands.

That's an easy road to travel. It is far easier than you are making it – far easier. I've been conducting a whole bunch of series – a whole series of test audits of one kind or another. I've been going over this subject – wow! Really – diving in here and there and straightening out this point and that point about it. And the only reason the auditor can only drive one pair, two pair of black balls down this road is because he hasn't driven by pairs. He got an oppterm and an oppterm and then he got a terminal and a terminal, and then he got an oppterm and all of a sudden the road is barriered. There's a landslide.

Why can't he go any further? You might say it's the magnetic attraction of those terminals and oppterms which he didn't pair up. And when he didn't pair up a pair, he left something that will drag him back. And he will see that drag-back expressed in a rising, sticking tone arm. The tone arm will go up four and a half, five or go low. It can also go low. Case making no progress. Case gives you the same items over and over and over.
It's like you were driving down this highway, see; you're going lickety-split down the highway and you're doing about eighty, and you say, "Oh man, this is really the most, you know. Flat. Easy. We're getting terminals." And, oh, everything's going along fine and so forth. And all of a sudden it's just like somebody put a jack under the rear wheels. And man, you step on that accelerator, you know, and that engine roars but there's no traction. And you just keep punching the accelerator.

Of course, a good thing to do at that time is vent your temper on the pc. Why? What's all this? Well, it's just the fact that you passed one of those spheres back there, and it's still back there. Pc can't go any further. His attention is being dragged back to that.

Now, what is this sphere? What is this sphere? The sphere is something the pc knows. The pc knows. Why? Because in any one of these pairs – unless they're lock pairs; and you can't tell the difference between a lock pair and a real pair – there's impact. And that rock slam carries – even if there wasn't any force involved and it was just a lock, you know, it still carries the idea of knowingness. But you get one of these with real force in it and try to bypass it, and he thinks of knowledge as behind him. There's something over there he should know about. And he just sticks to it. He sticks to the mystery of it all. What is it?

Any time you get him into one of these terminals or oppterms he says he knows something and he cognites like mad. He's telling you he knows and actually during the ensuing – the ensuing day or two he's liable to try to add up his whole life into this, you see. He's found "little girls," you see, as an oppterm. And now he's added up all of his life and his whole track and everything from two hundred trillion years ago and everything he does and the significance of the way he holds his teaspoons, you see – this is all added up into this one terminal or this one oppterm. And, of course, he's trying to integrate his whole case into about one-thousandth of his case. Not to give you an idea that there's a thousand of these things, but you – it's that small a percentage.

Why does he have a feeling like it contains all the answers? It's because of that force and impact in it, don't you see? Give anything force and impact enough and somebody thinks it has all the answers. If you were to take somebody out in the middle of the sidewalk and kick him for half an hour, every time he passed the spot – if you could get him near the spot – he would have an idea that he knew. He wouldn't know what he knew, but he'd have an idea that he knew something.

The result of impact is a sensation that one knows. It's a sensation of knowingness. That's why people teach a lesson by punishment. This is one of the big mechanisms of this whole universe, is the lesson by punishment: "If we spank Johnny he will know." Of course, you get Johnny through his spankings and he'll run off a sensation of knowing. Even if he only knows his father's no good. See, he'll have got some knowingness mixed up with this, don't you see?

His knowledge is not actual knowledge but something dragged through force. There's no real knowingness about it at all; it's the illusion of knowingness. The Russians have got this so badly in dialectic materialism. That's not an electronic activity; that's the whole philosophy of Russia's forward progress, is "All knowledge comes from two forces." Oh, you – I could be very erudite on the subject, but I don't think anything as horrible, as illogical, as dia-
lectic materialism should be given the courtesy of a "proper" rendition. They're dramatizing the GPM. "Knowledge is the product of two forces." It's funny, see?

Of course, you get some zone or area of the world where it's hot all the time and cold all the time – in summer it's roaring hot and in the winter it's roaring cold. I've seen horse biscuits jump up in the air and explode in Vladivostok. It gets cold, man! You think it's cold in England, you've got nothing, man! Nothing! It gets cold. It's very difficult sometimes knowing, after you've shaken hands with someone, if you've taken your hand back, you know? Might have just snapped off in the process.

And of course this gooney race would be so keyed in they wouldn't know whether they were coming or going, and they would deal a whole philosophy off the GPM. They're aberrated. "All knowledge is the product of two forces." If you really want to know something, get two tractors, rush them at each other at a thousand miles an hour and you'll have the political answer to the situation, obviously. Well, that's how silly this dialectic materialism is as a study.

You have to have two forces and they have to come into collision and if you get these two forces into the collision, why, then you can figure something out and then you can go from there. If you want to know how to repair an automobile, run it over a cliff. Then you will know that it's busted. It's one of these idiotic things. It's taken straight out of the GPM, see?

So a pc knows there's knowledge over there someplace and he wants to know what it is and he holds up and he won't accompany you in your automobile eighty miles an hour down this line, he'll go out thataway and you can't get any further down the track because you've got no pc. Where'd the pc go? Well, he's still looking at oppterm one, which you didn't find.

He says, "What is this thing? There must be some wonderful knowledge connected with all this, you know? Must be. What is it? I hear something. No..." and you can talk to him all you want to. You can say, "Why isn't your needle clean?" You know? Good – good auditor presence, you know? "You're just doing this because you're mad at me because you haven't got your old auditor," see? You know, things like that.

He just doesn't unglue at all; just keeps saying, "What's this? What's that? That?" It's because the thing is charged up. You found half of it and he knows there's another half.

Call those items which are neglected "bypassed items." Those items are bypassed, and the bypassed item is what hangs up the case. Now, this is what I was going to tell you about this research auditing. It's very, very interesting to me. But it doesn't matter how you find the pair, they go onto the line plot in the exact place they're supposed to go, in sequence and that's the wildest thing I ever saw.

Doesn't matter how you find them. If you find them from one line or another line or something, and then you put them down on the line plot and then we ignore that pair – we find both pair, see – and we go off in some wild race across the countryside and we pick up some brand-new way to get a pair. And we find, you know, another rock slam, and now we opposition it. We put it on the line plot; they're exactly in the right sequence. Well, that's amazing.
You didn't skip a pair, see. It's amazing. I mean, you're lucky. They're always the next consecutive pair, no matter how you found them, if you found both of them. But you won't get the next consecutive pair if you only find one of one thing and then one of another. You have to opposition the thing you find. Whatever you find, opposition it. And then you keep getting proper pairs.

When you stop oppositioning what you find and just try to combine two rock slamming items – heh-heh-heh! – maybe they're a pair and maybe they're not. So that's the lesson. But a case in clearing hangs up when you bypass an item. That gives us the rule that everything you find that rock slams must be oppositioned. See, it's oppositioned as itself, not in some other way or with some other command or with anything else. Just opposition it. It's that simple. Who or what would oppose it?

I think this is quite remarkable. I think it's quite fantastic that the highway lies there with a sphere on the right and a sphere on the left, and they match together and they're both at the same location. And when you've got that sphere you can drive a little further down the highway and you'll find a sphere on the right and a sphere on the left, and they match each other. And if you get both of those spheres then you can go on down the highway a little further and you can find a sphere on your right and a sphere on your left, and you can get that pair. Then you can get down the road a little bit further and get a sphere on your right and a sphere on your left.

And it doesn't happen to matter whether you're getting them from the goal or from a wrong goal – as long as it gives pain. Well, you won't get very far with a wrong goal, the case will spin in. But nevertheless you can get a pair off a wrong goal. And if you abandoned it at the point where you got the pair and didn't go any further with it you're still all right. Sounds funny.

The rule is as long as it gives pain, you can list it. And when it stops giving pains, skip it. You'll just have the goal, probably, of one of the pairs you're now looking for, see?

It all depends on this interesting fact: The E-Meter will read on what is real or realizable to the pc. The E-Meter reads on what is realizable. If the pc can have a reality on it, it'll read on the meter. If the pc can't have a reality on it you won't get a read on the meter. The rock slam, being the biggest manifestation on the meter, is that thing you get the biggest reality on.

A funny thing: He'll put the pairs on – he'll put pairs on which are three sequences down the line – three pairs down the line, you see? He's at pair A, B and he'll put stuff on the list which is at H, I. But it won't slam. It may tick, but it won't slam. And you'll say, "Well, there it is."

And if you've got one of these pcs that's got to be original, never dares repeat an item, something like this, well, sometimes you have a little bit of trouble. Because he knows he's put "alligators" on it, every list he has so far done, and it's never come up yet. So he's apathetic about "alligators" just at the time when "alligators" is about to come up.

In other words, the progress which you are making down that track of pairs toward the end of the line, the progress which you are making is milestone by pairs, not milestone by
single items. And if you go and bypass one of these items and then never find it and so forth, you've had it. You're not going to go any further. You might find the next pair and that's it – end of track.

Where is it, then? It lies behind you. All you've got to do is equate it up into pairs and it'll roll again, as easy as that. You're dealing with a fantastically precise mechanical electrical fact. It's just in these – these things are in spheres. What are these spheres? These spheres are old identities. These spheres are held together by the nicest, neatest balance you ever heard of. It's impossible that they have held together all these millennia. But they have; they've just been exactly and neatly balanced. The forces from A to B are the same as the forces from B to A, so they hang up.

This is reinforced, then, by the negative pair. The positive pairs also have negative pairs. Frankly the reason I haven't brought this up or said very much about it is because it's one of these pedantic points. Because they just look like pairs to the auditor and they do the same thing.

There's the not-oppose pair – the not-oppose pair. And that's the secondary pair. They really don't oppose each other. They oppose the other two in some peculiar way and so they do oppose each other so they rock slam. All of which is very complicated and they're what render the thing up in a ball.

But frankly, you needn't pay any attention to them, unless you're going to ask a pc just for a pair. You start asking the pc for pairs and you rapidly learn, as I found out, that you can't ask him for just two pairs which oppose each other. I'm talking now about an auditing command to Clear. A clearing command. Like there's no E-Meter, there's no assessments, there's no nothing. I'm searching on this line because we've got something – to have something here for Clearing Co-audit, see?

I've been looking for some method of driving down this track in a Clearing Co-audit that would take a long time but would one way or the other wind the pc up there on just raw-meat-type muzzled auditing, see? I'm looking for this. Apparently it would be a very lengthy procedure. But it – nevertheless, I'm pretty sure it can be done. That's as far as I've advanced on that.

And one of the things I learned doing that is, if you ask him for two things which oppose each other and then ask him for two things which oppose each other and then ask him for two things which oppose each other and then ask him for two things which oppose each other, he'll turn on some of the nastiest somatics you ever wanted to have anything to do with. Thuuuh! Oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, see? Uh-uh-uh-uh!

Of course, he gives you little things, you know. He gives you items in the room and he gives you stuff out of his present time problems and he gives you stuff of this character. And you nevertheless are getting pairs. Of course, he finally comes up with the sixty-four dollar pair, because this is all done by gradients which the original clearing is. You would, in other words, improve his ability to confront to a point of where he can confront the first pair and recognize them without the assistance of the meter. And that's really asking you something, man; that's asking something.
But you can't do it that way. You have to ask him, "Tell me two things that oppose each other. Tell me two things that don't oppose each other." "Two things that are not in opposition" is the better wording. "Tell me two things that are in opposition. Tell me two things that are not in opposition. Tell me two things that are in opposition. Tell me two things that are not in opposition."

The full package, by the way – that doesn't work very well; you've got to beef it up – is: "Tell me a problem. What two things in that problem oppose each other or are in opposition? What two things are not in opposition? Tell me a problem. What two things are in opposition, what two things are not in opposition? Tell me a problem... ." Get the idea?

Of course, it's the Goals Problem Mass, and you theoretically could graduate him up the line and he could run it. But if you just asked him for two things in opposition, "Tell me a problem. Now, tell me two things in that problem that oppose each other," you're going to get some of the nastiest non-turn-offable somatics you've seen in a long time. Because you're asking for the fundamental pair every time, you never get the secondary pair.

Now, how much this means in driving down the road I haven't equated. I know that for a fact, however, that you have to ask for the oppose and the not-oppose.

Now, in view of the fact that you're finding things on oppose and not-oppose lines when you are listing from the goal, you of course are getting things that are not in opposition to each other, even when you oppose things.

You see, you say, "Tell me something that's not in opposition to catching catfish," see. "What would not oppose catching catfish?" You do a list, you get a rock slam on it, when you oppose that thing you got – you've got a pair of non-oppositions. The – it's very complicated. But it's actually worked into the four lines, so that you get the – you get additional pairs, and then you can oppose these pairs. You understand? You get an item, you oppose the item. The same rule holds. You get the item, you oppose the item.

Now, this opens the door to something interesting: that if you were going in and just listing lines and you never did find the pc's goal, you would undoubtedly have to introduce some other data into his auditing to keep on going indefinitely. You follow me? That opens the fact that but – you didn't have his goal and you've driven halfway down the line between these pairs and something might start hanging up; well, you might have to get the non-opposition lines because you probably skipped some items that didn't oppose. Do you understand? Do you – you get this?

You see, it's a four-way flow, not a two-way flow. And the four-way flow is introduced by the other pair. And they still show up in general auditing just as a pair, when you're listing from a goal. When you're listing from the goal they just show up as a – as a ordinary pair. You don't recognize to the degree that they're influenced by the last pair you found or by the next pair you're going to find. Pc doesn't have to recognize this to any degree to get going.

Well, let me put it this way – I see you're in a drift: You've got two pairs. From the auditor's viewpoint, you are simply driving down the road and you'll find A on the right and B on the left; that's one pair. And C on the right and D on the left; that's your second pair. And
you've – from where you sit you simply passed two pairs. You got it? That is the way it looks from the auditor's viewpoint.

In the actual bank they're not arranged that way. A versus B is crossed by C versus D. Actually, it looks like two dumbbells, the handles of which are held together. Look much more like this. They expel. They expel the things. You've just got, see, pair, pair, pair, pair, see? They have crushed themselves together on this particular line and this has to do with types of charge. Two of these are retreating so hard that they come together. And the other two are attacking so hard that they come together. You've got various electrical phenomena.

You go into the electrical phenomena of this, though, and you'll be blowing your brains out in no time. See? I was trying to tell you why we're not worried about this electrical phenomena. I only introduced this other thing, that by the time you were going to try the idiotic action of clearing somebody without ever finding his goal... You understand, that's not something that you're engaged upon. See? If you went into that you would have to pay attention to this crossed-handles effect of the dumbbells, see? Now you've got to pay attention to it.

We're not going to find the guy's goal. So therefore we're never going to have the four lines, "want," "not want," "oppose," "not oppose," see? We're never going to ask for the "not want" and the "not oppose," and those are the two that'll crash together.

Mostly you'll find the "want" and "not want" go together, and the "oppose" and "not oppose" go together. That's the way they normally get found. After the – after you got through oppositioning some item the pc will say, "Well, that belongs on the 'want' line and the other one belongs on the 'not want' line." They tell you where they belong on the lines.

But say you picked one off "not oppose" – you were listing "not oppose" and you got a rock slam. So you listed the rock slam out very beautifully and then you nulled that list, and you came up now with a nice, beautiful, rock slamming reliable item. Then you said – depending on if that thing is an oppterm – you say, "Who or what would oppose that nice, big, beautiful item?" see? You – it's always that. If it was a terminal, why, "Who or what would it oppose?" see, to get your next list. But that's an opposition to it. Then you do your new list with that, "Who or what would oppose it?" and so on. Got that list. You'll find out there'll be something on there rock slams. Null all this down, beautifully polish it up and what do you find yourself sitting with? You find yourself sitting with a pair.

Now, the pc will tell you that this new one belonged on one of these other lines. Also liable to tell you, "I never under God's green earth would have put it on that line." See? That was the startling part of it. You actually discovered this thing he would have overlooked. And that is your level of confront. In other words, the pc's level of confront is not quite up to these rock slamming pairs, and it has to be graduated up scale, gradually, to see more and more rock slam, more and more pairs and more and more and more and more. And you get further and further down the road. He's seeing bigger and bigger things. Do you understand me?

He can equate these things; he can put them together. And he'll say this is the way it sits, and he'll give you the whole game connected with them. And he'll say, "Here's the priest and here's the vestal virgin. Ah, yes. Oh, yes. The..." If you let him he'd spin you quite a tale – if you'd listen. You could ask him questions about it.
Now, you can do all kinds of things with these pairs. You can do anything with them you can do with any process in the last twelve years. Because that's the basic line that you're going toward when you are auditing somebody. You'd head in toward these things. When the pc would have a big gain, you'd hit one accidentally, and when you didn't have any big gain you didn't hit one. That was what your auditing results to a marked degree depended on. It's whether you got into this rock slam channel or didn't. It was that happenstance with the pc.

These pairs have got force in them. The force is from the A to the B, don't you see? The force is *between* the two of them and they're held in balance and they remain very badly discharged when you don't find the other half of them and so forth and that consists of a game. And A is in a – always in a games condition with B. You see? One side of the pair is in a games condition with the other side of the pair. One of these pairs is the pc. The other one is the enemy. Invariably that's the way he equates it, except when you get a combination terminal and that's a rock sitting in the middle of the road and you drive around that.

Now, here they are, as you go down the line. The amount of force contained in these things is invariably underestimated by the auditor. If he does a rough job of auditing, the rougher the job of auditing, why, the force is going to hit the pc hard or that much harder. Now, it's already almost unbearable, because you're auditing the pc in a body which wasn't there at the time he accumulated the mass. So the mass, then, impinges on the body in some crazy and weird way and tends to disrupt and upset various portions of the body. But remember when he was the priest and chasing the vestal virgins he wasn't wearing "John Smith, deacon of the local Presbyterian church." So you've always got a body in the road during auditing. It gets in the road.

Now, he'd experience these somatics as a than when he was somewhere outside of his head. He'd still experience them because he's still got mass, see? But your mass is complicated by the presence of a body. And the body goes hot and the body goes cold and the body hurts and the body this and the body that and so forth. So you're actually clearing somebody over his alive body. [laughter]

He has no business wearing that body because it had nothing to do with the dramatis personae of what you're auditing. That you can clear somebody at all with a body kicking around is a monument to your ability, because it's an extra, massive, hard, solid valence which is sitting up in PT, which in itself every time you find a pair of items does some discharging. It's always a third factor in the middle of every pair.

Now, because this third factor gets mixed up in it, the pc will flinch. He probably wouldn't flinch if you were auditing him out in space someplace with a couple of beams on the E-Meter, don't you see? But in a body he tends to flinch more because he's afraid something's going to knock that body off.

And you'll hear a pc every once in a while be very, very chary of going into that any further because, ha-ha-ha-ha... Part of it is, is he just can't understand how the body could keep going with that much pressure on the heart, got it? "Well, I don't understand it either" – you might tell him that. But I don't think it'd encourage him.

Truth of the matter is, the liabilities are slight. But the fear that something horrible might happen lends him all the potential of having something bad happen. He flinches, he's
still protecting a body – the body he's got in present time – and he's liable to back off and back out and get out of there. Flinch. You'll see pcs doing it every once in a while.

Now, probably he would straight list to Clear. You'd find his goal any old way and he'd just straight list to Clear if it weren't for this body factor in present time and rough auditing and other little factors that enter into it. Because these make him flinch off from confronting and putting together the total packages as he passes them.

Here he goes down the line and you find an item and you get the opposition to the item and you find another item and you get the opposition of the item. You find the goal, and you've got the goal, and he lists very ambitiously in the first forty items on each of the first four lines that we were originally doing.

And if nothing got in the road of his body – that is to say, it didn't look to him like his body was suffering too much and if he wasn't suffering to that degree and the auditing was very smooth and a lot of other conditions, why, then he'd get the next forty or fifty items. And he'd get the next forty or fifty items, and all of a sudden he'd pair a couple of them up. And then he'd go to the next forty or fifty items and he'd go to the next forty or fifty, and he'd pair another one up. And he'd say where this was and the next thing you know the needle is getting looser and looser and floppier and floppier. And all we had to do at the end of that line was clean up a few of the bits and pieces and he was Clear. Do you understand that?

All right. Let's take some other pc, and this pc – we get a terminal and we get an opposition terminal. We get it any old way. We find his goal and we've got his goal, and now we're going to list from the goal: "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish" and "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" – the wrong order, the last two. And we busily list him down the line, clackita - clackita - clackita - clack. And he gets down to twenty and the needle went di-di-di, clack-clack, clack, bang-bang, bang-bang, bang-bang, ba-bang-bang-bang-bang. And there was a horrible pain at that moment went straight through his brain. And he knew that he was going to go deaf or something of the sort if it stayed there.

Well, he put the truck into full speed astern. He restimulated this item, see? Now, he's put the item down, flinched from it and the next item up the line he simply puts down – and it's a little bit further away from it and a little bit further away from it – and you've got a partially restimulated item versus a totally non-found, bypassed item. He isn't going to go any further.

He's going to go pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, and he'll give you items, he'll give you items. We know now he'll give you thousands, tens of thousands of items. He'll keep going. His tone arm goes up and sticks and ...

And then you give him a Prepcheck and it comes down. It goes up and sticks again. And it goes up and sticks again. And you straighten him all out and get the goal to firing and everything is fine, everything is beautiful. And then you list a few more lines on some other pattern of lines, and the tone arm goes up and sticks.
What's happened? All that additional listing had gotten him no – not five feet further beyond pair E and F. See, that's as far as he got. He ticked E and doesn't even know of the existence of F, so he goes five feet further than that and that's it. The car is just stuck on the road, and it's just like having a jack under the rear axle. Doesn't matter how much acceleration you give it, it doesn't matter how much you fool around, doesn't matter how smoothly you audit or how you try to persuade the pc on down the road, he's going no further. He's stuck in a – the mystery sandwich.

What's the repair, then? Repair is actually very simple. By any means, find the bypassed pair. If he was lucky enough to have been doing a written list at the time all this began, all you'd have to do is null the list. Find the rock slamming item and oppose it.

If you weren't doing a written list, why, just get him to list a few more. He'll give you the same bordering item again. He's been giving it to you every session. Every session that had six hundred items in it, one of them had "a polecat" in it. He's mentioned this "polecat" a lot of times. "Polecat" is very suppressed. This "polecat," he – you know which one it is because he'll sigh before he puts it down, see? It produces, actually, a physiological reaction. He isn't going to go close to that polecat, he suppressed that polecat, see;

Well, you do that and you take over the list, and you'll find out it'll stay in with a tick. And when you tiger drill the last three or four items that are left in, one of them will be the polecat and the rock slam will open up again because the suppression will come off of it, and it'll go wham, wham, wham, wham. And then you want, "Who or what would oppose a polecat?" or "Who or what would oppose a polecat?" depending on whether or not it turned on pain or sen. You've got the pair and now he's ready to go on down the road. And he won't go until then.

Now, all good auditing aside, all bad auditing aside or anything else, that's the basic mechanism of what happens to a Clear, when clearing hangs up. Now, there's many ways you can make the pc not confront items. You could get the pc so ARC broke, you could get the pc so upset, you could get the pc so worried, you could get the pc this, you're auditing could be so lousy – all kinds of things could happen that would distract the pc off his case so he couldn't list, don't you see? It all bags up to the fact that he – the worse he's audited the more likely he is to bypass a reliable item. That's all that adds up to. But even with fairly crude auditing you still should be able to find the item.

Now, supposing you couldn't get him to list from that goal anymore, you couldn't get the thing to – it's so submerged that you couldn't find this item and so forth. I've got good news for you: Just find the next pair that is due to be found any way you want to find them and that'll be the next pair and that'll be the pair that he bypassed when you were listing originally. Quite remarkable. It's... We should be so lucky. It's very astonishing: If you take up the line plot with the pc and plot every pair that you find and so on, it doesn't matter how you discover the next pair, you won't ever find a pair beyond the pair that you hadn't found. Now, you can press your luck. Early in the case you can press your luck. You can find an oppterm and an oppterm and even an oppterm, by represents or some such fashion. And all you're doing is hunting down, there, the – you're getting closer to what was really slamming. And you got these three now and now you can get a ter-
minal. But the funny part of it is that you ask for the terminal against the last one and you get the terminal that belongs to the first one. You get what I mean? In other words, that goes onto the line plot where it belongs, not where you thought it went. You understand?

You've got A, B and C as oppterms. See, you've got opterm A, B and C, see? And then you say, "Who or what..." You're going to find a terminal now; you're going to say, "Who or what would oppose C?" And you list it out that way, and you'll have yourself a ball listing it out that way. And of course those of you who indulge in the novelty of asking the pc something about his case would find out, after you had listed it and found it... Yet oddly enough you can list it; you can list, you know, this, "Who or what would oppose C?" and weirdly enough wind up with what opposed A.

It belongs up here at opposition to A. But after you've found this thing you say to the pc, "Look-it-there! Look-it-there! Look what opposes B or C," you know? "Look what we finally found what opposed C." Of course, you wouldn't do that; that's direct evaluation. If you ask him, "What does this oppose?" and just gave him the three things, he will put it in the proper place right now, and it'll be A.

You sometimes – you sometimes can go – early in the case only – you can go well past and leave two or three of them behind you, but the first opposition you find belongs to the first pair, so you really never got by the first pair at all, did you? The pc was just hung up to that degree. And the more you find out of sequence and the more you try to find them out of sequence and the more desperately you try to avoid finding them in pairs, the harder it is to find them and the smaller the rock slam will become and the more difficult it is to go down that road – the more difficult it is to find goals, the more difficult it is to get anything to slam, anything of the sort. But as long as you find them in pairs, you're clearing the individual.

You can clear somebody by finding that sequence of pairs. But you'd have to start paying attention – if you were never going to find the goal, you'd have to start paying attention after a while to the not-opposition factor. You'd have to get things that didn't oppose things. You'd have to get the other parts of the dumbbells because you'd be likely to pass them after you've gone a while, because you're not being assisted by the pat wording of Step 6 in R – Routine 3-21. So you'd lay an egg to that degree.

But you theoretically – allowing for that factor – theoretically could clear somebody clear on down to the end. The time he found his goal, it would simply be a small explosion in the middle of nothingness and the whole bank would fold up and that would be the end of that and he would be a first-goal Clear. See, in theory you could do this.

So as long as you're finding these pairs, you're advancing the case. And it doesn't matter whether you have the goal or don't have the goal, if you can find pairs you're advancing the case. Because clearing is not a matter of finding the goal, clearing is a matter of straightening up the Goals Problem Mass and vanishing it. It most easily vanishes from the goal, by taking the goal. That's the easiest route. But other routes exist by which this could be done.

Lately we have been finding some. We find out that you sort of erase the pc and he will – the goal sits there in the chair. In other words, you give him Problems Intensives and Problems Intensives and Problems Intensives and you wind up with something that looks like you got the goal.
Apparently there are other ways of springing the goal and there are other things that would happen along this line. Old Routine 2 apparently was capable of making a Clear. And that was a goalless Clear, don't you see? And I've been working on something that without finding the pc's goal you would clear a person in a Clearing Co-audit.

Now, of course the joke is, of course, that you would just go so long and the pc would lay this goal in your lap. That would be inevitable. I don't think you could go a third of the way down this track without the pc discovering his basic purpose, because he is now totally surrounded by it.

You see what you're doing? See what you're doing? So you think that you're wasting time up to the moment when you find the pc's goal. Not if you've got a balanced line plot. All the goal is going to do for you is give a balanced line plot that is more easily gotten. Do you see that?

It's very funny. You found maybe six pairs and it's all fine. And then you find the pc's goal in great triumph and list the first four lines from that goal, and you say, "Now we're really going to go someplace." Of course, you're going to get this faster and so on. And all you wind up with is the next pair in sequence. Of course, after that you can find pairs in sequence with the greatest of ease. But that's the way it goes.

Now, there is the layout of the GPM. That's actually all you're trying to do. If you integrate what you know and what you've been fumbling with and integrate it around this fact – that it only takes perfect auditing to achieve it – why, you've got it made. There is a way to audit this, there is a way to be smooth about auditing, there is a way to handle pcs. These things have all been figured out. And if you've got those things taped, you do this other of just getting matched pairs, you wind up with a Clear – inevitably and invariably. You couldn't possibly get away from it. You see that?

So you're trying to not split the atom, you're trying to split the GPM right down the middle. And when you split it right down the middle the reactive mind disappears down to the point of the first goal. Then you split it the additional distance to the second goal and so forth. These pairs evaporate and discharge when they are found and when the goal is found and re-integrates into them. Do you understand this?

All right, thank you very much.
Fundamentals Of Auditing

A lecture given on 20 November 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Here we are with Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture number two, 20 Nov. AD 12.

There's a lot of material that you could have and memorize and do things with on the subject of auditing. There are probably thousands and thousands of rules that you could go by in auditing – thousands of them, probably. And the way to audit – the way to audit has only a few very fundamental rules.

When you look at these thousands and thousands of rules of thumbs and maxims and what you do and what you don't do and so forth, if you haven't got these few little basics down, you're not going to audit. Auditing does not occur.

In other words, there's what you might call some very, very senior data on the subject of auditing. One of those is: Auditing is a third dynamic activity, basis of it is communication and you have to audit the pc in front of you. And frankly, you violate those and you've had it. I don't care how many other thousands of rules you have followed. If you have violated those little rules, well, you've had it, that's all. You won't ever have any auditing occur.

Somebody comes along and he tells you this, that or the other thing in auditing, and to you, it seems to make sense that you handle your E-Meter on the right rather than on the left or something like this – the reason you aren't getting anywhere is because you're handling the E-Meter on the right or – and you should be handling it on the left. Or you have to take up the pc's present time problems and that's what you're not doing and that's why your auditing is bad. Or pcs ARC break and therefore don't read on the meter and that's why you're not getting anywhere, and that, frankly, how can you expect to audit a pc if you have dirty fingernails? You must improve your diction in order to audit a pc properly, and so forth, and go practice with diction. Your E-Meter reading must be more rapid. And if your E-Meter reading was more rapid, why, then you could audit a pc better. You could just go on down with innumerable items – all of them quite valid – which if you repaired them, without repairing the first three I have mentioned, would not make one damn bit of improvement in your auditing.

You can be told that there are thousands of things and some of you, and some auditors, get into a complete fog of the fantastic number of things they have to do and remember in order to audit. And in doing and remembering these thousands of things which they must do, they neglect those little fundamentals. They cease to audit the pc in front of them. They start auditing thousands of fundamentals. They neglect communication as the primary function and action in auditing and they sit there as a totally individuated item – island – a first dynamic auditing a nowhere. And, of course, they never get any auditing done. Those fundamentals have been totally overlooked.
If those fundamentals are overlooked, it doesn't matter how precisely you turn your toes in as you sit in the chair doing TR 0, it doesn't matter how much Listerine you gargle before the session, how many advertisements you put out about what a good auditor you are, hoping the pc will hear them and be impressed. It wouldn't matter a doggone what you did; you've neglected the fundamentals of auditing.

The fundamentals of auditing don't even consist of an E-Meter. They're very simple. Auditing is a third dynamic activity. There's the auditor and pc and they're basically a group. The activity they're engaged in is communication and the auditor is auditing the pc in front of him. Those things are occurring, auditing will happen. If those things are not occurring, you could handle these thousands of rules... Actually, I could go back over them and check them out of various handbooks, lectures and texts. And I'm sure I could count up thousands of them. You could follow all the rest of these rules letter perfect – and you would never make any auditing take place.

Of course, a Saint Hill graduate goes out of here and goes back to an organization or goes back someplace or another, they always make the inevitable remark. They don't make it because I have said they make it. Usually they don't make it at first – they're being polite or they're being something or they're being something. They're being nice about the area or zone they're in. And sooner or later, because they've withheld it or overlooked it and are withholding it and so forth, they will break down in a letter to me – it'll be the fifth or sixth or seventh letter they've written me, or something like that and they'll say, "But the auditing that is being done around here – oh, my God! Oh, my God! Oh, my God!" It's very expressive.

Now, of course, you say, "Well, this is a Saint Hill graduate, he knows all these tricks and he looks good and he's this and that and the other thing." Somebody out in the field will say this, you see? They'd say, "Oh, well, of course, they've just learned all these little tricks and all these little nuances and that sort of thing. And therefore, they look good." Now, I don't think that's it at all. I think around here you find out that auditing can occur. I'm usually telling you that it must occur. And out of sheer agony of trying to get off the hot seat, why, you have to audit. Because nobody's putting up with it if you're not.

And basically your case gains are coming on up the line, other things are occurring. And through practice, through interest in what you're doing, through these various things, you start auditing the pc in front of you. All of a sudden a long, blue spark hits you one day and you say, "Maybe if I asked the pc I could find out." So communication starts to occur. Then you get so many changes of auditors that you can't conceive of auditing being anything but a third dynamic activity. [laughter]

So, in the final analysis, you are being driven, actually, in that direction, until you recognize it. And what a Saint Hill graduate misses when he gets back into an area or an organization, what he misses, is any feeling that auditing can happen. He's surrounded by people that really don't think auditing can happen. They've very seldom seen it happen. See, they very seldom run into the fact that there is a right way to do it. They don't think there is a right way to do it. They think it's something they dream up as they go along.
They think this and they think that. They do an awful lot of thinking. They do an awful lot of figuring. They don't know that there's a right way to audit; that's what it boils down to. They don't know that there's a right way to audit.

And you get any unpracticed auditor who has not been very ferociously schooled on this subject and that is the first thing he overlooks – that there's a right way to audit. And the right way to audit is to consider an auditing session a third dynamic activity that has to do with communication, and that you audit the pc who is in front of you. And then auditing occurs.

Another thing you get over around here is being self-conscious about auditing. There's so much auditing going around and so much being demanded and your brains are so strained – trying to avoid you, a thetan, probably – that you get into a state where you haven't got any time to be self-conscious about it. And one of the things that happens around here quite routinely is, an auditor at Saint Hill looks very relaxed when he's auditing. It's one of the points you look for. He's stopped worrying – whether from apathy or otherwise. [laughter]

But if you neglect these fundamentals, then you can add thousands of things to do. Now you have to have rules to handle pcs' origins. Now you have to have rules to handle this and rules to handle that and rules to handle something else, because these fundamentals have been neglected.

I'm very obliging. If somebody demands rules of me – if they're foolish enough to demand rules of me – I'll give them rules. And they'll learn better after a while. That's about what it amounts to. Uniformity of an auditing session is highly desirable. A relatively muzzled state on the part of the auditor is highly desirable, if an auditor is going to add a bunch of nonsense into the lineup. But this is all curative, isn't it? That's a curative measure. That's trying to keep people from multiplying and adding nonsenses which have nothing to do with auditing.

The other part of it is that the human race wots not of a third dynamic activity – doesn't know anything about it. And as far as communication is concerned, to this day I'm still kicking myself. When I think about it, I get very cross with myself, and knowing better than to run motivators, I don't get angry with Reg. But if I didn't know about motivators I would be furious with him. But I didn't take a tape recorder, a pocket tape recorder, to a cocktail party that was given on the Queen Elizabeth. The officers give cocktail parties. I'd just love to have that tape! I could turn it on right now and play you ten minutes of it, and honest to Pete, you'd hardly be able to sit in your chairs! You'd just be dying with laughter. Because there isn't any communication in the lot of it. All they do is evaluate and invalidate. And no communication; nobody ever finishes a cycle of communication; things they talk about are non sequitur – never follow up any subject with any other related subject. It's a dispersed mishmash of invalidation and evaluation. And that's what passes for communication.

The most marvelous condensed example I ever heard of it in my life was at that cocktail party. As I walked out of the door of the cabin Reg said, "Well, I don't know, you don't look very good there – tuxedo with this tape recorder. It makes your shoulder, you know – bunches your shoulder up and so I wouldn't take it." That's what he said there. So I didn't get the recording and you can't have an example of what Homo sap considers... Wild! I mean, you
can't duplicate it. You'd have to get out a slide rule and figure this thing out. How many evaluations and invalidations can you get in per given remark? Everybody's trying to stop everybody else's communication – no communication involved. Communication is basically cause, distance, effect. Well, you can add a few more of the rules and duplication and things like that in – you got the whole definition of it. It never occurs in Homo sap.

So an auditor, or a person learning to be an auditor, has his first strike on him because he's been associating with Homo sap. He would make a perfect auditor if it weren't for that. We've got to cure him of it. Therefore, we have the rules, like TR 4. We have rules like Q and A. We have other things that we have to put in. What are those things doing there? Well, they're trying to bypass and not let into the session a number of human aberrations which already exist in the communication habits of the person who is trying to audit.

Now, I had somebody just do something very astonishing. They didn't realize that when the pc originated that the cycle should be permitted – that the auditing cycle occurred when the pc originated. They thought it only occurred when the auditor originated. And that's why they Q'd-and-A'd. Only the auditor was supposed to begin and end a communication cycle. Well, that immediately is not a third dynamic activity then, and you're not auditing the pc in front of you, because the pc in front of you is not permitted to originate a communication. Follow this?

What is an origin? The pc says, "Black is white." Well, an auditor who is still – he still has the cramps and coughs of being a Homo sap; he isn't, case-wise, up the line as far as he might be, lot of those things – he tends to handle this a la Homo sap. But don't think that that makes it any less a violation of communication. A communication is just a pure cycle and a communication cycle can go two ways.

This is not the fault of auditing that he's doing that; it's because he's developed bad habits. Somebody says, "Black is white." This violates his sense of something-or-other, so he writes script. So he says, "This person is nuts." So he says, "You're nuts. Black is not white." That's Homo sap at work, you see? A big figure-figure is added into the middle of the communication cycle. Where the hell do you find any think in a communication formula? It doesn't exist. You find most auditors, learning to audit, have difficulties with pcs in direct ratio to the amount of think that they add into the communication cycle. That's the extraneous action.

Pc says something, so they think something. Well, unfortunately, "to compute" was part of the definition of an auditor. So we just have to throw it out. Because an auditor actually doesn't listen and compute. The less computing he does, the better off he is, man. Pc says, "Black is white." What is the proper response to "black is white"? – "Thank you." It's just a pure communication cycle.

And do you know that every time a pc has ever asked you to do something in an auditing session has been after you have goofed the cycle originating from the pc about four times – at least once. Pc originated and you took it up and did something, the pc originated and you took it up and did something. So the pc, now being in auto-control, says to open the window. The only reason you need any definitive action between a pc wanting you to do something and the pc originating, is because the pc wants you to do something after you have failed to accept his origins.
You've queried his origin, one way or the other, before he starts thinking about the environment. Don't you realize that's a symptom of being out of session? Well, how did you drive him out of session? By not letting a communication cycle occur, of course. Every time you break down the cycle of communication, you wind up with a pc slightly and increasingly on auto-audit. Every time you break down the communication cycle, to the degree that you break down a communication cycle, you break down the third dynamic activity, individuate the pc, and after that, he starts running the session.

The reason you have trouble with a pc is directly related to the number of times you have not permitted the pc to originate. Pc only starts asking you to do things after you have failed to accept the pc's origins. So you fail to accept the pc's origins, he winds up in auto-control. He individuates out of the session.

Now, in view of the fact the pc is aberrated, and I wish to call this to your attention, the pc very easily individuates. It is quite a trick to keep a pc from individuating and going onto auto-audit. How many of you consider a pc in-session when his thinkingness is under your control? Same question, exactly the same question, is how many times do you have to get in the middle rudiments? You have to get in the middle rudiments as often as you don't have a pc in-session. It's very simple. You have to get in the middle rudiments to the degree that the pc's thinkingness is not under the auditor's control.

What's this pc doing? He's sitting over there commenting on this and commenting on that and doing something else and thinking something else and thinking something else and invalidating this and evaluating that and suppressing something else and failing to reveal something else. What's all this, man? That's a very non-third dynamic activity, fellow. That's two highly individual individuations in contest – something that looks like a games condition.

Now, of course, your pc – being a bit aberrated as he comes along the line – getting better, he is less susceptible to this individuation; therefore you can't expect the pc's thinkingness to be totally under the auditor's control in the first session. But after three or four sessions, it ought to be pretty smooth. What would you think of the auditor who took a pc whose thinkingness was under the auditor's control, and then three or four sessions later had a pc whose thinkingness was not under the auditor's control? The auditor had to do something to bring this about. And what the auditor had to do to bring this about is just interrupt the communication cycles as many times as possible in as many ways as possible and get as little auditing done as possible. You eventually will wind up with just that occurring. Pc's thinkingness goes out from underneath the control of the auditor.

Number of times you have to get in mid rudiments is a direct index of the amount of thinkingness going on in the pc, individuated from the session. And that's a direct index to how much individuation the pc has from the auditor. And that's how that third dynamic is broken down. Two first dynamics actually do not make a third dynamic. Any way you want to – you want to paint the barber pole it still is not going to work out. Two first dynamics don't make a third dynamic. An auditor's perception is not the perception of an individual looking at another individual; it's a third dynamic perception.
Now, I hate to build up the whole subject of intuition, because a lot of people say, "I don't have to use an E-Meter. I don't like an E-Meter. As a matter of fact E-Meters are no good, and they're very, very bad for auditors." It usually starts off in that gradient scale and gets more and more into a rave and they start talking about why they should use intuition.

Well, intuition is something that you could step all over, and probably be better off for it if it was that type of individuation which a person develops so that he won't have to confront anything the other person is doing. Now, we're not talking about that type of intuition; we're talking about pure, actual intuition. There is a knowingness about whether the pc is in-session, is not in-session – hasn't very much to do with looking at the pc. The auditor sitting there feels, knows, that the pc is in or out of session. Well, that's just a piece of perception. It's a perceptivity. And the perception of the auditor is good or bad. And it's bad to the degree that he has departed from the third dynamic back toward a first dynamic.

In other words, you get a deterioration of perceptivity. If you're real hot and you haven't got very much on the third or fourth dynamic and you're not in any big games condition with the pc – you know, you haven't got lots of oppterms on the third and fourth dynamic and you're in pretty good shape as far as pcs are concerned and you're not fighting the session all the way and that sort of thing. You're auditing along and all of a sudden the pc gets a withhold, you don't see it here, man, you don't see it on the meter. There's the pc sitting over there, and the pc's eyes have gone – kind of gone a slate gray. And you could probably track it all down. And a scientist of the purest modern school would say that you could detect this by various characteristics.

I spent a number of years trying to figure out what these various characteristics were, studying it on the basis of whether or not I was noticing something peculiar. Because in 1950, I had a bunch of people around me who were nagging me about the fact that there must be characteristics that told me what the situation was. And I finally have to come to the conclusion that there were no indications. You could study these indications till hell froze over and you still wouldn't have explained this very interesting fact – that I know when a pc has an ARC break before the pc finds it out, without even looking at a meter, and without looking at the expression on the pc's face or the position of his hands or how he's twitching his fingers. He hasn't found it out yet. But I find it out. How do you explain that?

Perception. On what wavelength? Same wavelength as in space opera. Dolls, by the way, seldom have names. They know each other. How do they know each other? Well, it's very simple. How do you know it's a red light or a green one? See? Joe always feels like Joe. Bill feels like Bill and Pete feels like Pete. In other words, you're talking to Pete and Pete feels a certain way. So that's Pete. Actually, a much safer way of identifying people. You can forge passports – try and forge a wavelength! No, there's no doubt about it – thetans communicate. Thetans communicate, not through MIEST. You don't even have to talk about wavelengths. Thetans communicate.

Now, there's some jerk by the name of Rhine... Oh, excuse me, I didn't mean to say this. I know he's an honorable man, and so forth. There's some bird's got a racket down at Durham University. And he runs a big swindle of getting funds to investigate extrasensory perception. And all this is very fascinating, but he's copped most of the coin. Well, we have to
speak in these terms, because after all we're talking about this bird. And actually, the number of validities which he has done in this are all MEST communication lines. On some fashion, he tests it all against MEST. He enters MEST into it at every hand. And then he enters something else when he isn't entering some MIEST: he's entering proof. See, when he isn't entering MEST to test out whether there's extrasensory perception, then he's entering proof.

"I'm going to test whether or not you can read my mind. Now, I am thinking of a number. Now, after you've read my mind, I want you to write the number down on a piece of paper, and then you show me the piece of paper and I'll tell you whether or not that was the number I was thinking of." How cuckoo can you get? That's proof, man, which is one of the biggest aberrative buttons on the track. You're going to test extrasensory perception through the aberration of proof!

Now, you start walking through the forest in some wild place and you try to explain it, but you don't see a bird. You've got a gun in your pocket – it isn't even available – but you just don't see a bird, you don't see a squirrel, a deer, a chipmunk, nothing. You see nothing! And you go out next time without a gun in your pocket and you see birds, squirrels, chipmunk, deer, rattlesnakes. What goes on? You're emanating menacefulness as long as you have a gun in your pocket. It isn't whether they see the gun or not; that's modern science, you see? They just know, because you know, that you're dangerous.

Honest, I've seen old-timers out on the frontiers, up around the Rockies and so on, comment on this when I was a little kid until it's the most threadbare record I think I know anything about, you know? They're always up to this. They would carefully take a gun out to get themselves a deer and they would see no deer.

Now, apparently some thetans emanate more than other thetans. Apparently BBC has more broadcast variety than radio Jersey or something, or... You get the idea? I mean there's apparently a difference here. You can know more about one thetan than you could about another thetan. And you apparently get relays from one thetan more about another one. Well, you're talking about various communication factors which are beyond the immediate recognition of matter, energy, space and time. And this in itself is a very, very interesting subject as long as you don't try to drag it down into MEST, because then of course you're talking about MEST communication. See?

It's a fascinating subject, communication without MEST intervention. This is a very fascinating subject. And it can't be studied by Doctor Rhineswine. Because all he can do is drag extrasensory perception down into MEST through the button called "proof," and then say, "Well, there it is," and so on. Well, that, I'm afraid, doesn't have much to do with it.

We've tried to use this in processing. Tried to process people along in this. The biggest button we have that it exists is this fantastic fact, which has occurred and occurred and occurred: We take pc A who is having trouble with human B. And we process pc A. We never go near and he doesn't write, he doesn't communicate in any fashion, with human B, and we straighten out the problem, and all of a sudden it evaporates with B. This has left a lot of auditors blinking. We have done this time after time after time.

I mean, first time this was ever called to my attention was an early ACC down on 17th Street. Golly! This was so interesting. So I've counted on it since and when it doesn't resolve
with human being B after processing A, I generally get after the auditor that processed A. I mean, it's that tight a situation, see?

It works reversely. If you are deathly afraid of oil companies, they're going to short-change you, give you bad stock and sue you. That's for sure. You're going to be in constant trouble.

Any time you've got a reliable item, you can rely on its producing a lot of trouble for you. And when it's evaporated, it ceases to produce this much trouble. This is what is so mysterious. Because you haven't processed it. All you've processed is the pc. Now, how do you account for this? And yet that is susceptible of "proof," if you want to put it that way, because there it is.

Auditors are very familiar with this particular mechanism; I shouldn't be beating it in the head. But I'm showing you that there is a perception factor.

Now, when the individual is in a games condition on the third or fourth dynamic, or on, let us say, with women. Let's suppose a big reliable item on the track is "women." We've got this fellow and he's an auditor and every time he audits a woman he just somehow or another, he just – things happen. It's just rough, that's all. It's just tough. Tough on all concerned.

He comes in and he's scratched from his ear to the groin, you see; he's in a mess. He can audit men, gets along fine. Why? Well, we say, "Well, actually, he's just chopping them up because of this." We can explain it. You know, we can give all kinds of reasons. But the truth of the matter is, he's in a games condition, and the truth behind that truth is the one we're interested in, in this lecture: He can't perceive. And actually that's all that's wrong with his auditing. Because he's auditing one of his own reliable items, his perception can't bridge across that games gap. You see, it is an enemy and therefore he doesn't dare confront or read it. His perception on the subject stinks. Now, he'll do two things with that perception – as you know all things will invert – he'll have – this pc will feel good and then the pc will actually invert the interpretation. He'll get an inverted interpretation.

In other words, the pc's sitting there – the pc's sitting there and saying, "My, what a wonderful session. First session I've had for days."

The auditor says, "Oh, my God, I'm killing him!" You'll see this happen, too. Well, what is that? He can't perceive it. So he dubs it.

Now, the manifestation of dubbing is writing script. That's where you get the auditor's figure-out, the auditor's think. And the more bridge, more gap, the more games condition there is between the auditor and the pc – the more of this there is – the less reliable perception there is and the more substitute perception you will find. And that substitute perception takes the form of *think*. This is a case of "look, don't think." You see?

Well, this guy doesn't look, he thinks. And he writes script! And he'll come to some of the most remarkable conclusions you ever heard of. Pc is sitting there, feeling as smooth as a banana split, see? And the auditor says he's got an ARC break. Well, that's how this perception gets invalidated. It's – only gets invalidated by those people who are to some degree in a
games condition with what they're trying to audit or perceive, because they do a think, not a look.

You see, it – the reason they can't perceive is because they can't confront. If they can't confront something, how can they perceive it? So if they can't perceive it then they must get a substitute perception – and this is a think, a consideration. They write script. They figure it all out.

Now, it's true in guiding a pc down through such a thing as the Goals Problem Mass, you have got to consider which way this thing is going to go and how this thing lies. You can't stand up and guess at all this, because it's a highly complicated track and it requires metering, and it requires this and requires that. Even on a Problems Intensive, you're going to run into trouble to the degree that you don't absolutely, mechanically ascertain this. One of the reasons for that is, is you're reading aberration; the pc can't read it either. You see? Aberration – it doesn't emanate. So you have to have highly mechanical means to attack this sort of thing. But as far as the pc is concerned, you should be able to read him pretty directly.

But if you can't confront him and if you don't want to confront him, you don't want anything to do with him, you're going to get a substitute in there, and that substitute is think. So you're going to go into a consideration of what is going on. And now we've got script writing at its worst. And the pc will be sitting there smooth as glass and the auditor insists he has an ARC break. The pc's got a horrible roaring ARC break and the auditor insists everything is going – and he's got it all figured out that the pc is just being mean today.

The auditor takes some fantastically weird action as far as the pc is concerned. Why? Well, it leaves the pc aghast and it leaves everybody else aghast and pretty soon it'll leave the auditor aghast. "How the devil did I start driving down that road?" You know? "Gee-whiz! We were going along so nice, and here I am running down this road and what happened? What happened?" Well, what happened is his perception dropped. See, he wrote some script. He made a bum guess. It'll be as clumsy as this, don't you see.

For instance, I find out that on a demonstration audit, my perception of the pc is worse than my perception of a pc in an ordinary session. That's because I have the additional action of trying to protect the pc, keep the pc from embarrassing or damaging himself in some way, make the session look good, make the pc look good, and hold it all under control under a rather extraordinary environment, see? Well, that splits up your attention. You're actually liable to make more mistakes and do less reading of the pc. So the pc originates and you tell him you will do it. See? You miss. You miss the TR 4, see?

You'll suddenly make a mistake. The pc says, "I think that list is too short." And you say, "All right, I will add some items to it." Oh, man! See, it's by giving demonstrations and that sort of thing (rather high-tension auditing situations) that I've come to realize what a short-perception auditor – the mistakes he makes. See, that's a curtailed-perception situation. The pc didn't want you to add anything to the list. The pc wanted to tell you that the list was short! And what's the matter with you that you didn't say, "Good. Thank you," and go on doing what you were doing?

You wouldn't permit a communication cycle to be originated by the pc. It's very embarrassing to me when I do this. I know I've flubbed across the boards. Every once in a while
the pc looks up and I – in a demonstration, something like that, very brightly – and this happens sometimes with more – with some pcs different than others – looks up very brightly and says something-or-other, and so-on-or-other, and I say, "Well, let's do something about it," see? I could step on my tongue the moment I do it because I've gotten a misread intention. I read the intention of the pc as just directly interpreted from his words, meaning I should do something and therefore I do something. In other words, I wouldn't let a communication cycle exist.

Actually, once you've done that, the next time you're likely to have a demand that you do something. Do you see what the gradient is? See, you didn't let the pc originate, so now you're going to Q-and-A, and now this is going to result in the pc demanding that you do something, because the pc is already on a kind of an auto-audit.

The number of times that you Q-and-A with the pc is directly related to the amount of auto-audit that the pc is going to engage upon. Because you've shown him that he is not in communication with you and therefore you've broken down the third dynamic situation. You've also reduced his, you might call it, theta potential, or something weird like this. You – well, he isn't emanating – although he isn't emanating anything anyhow – but he isn't emanating to the degree that he is. His mind isn't free, you see. He's clouded up.

You can't read him as easily. That's about where that goes. See, you cut down his horsepower, his wavelength or his megakilotrons or something, see? So he isn't transmitting so good. You've dropped him a curve.

So therefore you're going to make a worse mistake next time, see? Compounding the felony, he's walking out into an auto-audit. You eventually have two individuals conducting a disrelated activity. One fellow is busy nulling the list and the other fellow is trying to keep his rudiments in. That's a totally disrelated activity, although you've looked on it as a rather common activity. It's very common for a pc to try to keep his rudiments in while you're nulling the list.

What's he trying to keep his rudiments in for? You're trying to null a list. Well, let me guarantee, to that degree, you've Q'd-and-A'd with him. See, you've done something that interrupted his communication cycle.

Now, this might not have happened in the session. It might have happened between sessions, it might have happened in living around this person or being his roommate or numerous other conditions. But you have Q'd-and-A'd with that pc. And that pc tends to individuate to the degree that you have Q'd-and-A'd with him.

He walks up and says, "Oh, I feel terrible! I got a telegram this morning from my grandmother and she was dying of lumbosis."

And you said, "Where's she live?"

Well, of course, you aren't his auditor and so forth and this is not very offensive and so forth and this is the way Homo sap communicates and that's it. But you didn't let him get something off. The fact that you said something told him that he hadn't blown it. A lot of auditors go around thinking that if a pc mentions something, then it's – he has to do something about it so the pc can blow it. No, it's a communication activity. It's all communication, the
auditing is. It's a communication activity. And being a communication activity, when it's communicated and the cycle of communication is completed, it's blown. You understand that?

Now, the degree he can't blow things is the degree he's been Q'd-and-A'd with. That's a direct relationship. Some individual has been Q'd-and-A'd with and Q'd-and-A'd with and Q'd-and-A'd with, you find out he can't blow anything. He has a hell of a time.

Now, after you've Q'd-and-A'd three or four times in a session, what the hell's the use of trying to patch up the session? There isn't any way you can patch that up. What are you doing Q-ing-and-A'ing in the first place? Ah, but we get a bunch more rules now, don't we? How to cure an ARC break. You do this and you do that and you do something or other. Oh, yes, it cures the ARC. What the hell were you doing getting an ARC break? Do you see my point of view?

See, I'm writing a bunch of rules now on how you get out of a swamp. Well, what were you doing in the swamp? Here's a corduroy road marked with tape on both sides of it, and arrows, and it's bright daylight, and there you are over there a quarter of a mile away standing in the middle of a black swamp. And you say, "Ron, give me some rules. How do we get out of these swamps?" So I say, "All right." And I Q-and-A with you and I give you some rules. Or I even say, "What the hell are you doing in a swamp?", that sort of thing.

And, of course, you can hope for the day that you say, "Hey! How do I get out of this swamp?" You've asked a question, don't you see? And I don't answer it at all. That would be a sad day. But you've asked a question, I'll give you an answer. But I get a chance to originate at that point, too, to make it a complete cycle, which is, "What the hell are you doing in the swamp?" How'd you get there? Auditing must seem like a very complicated activity to you if you're over there in the swamp. How many rules did you follow that got you into the swamp?" [laughter]

Now, an ARC break occurs anywhere from fifteen minutes to an hour and a half before most auditors perceive it. Now, that's a hell of a condemnation. Because I can take a pc who is in the middle of an ARC break and find the auditor trying to cure up an ARC break which occurred anywhere from fifteen minutes to an hour and a half after the ARC break.

Now, let me give you a very fast one here. I want to give you the data on this. I've talked to you lengthily about this, but I think it's important to you. Let me give you an illustration. Now, this, what I tell you is true here. It's an hour and a half, half an hour, fifteen minutes, something like that, after the pc has had the ARC break, that you'll find the auditor trying to clear up the ARC break. He isn't trying to clear up the ARC break of an hour and a half ago, he's trying to clear up the ARC break of one minute ago! Ah, but it doesn't exist there! Why is he trying to clear it up there? This ARC break's an hour and a half old. He's cleaning up an ARC break two minutes old.

It's one of these remarks of, "What the hell are you doing in the swamp?" You understand? There's an ARC break that occurred an hour and a half ago and the auditor is trying to clear it up as having occurred two minutes ago. Ah, but there's an ARC break one hour and twenty-eight minutes before the point the auditor is addressing it on the track. And I get this kind of a weird feeling: What the hell did the auditor do, go stone blind? How did he miss this?
Well, the first time he missed it is he just wasn't on the pc's wavelength, that's all. He just didn't feel something very peculiar about this session. And he almost always committed this deadly sin if he's in trouble: The pc found out he had an ARC break before the auditor did. And that is inexcusable! Absolutely inexcusable for a pc to find out he has an ARC break before the auditor did. Where is the auditor?

Well, look at what the criticism this is of the auditor's perception – look at the criticism. Here's a pc mired down and mucked up in a bank with more perception about what is going on than an auditor who is sitting across the auditing table from him. Ooooh, man! You mean the auditor's perception is no greater than a pc who is totally mired down in the bank? Just think of – over that for a minute.

The auditor is supposed to be there all bright and alert, see? And the pc finds out about this ARC break before the auditor recognizes there is one. I'm not kidding you, this is unforgivable. It's never forgiven by the pc. You just check over the next ARC break you see in progress, no matter who it's between – you and the pc or another pair – and just go in there and check it over and you're going to find this to be the case: If it's really raw, roaring, screaming ARC break, it occurred an hour to an hour and a half ago – the actual incident – the auditor is trying to clear it up as though it happened a minute or two ago, and the pc found out about it before the auditor did. And those unforgivable circumstances, of course, are not forgiven by the pc because it's been proven to him conclusively that he's not in a third dynamic situation. It's proven to him conclusively that he hasn't got an auditor, that the auditor is individuated.

What is the auditor doing, not noticing this ARC break? Do you see how that adds up? Well, I couldn't say it too emphatically. Now, you understand, I'm saying it's an unforgivable situation because the pc doesn't forgive it – not because I don't forgive it. So, of course, you have an awful lot of trouble with pcs if you're always noticing the ARC break after the pc does. And if you're trying to clean up the ARC break when it became vocal and visual, and you pick up that point of the track to clean it up, you're always in trouble. You'll always never have sessions, you'll just have dog's breakasts spilled on the deck. You won't ever have sessions. And you'll wonder why you get so little done.

No, if your Martian antennae – which I'm sure you have a facsimile of; somewhere on the track you've worn antennae (off one of your favorite items) – is just properly tuned in or, better still, you are alert, you'll find out ages before the pc that something is wrong.

Now, if you're in a state of writing script and imagination, you'll start badgering pcs. The pc hasn't got his hair combed right or something like that, so you start saying to the pc, "What's wrong in the session and what's wrong in the session and what's wrong in the session?" There isn't anything wrong in the session except you're asking him what's wrong in the session. See how he could read this out, see?

But, at the same time, you'll get pretty good on this sort of thing. If your own perception is up and the pc is sitting there and – it isn't any way the pc looks, it just doesn't feel right to you – you say, "What's – what's happening? What's going on?"

And the pc says, "Nothing."
"Well, you think something here recently – something come up there?" You're not getting in mid ruds, or jamming him around on it, just two-way comm. "Something come up there?"

"Uh – no – no, uh-uh... Oh, well, yes. Hey, yeah. As a matter of fact, you're reading the wrong list." Nothing wrong with you making a mistake in the session. The only thing that is unforgivable is the pc catching it before you do.

Actually, you see, perception comes above technical perfection, because you can always handle a mistake if you find out about it before the pc does. But you could be doing "flawless" (quote) (unquote) auditing and be reading the wrong list. And the pc finds it out and man, you're not going to clear that up in a hurry. That's just going to ARC break all over the place.

The degree of the ARC break is related to the number of ARC breaks which have directly preceded the apparent ARC break. The first ARC break, the basic on the chain for any given session, is quite previous to where the pc thinks it is. And that's another law, is: The pc never notices where the ARC break really starts. The pc always picks it up late. And that is true in lists. You're running down the lists and saying, "Waterbuck. Catfish. Mack Sennett cops."

And the pc says, "I got a pain, pain, pain, got a pain, pain, pain."

Aw, what are you doing? You put it down after Mack Sennett cops. Waterbuck. You start tracing it back. One of your smart things to do is say, "All right. Mack Sennett cops. How's – how's the pain on that?"

"Well, that didn't get any worse."


"Oh, it isn't any worse."

"Waterbuck. Waterbuck."

"Haah! Gh-uh-1-1-ha, uhill-uhll-uhll. There you-uh-ull... There you did it again." See? He's always late.

Pc is monkeying with an instantaneous reading bank and he's always slower than the bank. That's what you can count on. Pc is always late. He's always picking up the item after the right item. He's always picking up the ARC break which occurred after the ARC break. See? He inevitably wrongly attributes what's happening, because after all, you're dealing with somebody who's attention is fixated on this, that and the other thing all over the bank and all mixed up in the middle of their items, and it's a wreck. And to ask him to think anything at all is miraculous.

Of course, a lot of auditors never recognize the pc as anything but old Joe and old Joe is always pretty quick on the draw, and doesn't realize old Joe isn't sitting there. He's auditing Mick Slan, Commandant, Sector 89, Extraterritorial Empire, whose penchant is killing small babies. This guy is being more that than anything else.

And all of a sudden you say, "Hey, hey, hey, hey, hey, Bill."
"Uh – Bill. Um – Bill?" You know, it takes him a split second to disconnect, you
know? "Da – oh! Where? Yeah, here! Ha! Here! Ah. What the hell? What's the matter?"

It's very funny, you know? You whistle the pc up to present time. Very often if you
don't say "Hello," they get an ARC break. Did you know that? Of course, you don't practice
that these days, because they're not going down the track and coming back. This is quite re-
markable – after you've gotten rid of an item and you've gotten this and that out of the road,
and so forth, and you got the pc into the room and so forth – if you said, "Hello," how accept-
able that hello is to the pc.

Now, I'm not telling you to do that as a practice. But he's gone somewhere. He's into
something. And that is out of time and space than where you are. And you expect this guy to
be an auditor, two hundred thousand years before he ever heard of it, it's no wonder he's a
little bit slow. But he's always – almost always slow – almost always slow.

He will sit there and explain to you carefully that the ARC break that he is talking
about is the fact that when he asked you if it was cold in here, you said, "Shall I close the
window?" And what he wanted to know was if it was cold in here or if it was a somatic that
he was in the middle of! And if you'd answered him, why, then he would have known whether
it was a somatic that he was in the middle of and that was the cold he was trying to locate!
And that's what he's ARC broke about. And he'll tell you again and he will tell you again and
he'll tell you again.

What's really remarkable is how many times they will tell you without it blowing. And
somewhere along the line you should get suspicious that you aren't dealing with the basic on
the chain. And you're not. You say, "Well, before that, were you trying to tell me anything?
Was there a question I didn't answer before that?"

"Well, yeah, yeah, I uh..."

And you'll find out there's a question about ten minutes before the session started. And
he asked you something and you didn't answer it. And that has been the source of all the upset
and ARC breaks ever since. And he's pointing to one that is an hour late. Isn't that remark-
able?

Now, you're only a knucklehead when you don't recognize the fact that the pc would
not need an auditor if he knew what was going on. Why does he need an auditor? See, if he
was always right, it would always blow. But it doesn't always blow so he can't possibly be
always right and that's why he has to have an auditor. And that's why you've got to have ESP
and a few dozen other things in order to ride this track.

The various rules of the game is that it is a session, that auditing is based on commu-
nication, the basic communication formula is much simpler than Homo sap makes out. "I
originate and you invalidate" – I think that's a Homo sap communication. "Then I evaluate
and you negate." No, it's just a pure communication cycle and that the pc who is sitting in
front of you is the pc you've got to audit. You can't audit a meter and get a Clear pc – can't be
done.

You try sometimes to put a GPM series of items together without asking the pc where
they belong. Just try it. You're not going to get anyplace. You've dug them all up for him, but
the final step of matching them up can only be done by the pc. You could test them and figure out and so forth. But if you had to fit them all together in the end, they wouldn't be the GPM. The pc wouldn't be blowing the GPM either. And it would have no value for you to do so. So sooner or later you have to face up to the fact you're auditing a pc.

Now, if you go consistently and continually on the basis that if the pc says it, it isn't true – this is just another Homo sap evaluation and invalidation on the communication formula. The pc very often is right. And there are certain things that only the pc is right on. ARC breaks aren't one of them. The pc is never right on a misemotional points – never right on a misemotional point. But where it fits and what the score is and if it's the item and that sort of thing – yes, he's right.

You could do a meterless assessment of an item, by just putting the meter aside, taking a list and then going over that list, very carefully asking the pc to tell you every pain that turns on, go over it and sort out the thing against the pc until you had the one that turned on the most pain and ask the pc if that's it and the pc says that is it, you have found an item. And if you put it then on the meter, you would find that it would rock slam if your question was correct in the first place. Are you aware of the fact that it is that easy? It's that easy.

There's no substitute for putting the pc in-session. There's no substitute for giving him an auditing session. You're going to get yourself tangled up in 8,765 hundred rules. Well, that's just that many rules between you and the pc that are forbidding auditing. If those rules are being used – those rules are quite valid – but if they're being used by you to prevent a third dynamic, to interrupt or upset a communication cycle, or to get out of auditing the pc in front of you, then those rules are not for that session. There's many ways to audit pcs, there's many styles of auditing, but there is no substitute for auditing.

What does the pc consider auditing? Actually, an alleviation of his upsets and reaching his basic purposes and driving that road down between the GPMs – those things are auditing to the pc. Oddly enough, he won't let you near his bank and won't forgive you if you don't run it out. Nevertheless, you audit the pc, the pc is getting someplace, the pc is making gains, the pc would take anything off of you. Your auditing could be apparent technical perfection, with the last word of the finger held just right and you're not using that technical perfection to get anyplace with the pc, you'll have nothing but a busted-up, ARC broke pc the whole way. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, there is a right way to audit. It's good, direct, straightforward, audits the pc. And the basic patterns of auditing that you are using are very, very refined patterns. As you're sitting there auditing the pc, you're in a very fortunate position of not having to develop auditing. The test of a good auditor is when he has learned this. He just uses the tools he's got and carries on down the line, and he uses them sufficiently well, the pc is getting auditing, he's getting something done.

The bad auditor doesn't know that these things exist. He thinks there are thousands of ways to audit and that he's got to dream up a thousand-and-first one, right in the middle of the session. That's just another way of figure-figuring your way out of giving somebody a session. There are right ways to audit. We're teaching you the right ways to audit, and you'd be surprised how many rules have been lopped off of auditing. But the most direct approach to
auditing happens to be the very pattern of auditing and the equipment of auditing that you have right at the present moment. And there is a way to audit.

The more you embroider that, the more you add to it, the more unnecessary stresses you put on it, why, the less it'll work. But you could sit down and say to a pc, "Start of session," – just this, no R-factor, nothing, you understand? You just say, "Start of session," and pick up the list you were doing in the last session and start in the middle of that list where you were – stopped nulling, and go on and nulling, you know? "Waterbuck. Tiger. Catfish. Crayfish," so forth and so forth, right on down through the end. And as long as you were technically perfect and you were... in doing just exactly what you were doing, as long as nothing else went astray, you wouldn't have a bit of trouble. There are a few things that could go astray, you handle those one way or the other before you start the session, because they can go astray and make it tough on you, you understand?

But oddly enough you would be better off doing that than you would be to take a two-hour session and use an hour and fifteen minutes of it to get rid of a Q and A which you shouldn't have put in in the first place. Do you see where the emphasis of auditing is? There are right ways to audit, there are right things to do, the auditor who audits according to pattern in the smoothest way gets the furthest in the long run, so long as he isn't violating those three basic rules that I gave you in this lecture. I invite your cooperation.

Thank you very much.
Q&A Period:
Tiger Drilling, Clears

A lecture given on 22 November 1962

Thank you.

Well, we have a – what's the date?

Audience: 22nd.

Twenty-second. Of what?

Audience: November.

Gee, you're in present time! Twenty-second of November, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

[some cuts!]

It hasn't been officially announced and you might not have seen the Mark V, but this is the Mark V E-Meter. And all in its pristine gray. It requires astronaut training to run this one. [laughter] But this is a smasher and has nothing to do with a sales pitch; this is not a television commercial.

But we can't ship meters into the United States. And if you're getting out of here and if there is a Mark V available and you're going back to the States, you'd better take one. Because the FDA has now got several departments of mental – ha! – health. Interesting, isn't it, that the US government is going in very heavily for mental health with exclamation points. But by "mental health" they mean the electric shock machine, psychiatric incarceration instead of prison punishment. It had nothing to do with mental health at all. But they're very, very active.

And there's some organization called the HEW – H-E-W – it's brand-new to me, Health and Education and Welfare, I think it must stand for, but it certainly sounds like HEW to me! [laughter] The Washington organization's going round and round with these characters and we won't drive them into the hole – we'll drive them way down in the hole and then we'll pound the hole in on top of them because we're tired of them. We lick them, left and right. But they never learn! They just never learn. They never learn. We're bad people to attack.

But it's quite interesting to me that the color and tenure and aspects of the United States are changing very, very rapidly and going over in the direction of super thought-police type think, you know? And I hate to see it go that way because it just means a little more work for us and we'll have to pound them in their hole and pound them down deep in the hole and then pound the hole in on top of them and we will do so. I hate to have to even bring up the subject – particularly in front of ladies!
Well, we've got quite a bit of stuff and agenda here. Now, I put a notice on the board. This is a question lecture here, this hour, and I put a notice on the board that they had to be legible – written and legible. So, if your question doesn't get answered, I couldn't read it.

And first question is, is "Will Mark Vb be available to anyone who wants one?" Oh, well, why not. You can't do very much about it one way or the other. As far as controlling the meter is concerned, when you control a meter you control nothing. That's not a good point of control in Scientology. They can be built all over the place. The thing is a hundred years old. I mean, they've been monkeying with the Wheatstone bridge for a hundred years.

We have copyrights and patents on these meter circuits and nobody can put one together like this. But they can still get kids' toys and toy lie detectors and junk like this and you actually can't control from the point or area of meter. Where you control from is copyrights and registered marks and that sort of thing. Yeah, anybody can have a meter.

My motto is, is if they're that ambitious, let them get in trouble and they'll have to go to an Academy and learn how. Okay.

"What pcs do you audit when doing research auditing and what time do you do research auditing? This has puzzled me for quite a time." [laughs] Puzzled me, too!

Research auditing: I learned quite a bit from being audited – have across the ages – otherwise I'd have no subjective reality on what we were doing at all. I'm a rather easy audit. But the research auditing which I do are divided into two classes: One is pcs I directly audit and pcs I indirectly audit. And I normally will get some auditor – you, amongst you here, have done some research auditing for me. I have told you to do a certain thing and then I've sort of watched the lines to make sure that it was going all right and then it has come up to an end and I've decided something about that. Not necessarily experimental, but it is to prove a point or to prove some oblique point.

For instance, Williams was used as a research pc. I think he knew it at the time. At the time, no better goals action was in prospect – he wasn't getting very far – and I had a list of "Who are you?" and "Who opposes you?" and so forth, listed on him for a very long time, just wondering if you could totally bypass a goal. He will tell you that it did him some good and anybody who wanted to get some items on his case could take that old list and they'd undoubtedly find some things that slammed on it. I'm sure it didn't louse him up particularly, but it showed us that we – it was pretty certain that you couldn't just list straight items through to Clear.

My own auditing – I was auditing on a research line; audited Reg going over to America – but this is partially research auditing and partially just trying to give somebody a hand, you see?

I keep up with all modern techniques. That is to say, anything that you're using now, I am using. Any type of session you are using, I am using in research auditing. I try not to depart from these things. I could probably audit without using any of these things. Nevertheless, I know then what frailties you will run into. That is one of the facets of research auditing. When I run into dead ends then I know that you're running into dead ends, don't you see?
And audited three pcs in Washington in addition to one that Reg audited. He's probably forgotten Fairchild. I was testing him out for entrances. And had been auditing Mary Sue hot and heavy and hard along the 3GA Criss Cross line. Not just going in the direction of finding a goal, but in actually peeling back the items one right after the other; and will go on doing so until a goal flies up. That is a research audit proposition. Possibly I could have found her goal a long time ago, see. Found various methods of entrance.

"And when do I do this research auditing?"

Usually from about 10:30 to about 1:30 in the morning. Answered? All right. There are other people that get audited from time to time, some of them know it and some don't.

Your case reports are always of assistance, always of assistance. Particularly it tells me what you can do successfully. That is what I watch that for. I seldom bluntly assign something new or strange to be done, but I want to know if you can get results with what you're using. And when I see that too many auditors are not getting results with what they're using, why, I then do something drastic about it.

That is another entire, different channel of research, by the way, is: What can an auditor do, what will he use and what results can he obtain? Now, that is an entirely separate thing. I've never kidded myself about that at all. And one of the reasons we've made success is just because I can make a technique work or just because I have a theory, I don't ever classify that as true at all. Never do.

Most scientific research is team research. It is done mostly by cross-coordination of records. Modern research all has a certain pattern. It's done by cross-coordination of records, it's done by various – following various lines through. It's a very expensive procedure and basically we can't afford it. And perhaps if we had fifteen or twenty billion dollars, why, we'd be almost as far as we are now. We don't do that type of research.

What we're doing is a research line which is directly empirical, but we will be able to achieve a result and then we try to broaden the number of people that result can be achieved on and then try to get it into some form so that an auditor can and will apply it and will be able to achieve that result himself. And those are about the steps which it ordinarily would take.

And the auditor is always a quotient in this. He's always a factor. If I had two or three bugs, as practically every research scientist on Earth has, we would be nowhere. And amongst those bugs is scarcity of theory. A theory is something valuable; a theory is something you get down and worship, particularly if you yourself have thought of it, you see? And he says, marvelous theory, and then you do nothing the rest of your life but peddle this theory, you see?

Man, I can think up more theories and throw them out more windows than we've got. Never hold on to a theory, never hold on to a technology if it appears weak. Just dream up another one, go along another line.

This way, you see research being done over a period of a dozen or fifteen years – the concentrated research of Dianetics and Scientology, which – I don't know, is possibly two or three hundred year development, maybe two or three thousand, as far as I know. But it's quite rapid. And that's the basis of why the research is rapid, is I have no enamorment of theories. If
a theory is right, marvelous. But it is never so right that it can't be wrong and it certainly — there's no slightest desire to hold onto it. And then I don't give a damn whether people think I'm a good research man or not, see? I just couldn't care less. The only thing I'm interested in is a result — a result.

The whole woof and warp of Dianetics and Scientology is on the basis of "Does it work?" And it's the result that counts. No aggrandizement or anything else. The only time you'll hear me kick is when I've developed something and somebody else puts it out with an alter-is. Because then they, to some degree, have made me guilty of lousing somebody up at the other end and I squawk on that. You notice medicine in the United States has now adapted themselves over into early Dianetics. They're in the earliest of early Dianetics and they don't know quite where they're going.

Now, that's about the speed of Earth research. Somebody has dreamed up something and then in a dozen or fifteen years somebody else takes an alter-ised version of it and you start hearing something about it. And do you know where they've progressed to?

Well, they're not consecutively up to Dianetics. They haven't really started reading the first book, see? But they — I'm not even being funny now — they've now realized that silence is necessary in the operating room. But they are not willing to practice it. Now, there's where they are. They have already accepted prenatals as a spectacular action. And this has taken how many years? It's taken a dozen years, see?

Well, that works a hardship on auditors. That works a hardship on auditors. I'm very well aware of this and often very ashamed of it. I have to junk something that you're getting results with, see? I give you a new curve, I give you something up front, something more distant than that, you're perfectly happy. This class would be perfectly happy today if we had nothing more than I gave you just before I left for America, on 3GA Criss Cross, you see. You'd still be sweating around on this and you'd still be finding some goals and it'd be all right. You'd muck it through somehow or another. Well, I gave you tremendous extensions on this, see?

Well, it has a tendency to overwhelm you slightly with data. But if you understood why this is happening and the rate of advance — if you understood those things — then you wouldn't feel so overwhelmed. I won't be happy in cutting off intensive research on clearing until you can sit down and find somebody's goal with great speed and great accuracy, do you see? And right now we're dealing with something that's just a little bit tough for an auditor. I recognize we're dealing in 3A — GA Criss Cross with something that's just a little bit too hard. You're making mistakes, see, and it's taking you a little bit long. But I'm confident that you'll get the hang of it.

The main things you're doing wrong is just not completing lists. And I told you to dig out those lists and you didn't. Give her a flunk — flunk her. I wanted to show you a right list
and a wrong list. Let me show you that right now, regardless of these questions. I must get
this across to you. Particularly you guys that are departing – you're liable to make some horri-
ble mistakes.

Here's an item. [writes] This is an item. And this is another item. This is another item.
This is another item. This is another item, see?

This is a list, this is a roll-your-own, this is any kind of an item, see? Any kind of a list
you're making for assessment, see? Well, I opened one of your folders the other day – yours.
And I thought, "Oh, my God!" you know? "Oh, ha! How can anybody do this?" You know
what this list looked like? [writes something, seems like he puts many strikes (/) behind the
items on the list] [laughter]

Lists don't look like that! That's an incomplete list. Just the symptom of these things
on it; it's incomplete. What are you doing? See? Why are you pursuing it? Or it's coming from
the wrong source. You've got no business listing this line anyhow.

When you listed the line you got no TA action. Why'd you keep on listing the line?
Any list has got to give you TA action – except the goals list. Oddly enough the goals list is
completely in reverse. A goals list that gives you TA action is incomplete – goal isn't on it.

When you're nulling a goals list and you get TA action, knock it off and find some
items. There's a fast tip for you. Now, I'll show you how this thing ought to look, if I can get
this apart without collapsing the place. Now, this is something on this order. [writes]

Now – I'll show you how one of these things ought to look. It's very simple. Here's
your list, here's your item. You know, your item of lists, something like that, see.

Now, this is the page on which the item was found. You got that now? This is the page
on which it was found. So, you can understand how much less the other pages are. It looks
like this. [writes] That's the way it looks.

Your lists look like that? Well, if they don't, you're listing an incomplete list. That
thunderstruck some of you, didn't it? Well, if that – if you're listing and your final page does-


"Oh." You say, "Uh-uh-uh, oh-oh-oh, whoa-whoa-whoa-whoa-whooooooa!" You say,
"What'd you think about?"
He says, "Oh, nothing, except that first one up there, I realized that was silly."

And you say, "Okay. Thank you very much." Read the first one again, it's out, out, out, out, out, out, out. You wind up with eight, nine, ten in, out of about a hundred. And then they go out, out, out. You've got about four in; tiger drill them – rapid Tiger Drill.

And I noticed you doing something the other night that you must not do. Tiger Drill is Tiger Drill – Tiger Drill is Tiger Drill. It has never been modified. The original drill is just as it is in the bulletin you'll get there – you'll get there. Now, if you want to polish this up and get fancy, why, add Careful of; and if you want to polish it up and get fancier, add the Protest. And you've got what passes for Tiger. But actually, the basic Tiger Drill is just the basic Tiger Drill and runs something like this: You read the thing and it fires so you say, "Invalidate." You read the thing, it doesn't fire so you say, "Suppress."

Now, you don't prepcheck Suppress, is what I'm getting around to, see? You don't do anything with it. A Tiger Drill is a Tiger Drill, you understand?

_Audience:_ Mm-hm.

Anytime else you strike Suppress – mid ruds, you strike it in the mid ruds, you strike it in Prepchecking – and you want to make sure because this is a very suppressive pc. This is a very unusual circumstance. You know, they're very suppressive pcs so we're going to do it while we're trying to get items out, you understand? That's unusual. As you're going down the list you say, "To catch catfish." Reads. "On this goal has anything been invalidated?"

See? Gives you the answer; you say, "To catch catfish." It doesn't read. You say, "On this goal has anything been suppressed?" Doesn't read, you say, "Thank you, that's out."

Tiger Drill is just Tiger Drill, you understand? That's how you get these items out. And that's why you're going down the line and just sweating yourself silly, you know? You're taking five, ten minutes to tiger drill one of these things out, you know?

It says, "cowboy," see. "Cowboy" reads. "On this goal has anything been invalidated?" No tick. "On this goal has anything been suggested?" See? "On this goal has a mistake been made?" – or, "On this item has a mistake been made?" rather. Pang! Reads. "What was the mistake?"

"Well, you said so-and-so and I said so-and-so."

"Thank you very much." Read the goal again – don't even read "mistake" again, see? Why waste the extra read? Why test it?

You say, "Cowboy." Didn't read. "On this goal has anything been suppressed?" Didn't read, it's out. You understand?

Listen, anything that is in, is charged. You've read it too far. You think the charge comes from the Suppress or the Invalidate or from – you think that the read comes from the "Invalidate" or "Suggest" or the "Careful of" And it doesn't. See, the read doesn't come from there. The read doesn't come because he's invalidated it.

Did it ever occur to you why, when you say to some pc something or other and you get a rock slam – one time you get a rock slam, see, just random rock slam on the list! You say,
"Careful of" and you got a rock slam. Where's that from? What's that? That fades away, that washes, see? It's not in.

But on the next item he was careful of that one and he didn't get a rock slam. Did it ever occur to you to ask this burning question: How come on some items you get a rock slam, and some items you get a heavy fall and some items you don't get anything?]

Well, the pc invalidated each one. Let's say the pc said, "Oh, to hell with it," on "a cowboy" and "a tiger" and "a waterbuck," see?

Well, you read "a cowboy" – it's not his item, see? And he said, "To hell with it." It doesn't even read! So what, see?

In other words the thing has to have an underlying charge before the pc's invalidation does anything to it to give it a read. See?

So, the amount of action that your meter gets on an item is inherent in the item – not in the pc's ability to invalidate and make the meter read, see? You're going on the basis of the pc is adding charge to it. No, no.

He invalidates a rock slamming item – "tiger." You say "tiger." Slam, slam, slam, slam. See? "On this goal has anything been invalidated? On this item has anything been invalidated? On the item 'tiger' has anything been invalidated?" – slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam. Well, you had an invalidation earlier on the list, didn't you, and nothing rock slammed?

Well, so it isn't the pc's ability to rock slam that you're meeting. It's the fact that when he invalidates a rock slam – potentially rock slamming item-you'll get a rock slam. In other words, his invalidation only activates the charge that is there.

So the activation of the charge that is there is what he's doing. So naturally, you're not going to be able to clear up a really charged item. You say, "On this goal has anything been invalidated?" Pang!

"Well," he says, "Yes, I so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." Well, that clears off Invalidate. But you read this item again, you say "tiger." Pang! See?

And if it's the item, you're not going to get rid of it. Chances of it submerging are very slight.

Of course, you can take some goal, and just cave in on this goal and it doesn't read anymore and then precheck it and it reads again, and so forth. But you never – that's why it's the goal. It has – you can't completely get rid of the charge. Sometimes it disappears and sometimes it appears and it's back and forth and it never cleans up and there's always pain on it, or something like that, see.

But that's what you're reading on the meter. You're not reading the fact that Joe, a pc – by invalidation – makes a tick. You're reading that when he invalidates an item which has a tick in it, you get a tick. You get that?

Audience: Yes.

So therefore, the most cursory tiger drilling will sort out your items.
Now, you get this main item – this is the one. You can't make it go out, you see? "On this goal," or "On this item, has anything been invalidated?" Pang!

And you say, "All right, what was it?"
And he says, "So-and-so."

"On this item has anything been invalidated?" It's gone now. You say the item again, "Tiger," crash! All right.

"On this item has anything been suggested?" Tick. You get the Suggest off. "Tiger," crash! See? "On this item has a mistake been made?" Tick.

"Well, I did, I thought it wasn't it."

"All right. Good. 'Tiger,'" crash! You say, "All right."

Now you've got to prove it up so you move upstairs with your Tiger Drilling, don't you see? Now you're going to get "Careful of," and you're going to get "Protest," and you're going to monkey with this thing. Next thing you know it turns on a rock slam, see, but ordinary tiger drilling of items – until you want to work something over with the Big Tiger, see? So you – what you've done is take Tiger Drilling and graded it up to Big Tiger, see? And then graded actually Big Tiger up to something horrendous. So you're still wondering what Big Tiger is.

We were talking to you about Big Tiger. You could say six buttons, with "Protest" occasionally used – Big Tiger, perfectly adequate. The original Tiger Drill is as published in the bulletin. That's little Tiger, ordinary Tiger.

And you go sweeping down that list, crash-crash-crash-crash-crash. Some marvelous thing happened today – where's May? Marvelous thing happened today, we had a rocket read on the goal "to catch catfish." [laughter] I mean, marvelous! I sat there and laughed. I knew sooner or later this was going to hook into somebody's goal line or something of the sort. Sure enough, the pc used to catch catfish ever since she was six.

But she was thinking of what would be the effect side. She was trying to figure out a bulletin while it was being done. What's the effect side of catching catfish? Well, to be caught by a catfish, see? And that was what was giving the rocket read. I think it's marvelous. Somebody's going to come up some day on one of these items lists and get a rock slam on "tiger."

"When is a rock slam recoverable? Am I right in understanding it is not when an item has been fully opposed and after it has been listed from, with a dwindling R/S? Would you please say more about the probable stability?"

Oh, no. When is it recoverable? Well, it – actually, it's always recoverable and you actually don't expect a rock slam to totally diminish on a very good reliable item by being opposed and by being represented. It won't diminish – it'll diminish, but it won't disappear. And you can always recover them.

If it was a reliable item you can always recover them. You say just, "What wouldn't you give it?" and get a couple and all of a sudden you've got your rock slam back again. You can always make these things recover providing you don't do it too often.
Now, the only thing that makes them disappear, utterly and completely is when they are paired. Now, as you know, you can't clean up a lock on a serious withhold. Let's put it this way: the guy has a basic withhold. And you're trying to run O/W on this person – the person has a basic withhold. All right. And you catch the with... The basic on it is when the person was eleven. You're trying to pick it off when the person was twenty-one. And it just sort of is a dirty needle mess, you see? And you never find the basic on this chain. This is this – the same structure exists whether we're using the structure currently or not, you see?

All right, similarly, you really can't get all the disturbance off of an item until you've got the disturbance off the Rock and opprock. It's going to hang forever. It won't ever completely wash. It'll submerge, it'll suppress, it'll do this. But you can take most reliable items after they've been handled and opptermed and everything – and if you were willing to put in time enough to prepcheck the reliable item – this is very extraordinary, you see; never would prepcheck a reliable item that is three pairs above where you're now working. You just wouldn't do it. But if you sat down and did it, you would recover the slam. That's quite interesting isn't it?

Now, it'll reduce, it'll be less charged and you can knock it out. You can kick the thing to pieces by pulling missed withholds – which you shouldn't do, by the way – you can pull missed withholds on it and it'll deintensify. You can deintensify it in numerous ways. But why do so? The best way to deintensify it is pull it right on down to the bottom of the chain. Because it isn't – hasn't gotten really enough residual charge in it to bother with. It's been opposed, it's been represented – particularly that. It isn't immediately recoverable as a rock slam; you have to work it over a little bit to get it to slam again. What do you want it to slam for?

The only time you really want one of these items to slam again is when you take a pc over from another auditor and you're suspicious of the reliability of those items – and you can get the things to slam.

Now, I don't – you should not go to the tremendous step of doing a Prepcheck on each item. That becomes silly. But you could make them slam again. Your most basic test is to make a very short list of "What wouldn't he give that thing," if it's an oppterm. And if it's a terminal, why, "What wouldn't it give," you see? You'll see the slam back. It's a very cursory test.

It frankly doesn't matter too much unless your – unless somebody has laboriously found about twelve items on some pc. Then you get the pc and you're not sure whether these were all reliable items or not – and pcs are the darnedest invalidators in the world. They're liable to tell you that these weren't the items, that they never cognited on them. You get some wild tales from pcs. You shouldn't believe them.

Because what's happened? The thing is submerged. It's done this, it's done that. They'll even invalidate them. They'll dramatize the invalidations of them. The only time you really get into trouble is when you want to list some goals! You want to start right out and list some goals, against one of these oppterms.

Now, as soon as you want to do that, you're stuck, if you had to prove up every one of them. Now, the one you will now find alive is the one which is most like the opp and opprock – the Rock and opprock, see. That's just the basic pair on the chain. The one that is now alive.
is most like the basic pair on the chain. List goals against it and be happy. Just read all twelve items, see. One of them rock slams, see. If twelve items don't – just start down and treat it as a goals list – just do little Tiger on them. See, pang-pang-pang-pang-pang. All of a sudden one slams. That's good enough. You understand? Do the rest of them if you want to find out which one slammed the best. All right, you've got one now that's slamming very nicely; list goals against it. You see how you would do that?

Frankly, you will – the point is well taken – because you will take over pcs who have a complete line plot which has nothing to do with the price of fish. And one of the quickest ways you can tell them is, is the needle dirty. You take over this pc who has had ten items found and you take a look at the needle and you start to ask the pc some question or get the pc in-session; you got a dirty needle. It's going bzz, bzzz, bzz-bzz-bzz, bzz-bzz.

Ah, there's something wrong. There's something wrong with that plot, that's the first thing you do. And your best remedy is not to go back over and check somebody else's work but to do some effective work on it. Just find some more items. See, it's relatively unimportant, then, to prove up somebody else's plot. That's real, real weird. Also, there's another sign that I could give you, the pc will be senned up. Lots of sen. Lots of sen and a dirty needle and the pc's line plot was for the "boids". Something wrong with that plot.

All right, enough of that. The next question is, "Could you please say more about the probable stability of a first-goal Clear. When next goals key in old one, expect totally different valences and so forth and a black – and a different aberration type."

There is no study on this. I haven't even thought any study had any necessity at all. A first-goal Clear is about three goals from the basic pattern that started him out being aberrated. And actually that person will dramatize something to some degree until the third goal is listed clear. And it'll be in the same pattern line. It'll have different names and it'll have different words and different music and it won't have as much – he won't have anywhere near the influence over the pc.

But I know a pc right now that I'm just praying the day will come when she gets her fourth goal. Because this pc is still chopping in certain directions like acid. And it's still from that first channel, you understand? That was an indifferently complete job on the first goal, an indifferently complete job on the second goal, you see. I mean, this wasn't very good work that worked this pc up there, so there's still residuals there, don't you see? And I should think to bust the whole thing up it'd be about the fourth goal. If you're going to get indifferent clearing of this particular type to blow the lot, why, you'd have to get about the fourth goal up the line, see?

Now, if the person had been very well, thoroughly brushed up and cleaned up on the second goal, why, you should sort of expect this dramatization of various sectors to cut down. But let me put it to you this way. You know how much your own or your pc's conduct changes on the finding of one item. You find one good reliable item and you're going to get some change. Well, that pc's still having some trouble in other sectors, aren't they? Yeah, that change is quite stable, it'll stay that way.

All right, now let's take the pc's first goal cleared. Well, that's going to introduce an awful lot of difference to this pc, you know? But let me count it up for you. Let me count it up
for you. The pc probably won't have a lot of physical troubles. If they exist, they will go away. But they may still exist. The pc won't be mad and choppy and violent and beyond control in certain directions. They'll just snap in those directions. Maybe before they were too apathetic to snap, see? So now they'll chop. The world around them looks much brighter, they're much more sensible and they can work their way through it much better. They're still having a hell of a time perceiving the other man – the other person over there – they're still having trouble with that.

First dynamic is almost analogous to a first-goal Clear. Doesn't matter what dynamic it was on, the first goal basically cleans up a person's concentrated worry about himself. Put it that way. And it might not be too awfully observable. Oh, people would observe it, yes, there'd be an awful difference to them, but, I mean, as far as he's concerned other people haven't changed yet and there's a lot of reservations here one way or the other. He feels stable, he feels happy, you're not trying to degrade this state. But it's a question of how far has a man got to go?

Now, if that's listed out and has given a free needle – the way you were listing now on your Routine 3-21 – I'm very sure that is very stable. Because I've seen stability increasing every time we did a better polished job of it, I've seen the stability better. That's pretty good.

But as – let's take now this fourth-goal Clear. Let's just skip those intermediate states. You realize that a fourth-goal Clear probably needs a body to talk? That's aberrated, man! I don't care how else you look at it, that's aberrated. Needs a body to talk. May still eat; that's crazy, man! Breathes; what do you want all this drafty stuff pouring in and out all the time for? [laughter] Influenced by gravity; drops his watch and it'll hit the deck – break, too. You get the relative state of affairs. You see, you're going on up there – you're up throughout the sixth dynamic. And he'll be still having trouble with the sixth dynamic. Do you get what I'm talking about? I needn't go over it in any hideous state.

I think the present stability of a first-goal Clear is absolutely remarkable. But you can get your idea of the situation this way. Get the idea of pinning your whole hopes for a complete change of this pc on getting one item blown. Get the idea of that. Now, you know how much the pc changed in getting that one item blown. Made a big difference to the pc. Something that could – that's not negligible.

Well, of course, a goal like this is astronomically greater than just the one item, see, because there are dozens and dozens of these pairs. But you can't put all your hopes on this first goal, either, see? It's always a mistake to make the big – to make one thing do it. And you're going to make this mistake sometimes when you're deintensifying a rock slammer or you're going to oppterm – they're rock slamming like mad on Scientology, see, so you're going to oppterm this and you get the oppterm, see? And this cools them off and so on. But you've put your whole stake on just this, see? And Scientology now makes them unhappy. See? They're not trying to cut it up and they don't think it's cutting them up, but it makes them unhappy, do you see? In other words, there was something left, see, and there will continue to be, until they're up there a lot of packages, and so on.

You can make an enormous change – can make an enormous change and the only thing I must warn you against is making a mistake of absolutes – believing they are obtain-
able. Believing that this person who is an alcoholic, after you've gotten three items off, will cease to be an alcoholic. See? He'll probably be queasy on the subject of being an alcoholic right up to the second goal. See? He'll have little moments of queasiness. He may not even tell you about them, you see. Oh, he's cured of it. He isn't doing that now. But you say, "Well, I'll cure an alcoholic. I'll just oppose alcohol and I'll get one item and then he's absolutely – never afterwards he's going to be an alcoholic."

Well, if you compute like that, you're going to get lots of loses. Similarly, if you expect that every first-goal Clear is going to be able to fend for himself on all dynamics, you're going to get lots of loses.

Because the first-goal Clear won't fend for himself on all dynamics. He'll generally fend for himself very ba... very, very well on the first dynamic – do infinitely better. It isn't they become more first dynamicy than they were before; they just get a first dynamic. They become aware of themselves, or something like this. It's the first time this has ever happened, don't you see? Before that time, they're withholding themselves. So that's the story of stability.

As far as stability is concerned, how long will the state last? Well, boy, we've had some of these going for quite a while now. And we've had some of them checked out after the fact and so forth, and they seem to be staying remarkably stable.

A case has to be pretty well cleaned up before it stays stable. The degree of – the second goal doesn't operate as a key-in against the first-goal action. That might be something interesting to you. You sometimes are going to have trouble to get the second goal to key in so you can list it. In other words, you're going to have trouble sometimes killing that free needle.

Imagine trying to get the rudiments in on a very well cleared first-goal Clear that you can't read a meter on. The best thing to do is to get them to read a goals list because that'll key them in faster than anything else. They'll now – they won't dramatize their second goal any more than they have been, however. Dramatization doesn't increase by reason of restimulation. They just go on that way.

The speed with which the second goal cleans up is what's got me startled. I've seen several of them now and I'm just – gee! You know? Do an eight hundred and fifty goals list-just your Routine 3-21-do an eight hundred and fifty goals list and so forth. I'd seriously doubt you'd have to do very much with items. But on the other hand on some cases you might.

I'm thinking of the case who made up his goal last century. Did you realize, I mean, that we might hit a case that the first goal was postulated in 1810, and all you've cleared is back up to 1810 and then it's free as a bird? Then the second goal is what you'd have trouble with, wouldn't it? Well, we don't know too much about that, but those are some hazardings.

All right, let's get a few more here. Ah... I think I just answered that question.

Oh, "Dwindling rock slam." You had a hot item. "What does it signify?" You had a hot item. Don't worry about it. Sometimes you get a dwindling rock slam; sometimes you don't. And you're doing very fine, now, without finding any. So it's just a phenomenon.
Now, you could have used it before when you had a limited number of items you were going to find goals on, right? See, when you had a limited number of items you're going to find goals on, therefore, you had to find a particular kind of item in order to list goals against it, see? Well, therefore, you needed a dwindling rock slam. Well, sometimes you're going to get dwindling rock slams and sometimes you aren't. But you're not going to use them to find a goal with anyway so why bother with them?

You don't necessarily only use that you have a dwindling rock slam on to find the goal from, either. In other words, dwindling rock slam is actually a phenomenon. It now indicates that it exists. You'll see it, but if you don't get it, so what? Doesn't mean anything, doesn't mean you haven't got – you're going to get an invalid item.

But let me tell you, the line that you get that dwindles will give you a honey. You always get a better item on a line that dwindles than a line that doesn't. That doesn't mean you should go around looking for dwindling ones because you get perfectly good ones that you have to get anyway on lines which when listed, don't dwindle. Non-dwindling lines – no dwindling rock slam on the line – give you a perfectly usable item. You understand?

"If when oppositioning a rock slamming Scientology terminal, a very persistent dirty needle turns on and the list is five hundred items long and it'll still dirty needles, and missed withholds does not immediately remedy the condition, what should one do?"

Well, there's a missing datum here. Did the thing turn on any rock slams? If while you're listing you got some rock slams, why, you got a pretty good chance of finding an item on it. And you certainly better list the dirty needle out. But let me tell you that if it didn't turn on any rock slams – you're just going up a blind alley.

Remember that it – your nulling bulletin is absolutely correct – it must come from a fruitful source. And this particular item is not from a fruitful source. See?

There is a missing datum here – the question is unanswerable just to this degree. So a dirty needle turns on. Well, if it's from a correct source that it's going to get you an item, the dirty needle will turn into a rock slam, turn into a dirty needle and then dwindle out and vanish and you'll have a complete list and you can null it and find a rock slamming item.

Well, let's just take at random, "Who built this house?" Let's just pick one out of the air, see, and we're going to list "Who built this house?" from a PC, see? We're going to run this. It's way out of time, space. We haven't assessed for it. It makes no sense anyhow and now we're going to get a list. And let me tell you, that list will go dirty needle, dirty needle, sen, sen, sen, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, sen, sen, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, sen, more sen, dirty needle, dirty needle; needle maybe clear up. Something might rock slam for a moment

Pc's protest over the charge, see? Just an instant, you know? And – dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – five hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – six hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – seven hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle. You'd better wake up! It's from nowhere. Literally and factually true.
Now, we'll run the case for a while and someday come back to the list and null the list and what do you know. We now have rock slams on it. But now the case has been unloaded.

That's a case of – that's, by the way, auditors are going to make mistakes on that, I suddenly realize. Auditors are going to make mistakes on it. They're going to do this. I myself just picked one off the PC and did a list exactly like this – and I wish I hadn't started it. But the sen dwindled. I eventually wound up with no sen on it. I listed the sen off the list, which I think is quite remarkable, but it was not a properly picked-up thing. It was just an arbitrary test line. Sen came off of it and PC felt mighty sick listing it, but at the end of the line sen was off, pretty well – and I took items – it had R/Sed a bit here and there, once in a blue moon – and I took those and I tiger drilled the R/Sing items, and the second I did a dirty needle came back on the list. I said *ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah*! We're out of here, see?

Otherwise it'd looked good, see. The sen dwindled. I mean, you haven't got any sen on the pc now. And you had a rock slam in, I think, six items on this list of many, many pages – rock slammed slightly for a moment. Pc thought of them. When the pc thought of them they rock slammed. Obviously this was a very heavily charged list, but it was leading no place. At the end of something like fifteen or fourteen pages or something like this, why, still got a dirty needle on it.

What is this? What is this list? You might say it's premature. That list you ought to have been listing on after the pc has had another thirty items found, you got the idea? It's too far down the track. Pc wouldn't have any reality on it if you found it. It's not going to slam. The item that is on the list is not going to slam. It's too suppressed. It's too much in the package. It's – see, it's too early. There's too much force in it. The pc can't confront up to it. Don't you see all these things?

Therefore a great deal of good sense has to be used in choosing what lines to list. And by choosing the wrong line to list, why, of course, you get dirty needles and you get everything else and you get yourself into a lot of trouble and you get the pc into a lot of trouble and you don't know whether you're coming or going. That's listing from the wrong line.

Let's say you do a lousy Prehav assessment. Let's say you do just a *stinker* – horrible! It should have been "prevent knowing," and you came up with "tell everybody," see? This thing is just lousy, see? And you go in there with great ambition and you list away. This is the condition which you're going to find – just the conditions I've just described to you. You can go on and on and on. I think you could list ten thousand items on it and you would still not have listed it out. Because the item itself is not going to appear to the pc on the list. The pc will never recognize the item, even if you found it.

Supposing you had some method of finding it and handing it to the pc on a silver platter and say, "Here it is – Homo sap." You know? Pc would say, "It hasn't anything to do with me."

Now, you've got the pc's goal listed down and you – case is way advanced – case can tolerate and confront a great deal much more force, you see. You've got dozens of items in addition now to this. All of a sudden, mysteriously, on the list will appear "Homo sap" and the pc will say, "That's my item." See? That's a very premature action. Most of these wrong lines,
however, give you just exactly nothing. They don't give you a dirty needle or anything. But you can get ahold of one of these lines that someday will come up on the pc, but not now. And that's the way it behaves. Okay?

All right. Time for one more before the break, huh?

The question is, "Must this pc who is listing on the goal have rock slamming items found, or could he go Clear by continued listing on the four lines?"

Answer: Pc did not go Clear with the four lines, so therefore pc must have rock slamming items found and those items must be opptermed. The reason this pc didn't go Clear is because of bypassed items. Got it? He just couldn't list out to Clear, so you must have bypassed something. You have to go back and find it, okay?

I dare say some day you may be clearing that way. Them as list straight out onto Clear and so forth, you never bother to. But a case that's been listing for a while and he isn't Clear yet; somebody certainly better get interested. Okay. Aw, we've got time for one more.

"Will we be able to take meters back into the US without trouble and when will the Mark Vs be available?" Actually, Mark Vs are available – a few of them are available right now – some more of them are coming in. Edgar could tell you more about that. When are Mark Vs available, Edgar?

*Male voice: Tomorrow.*

Tomorrow? So there's – there's Mark Vs available. As far as taking them into the US without trouble is concerned, the people have never stopped a meter which was by surface package mail or was in somebody's paws as a personal effect. No meters have been stopped.

The only meters that have been stopped have been by air shipment and in bulk. And that's big enough for the FDA's myopic little man eye to see, and it comes in with much higher velocity than they at their state of case can tolerate. And so they're stopping those madly. You don't even have to make a point of taking a meter into the United States. The fellow says – customs is poking around and he says, "What's this?" Well, don't tell him it's a time bomb, because they've been known to arrest people just for saying it. But say, "Well, that's just a – I'm a minister – that's something which we use in confessionals."

"Oh, is that so?"

The only trouble is, the only – that's the best way to classify it. [laughter] The actually, look where the Catholic church had been if all their confessionals had been done with an E-Meter. Look at the missed withholds they must have missed. Anyhow – that probably shattered them. So it's a good explanation.

The only liability – the only liability you get into, Tom, is the fact that when you've told them this, they will probably call over a buddy who is interested in psychology and he will want to talk to you about it. Not because he wants to find out anything, but because he'd like to get out of the racket he's in. That's a fact. That happened to us the last time in New York. We almost couldn't get through customs. We were being too bothered by customs men who wished to join the club. Expect no trouble in that direction. Tell them it's your personal
property and that's a tool of the trade and you're all set. They won't say anything more about it.

Okay?

Let's take a break.
Q AND A PERIOD: DISTRICT OFFICES, CO-AUDITS

A lecture given on 22 November 1962

Okay.

Here we have the second Saint Hill Briefing Course lecture of November the 22nd, AD 12.

Now, our question period progresses and continues.

[part missing] [further down also a big part missing, certificates]

Okay. I've got a question here which is – I don't dig. Oh! It's a question, "Has some – has somebody been terminated or retained?" That is to say the fact of termination. This person is mixed up about the co-audit. The co-audit has ceased to exist. Termination is simply just termination. There is no further co-audit after termination as far as the course is concerned. You want to sit down up in East Grinstead or something like that and drop around once in a while it's perfectly all right with us. But as far as termination is concerned, that is just termination.

Now, as far as auditing a pc outside, there was an offer there to the December 1st and so forth. Well, by all means hang around until December the 1st if you're not assigned classes or anything. But this doesn't constitute a co-audit. Termination's a termination. It means we have no further responsibility for your training and that I demand exclusively that you now operate. The termination says you are now an auditor.

And here's, "When do I think this auditor's District Office would be likely to materialize officially?" Well, this whole question of a District Office, the Scientology 1970 should not be understood as first we redesign HCO WW and then we redesign Continental Offices and then we redesign city offices, and eventually get around to building up District Offices. The District Office has yet to evolve. There are no orders at this moment as what a District Office is supposed to do or what it constitutes. There has only been a thought of what it might be.

The person operating a District Office might take off in numerous lines. Might do numerous things. I notice that Melbourne was a bit mixed up on their clearing co-audit which is also a health co-audit which will also make you live longer and it's all on the same HAS Co-audit. See? Well, I would say a District Office shouldn't do that. See, that's four things that are combined into one activity. And that's hoping that everybody will come in on the same activity and go out the same way, you see? Actually, it's not designed that way. If you're going to run a clearing co-audit as a District Office, well, run a clearing co-audit as a District Office. But nobody in your district or area has heard of clearing – you can't seem to get anybody very interested in clearing – you've got a health co-audit, don't you see?
You've got a springboard that you can take off from. But for a District Office that is now operating as a private practice – a fellow in private practice wants to go over into a District Office. What do we do? Cut off his head and make him totally insolvent? And say that he must take on no private pcs forevermore and that he can only run a clearing co-audit? But he hasn't any candidates for a clearing co-audit. He hasn't built anything up.

Now, these things are not done with great suddenness and exclamation points. These things are evolved. We have yet to find out stably how can a District Office best survive? I know a lot about this because I know what made the Dublin office survive and not survive – and it came very close to being a District Office. It was little or no private processing – it was all group activity of one kind or another and if it had gone along and had good leadership along the line after I left it, it would have been very, very successful.

Had quite a bit of experience with this kind of an activity, but these things come down to economics. And before there are shifts, we've got to pioneer this action. Now, we have some things called District Offices. But there is nothing specified as to what they do. What is specified is that they are part of Scientology – that they are a regular Scientology office – various other conditions could be made concerning this, and have been made concerning their legality – part of the administrative framework. That sort of thing. But exactly how do they give service?

Well, that has got to be evolved. And you see that it'd be folly for me to say that they give service in just exactly this way, this way and this way whereas the matter of the data at hand is so slim that one couldn't say this. So maybe one District Office is a little sort of an HGC and another District Office is a co-audit for health addicts – and another one, they get a lot of things going on the subject of clearing, don't you see? And they gradually get their feet off the ground.

Now, anybody in his district or area at this particular time has some income line or some flowing line on the subject of Scientology. There's already some action taking place in that immediate area. Well, the question is to build that action and evolve that action, as a District Office. And you'll wind up with a very strong District Office. But you're not going to kill off the interest, the enthusiasm in various lines – then put in an arbitrary thing and try to smash people's enthusiasm into that – because it never smashes. It just smashes. You can't detour this enthusiasm – you can – you can gradually shepherd it. You can do other things with it. Let's say we have twenty people in Riverside who are very, very interested in their auditor coming back from Saint Hill. So we say to this fellow, "All right, you're a District Office. You're going to be a District Office." And fine, he says, "Swell." That's good with him. He never particularly liked the franchise setup and it's left him in a great deal of – with no financial resources or anything like that. So he's going to be a District Office. All right.

Now he goes back into this district or this area. He's got twenty people. Well, he's certainly going to have to talk it over with these twenty people what they're going to do. And then his District Office does what they're going to do. Get the idea? That's the criteria on which you build it.

Now, when District Offices are straightened out and all of that is very smooth, then we'll start putting together city offices to take care of that service sphere and then we'll put
together the other offices to take care of the lower offices. You cannot build a house by laying in the roof tree first. It just can't be done. So any question about a District Office – yes, we intended every auditor's activity anyplace should be a District Office.

What is the activity of a District Office? It is what they make it. What service does a District Office get? It's what they've got to be given. You get this? And that way we'll build a strong structure from the bottom up. And the services that are given will be real and the people who will be supporting it and doing it will be real and their interest and service they'll consider real, don't you see?

Now, if I were going to set up a District Office – this is a different proposition, see? If I myself were going to set up a District Office – and I'm just an auditor now and I can clear people or run co-audits and I've had experience in this various lines – I'd probably go rent a store. I probably wouldn't take the front room of my house. I'd probably go rent a store, an old empty store someplace or another. They're wide – pardon me, they're narrow and deep. You can put auditing room partitions in the back of them, you can put book displays in the front of them, you can make them look good, you can curtain off an area just inside the door from the street. You've got a big room there you can set up two lines of chairs in and people can do co-auditing. In other words, this is fine. And it also gives you street visualness. And you put up a proper book display and some other displays in the window that says what you're doing and that sort of thing.

And then I'd go into it hammer-pound and I would pick up – I would send out a great many feelers. I would get some lines going out of one kind or another. And I'd see which one of those lines responded. And that one I would hit hard and then I'd build it. I'd build it from there. And I wouldn't change it as long as that line was successful. I would just keep it building. I wouldn't split or disperse my interest. See, all of a sudden to find that all the high schools in the vicinity are so juvenile delinquented that they don't know whether they're coming or going. Then I find that everybody's terribly interested in this. Everybody's fascinated with this. Everybody listens to it. Find out they understand what I say on the subject.

Well, I don't run this District Office, then, day and night, on this subject and that subject and another subject and another subject and another subject and... No, I'd just reach out and I'd grab three hundred and eighty-five high school students and I start them through the thing, man. And as far as persuading the student – high school students to go through it, well, I'd – that's fine. But I also persuade other people to make them go through it. You get the idea? And I arrange for certain set charges and they all come in and they co-audit and they gradually get so they can see the wall, you know?

And everybody'd be very happy with me. I'd go around to parent – teacher's meetings every now and then – get three or four auditors to help me – HPA, HCA level auditors to help me. Knock their heads in if they don't give proper technical supervision. Don't let anything get weird on the subject. There's certain fellows there that have to have a certain amount of help, which is individualized help. They're much too tough – they can't even sit in the chair, you know? Well, I'd pray to have a city office running an HGC to turn them over to. Because frankly, I would not have time to do it.
I mean, that is about the way I would go in along the line. But it's a matter of feeling your way. And developing what you find. And not staying on a big dispersal – and hitting every line all over the place. Because you start following an interest line in the society, it actually requires all of your interest, all of your attention, to keep that one line going. And you can keep it going very, very well.

In Ireland, oddly enough, what happened to the office is quite interesting. It's – because it happened to it after I left there. It was quite solvent and everything was fine till I left. The idea got home that longshoremen were not quite nice. I was developing a land office business in longshoremen. These were tough mugs. It was quite remarkable. These characters were coming in and somebody disagree with the Instructor or something like that – well, their full answer was to throw him out, bodily, see? They didn't even talk good English. They weren't educated, you know? They probably sweated a bit, you know, down on the docks.

That was developing at a high roar. These characters and their union and everybody else was getting very interested in this, you know? And it was a matter of, "Well, Tim, I think you ought to go down there tonight, since I'm not – Tim?" He'd be down there that night.

These guys were very solidly behind us. And the people – not necessarily the people that followed me there – but some of the people who were there decided this was not quite nice. And they got in some intellectual louses who were very intellectual. And in spite of my telling everybody that an intellectual is defined as somebody who thinks about things – and we didn't want anybody thinking about anything – we wanted people doing things. And these longshoremen were absolutely ideal. But the next thing you know, why, these crude characters and types were being discouraged and so on – and then there were other little nasty things like this fellow wasn't quite nice because he was a member of the IRA – and this other fellow wasn't quite socially acceptable, you see, because, because, because. And next thing you know they didn't have a solvent office.

Now, the only thing that happened there is I found this track in the society. I found this zone of interest. And I was busy driving this thing home. Think of it. If every longshoreman in Ireland had gotten very interested in this and that had gone over into the drivers and teamsters and think – and taxicab drivers and this birds and that birds and the other birds and – and if it had hit there at the doingness strata of the society, think of what would have been the final result of all this. Instead of that we finally wound up with fifteen or twenty people sitting around talking about it. And I thought it was awfully sweet, and we closed the office. I was no longer there. I'd been gone for ages. But that was an interesting thing.

You have to look into the society and find a track – find a place where you can drive something through, you see? And then you don't keep hammering around at other places where you can't drive something through – you keep adding up all of your hammer blows on that one track, if you're dealing in a small area. And when you finished it up, man, you've got a hole driven through all of the results, all of the objections of this and that, you see?

And the only times I've ever seen Scientology on a dissemination pattern fold up is when a specialized proven line was not forwarded. And I've seen something come off of that. I've seen time split up. I have seen something else happen in that area that shouldn't have hap-
pened, see? A dispersal of interest, a dispersal of activity – and then it failed. So that's the criteria, actually. That's all I can almost – all I can tell you about a District Office, see.

Who's to man the District Office? Well, the people that man the District Office are people necessary to take care of the business of the District Office. What is the business of the District Office? Well, it's that business which best disseminates in that particular area for that particular office.

Now, you ask me what and I say at once, well, there it is. And who should run a District Office, who gets a District Office? That's very interesting. What do you get for getting a District Office? Well, I got the answer to that one the other day. We've now got several District Offices. They were fairly successful franchise offices. And, let me tell you this. A person who has been a party to or has formed up a District Office has now this: He has the rights to that post or position in a District Office. You think that over for a moment. That's quite revolutionary. That's quite revolutionary, if you think it over. He has a right to a District Office or that equivalent post in the District Office.

Let's say somebody was a Receptionist in a District Office and it built up to a very successful District Office while that person was there. All right, what are the rights of that person in that District Office? Well, they're the rights to be a Receptionist in a District Office. Now, what does this take care of? This takes care of the people moving from – well, somebody gets awfully tired of lower South Amboy and they want to go to lower Chicago. And, all right. What do they do, just give up any rights to anything that they have built or constructed or something? No, it's up to the organization to give them an equivalent spot in a District Office. That's what they own – that's their right, don't you see? They've earned that right. They have a right to one such spot, don't you see?

Now let's say somebody went in there and hammer and pound and so forth and he was head of a District Office and so forth. He'll always be head of a District Office. If he got made a successful District Office, he always has a District Office. All right, he wants to go to lower Chicago, and nobody in lower Chicago has built anything up, there isn't anything in lower Chicago and so forth. Well, obviously the organization would have to finance – well, it was agreed that lower Chicago was a good place to put it in – the organization would have to finance him a District Office in lower Chicago. They would appoint, however – and this is what covers the one point where we've been missing on dissemination – and believe me, this is the only point we've really been missing on dissemination – lower South Amboy is not suddenly without a District Office just because this fellow wanted to go to lower Chicago.

And that's our biggest point of failure. Auditor pulling up stakes and going someplace else and he doesn't have anybody to turn his group or his connections or anything else over to, and listen – when that happens, I hear from people or I don't hear from people, and they're usually all ARC broke. And somebody spent – we spend a lot of our time individually building up some particular area and then, very often, just go off and leave it. And it collapses and nothing picks it up. The District Office is basically an idea formed – that after an interest and so forth has been built up in an area that it will be continued in that area without nailing that auditor down in that area. Because auditors are shifty-footed – they go places.
And so all right, so he's built a District Office. It must have an address and it must have this and it must have that and must have the other thing, naturally – always does. Structure of activity. And this person, this person isn't going to stay in Riverside forever.

Well, all right, so he gets in touch with his next immediate area – you see every District Office doesn't necessarily have a city office over it. He gets in touch with his next contact up the line and he says, "I'm leaving Riverside. I want to leave Riverside. And I want to be out of here by the first of November." They're going to have to find somebody in Riverside, that's all. They're going to have to put somebody down in Riverside. You see how that would work out?

Therefore, that territory which has been conquered stays conquered. You're not always abandoning territory. I mean, the amount of work which auditors have done to straighten out or fix up various areas in the world, it'd break your heart. Because when they move on, when they change interest, when they do this or that – then that area and zone collapses and that ceases to be conquered territory, and it's quite interesting. So the District Office is basically a design which will not nail the auditor down in one spot for the rest of his life and which continues that area as a going concern. And that's what it's all about.

Financing and that sort of thing is a delicate point. It's sometimes hard to take care of. It's got to be done on a give-and-take proposition. The amount of money which can be made by a District Office is basically made by the developed patterns of approach to people. I learned an awful lot about this in Ireland – I really did, in Dublin. It was quite amazing. I had a ball over there. I figured if you could put one together in Ireland you could put one together in hell. [laughter] Let me tell you man, that's marvelous! I mean, that's – that's fantastic. You had groups of people who could not define or encompass create. They could not define it or encompass it – couldn't talk about it, couldn't agree or admit that it existed. How do you like this? Fabulous! Blow your brains out.

They had people at work who were all the time telling them it was against the church for them to come down to that particular horrible place. They were running up and down the streets with placards. "We have never heard of those people across the street," see? And they were making a big noise about it, you know? Oh yeah, had everything you could think of against us. And we still climbed the hill. And I thought, "If you can do it here, you can do it anyplace."

Hope that answers some of your questions on it. Didn't mean to get too lengthy on it.

"Please, will you let us have suggestions for handling co-audit listing. Would an amplifying system with earphones, each audit coupled with a panel meter control be practiced and so forth?" Very burning question. A very, very interesting question. And it's asked directly and immediately in the middle of the development on the answers to it. I hate to see you nailed down with that much electronic gear. See? By the time somebody sits down in the seat he looks like an astronaut, you know? [laughter] I just don't think it should be that complicated.

But what I'm trying to do – what I'm trying to do is, at the expense of it being much longer and taking much longer – develop a clearing technique that could be run very, very solidly in a co-audit by just maybe two or three repetitive commands. I know one right now
that would probably do it in three commands. Same as the old HAS Co-audit. You write the commands up on the blackboard and if the – if the pc says something or does something the auditor frightenedly puts out his hand to the back of the chair and an Instructor goes up and handles it, you know? That kind of an action. He's just supposed to say these three things.

And I don't envision any listing on written pages in a co-audit. You're rapidly breaking down certain percentages of pcs. Rapidly breaking it down here into what types and kinds of pcs there are, and so on. Well, they're all the same kind of pc, but some of them list easier than others and some of them this way and some of them that way, don't you see? And there's about 25 or 30 percent of the pcs have no business on a co-audit, a clearing co-audit, see. They would just fumble and dumble. Well, I'm trying to hit at that level of case for the tests I'm making on these three commands. And I'm trying to handle the toughest case that you could get to handle it.

Now, we wouldn't have a clue as to how many years this fellow was on a co-audit before he went Clear. We just have a guarantee of progress. Now, the main – the main thing we're after in a co-audit then – the direction we're trying to take – is a repetitive command basis which is relatively unsupervised. That is to say, as far as listening directly and immediately through meters and earphones is concerned. The remedy is policing the co-audit as it occurs. Auditors – HPAs and so forth – are quite successful in doing this. I like the way they handle this sort of thing. They do it well. They get a number of raw meat pcs lined up in the pcs' chairs and the auditors' chairs and so forth and they handle it from there. And they've always been very good at this. So that's something auditors do well.

Now, it could possibly be improved by having a meter, a line and a bunch of electronic gear and a microphone and all that sort of thing. Probably this could all be improved in that particular way. Is it justified to do so? That is my only question. Because the direction of research which is where I hope it will wind up, will be in the direction of not requiring it. The way you handle a co-audit, the way you've always handled HAS Co-audits, you'd handle them all the same way. Be the same old pattern. It's gotten creaky. If you don't know it, ask somebody who's run one. There must be a dozen people here who've run them for months and months and months or years on end. See, you just put them down in the chair and, I mean, the guy's supposed to utter the auditing command, and, actually the Instructor who is present audits the lot. It's his responsibility, and the raw meat audits beautifully as long as there's somebody there that they can put that hand out and say, "He-he-he didn't answer the question." That's the direction of development. It's not the mechanical direction. Or not this particular direction.

We have more need of this here than in a co-audit. I would like to see supervision capable of being done in paired chairs in a room here, in the Z Unit only. Boy, you know, you're awful lucky, those of you who are leaving. You're terribly fortunate that you got through the Y Unit. Because you know, probably never again in the history of Saint Hill will anybody get through the Y Unit. Do you realize that? Isn't that sad?

Do you know what the Y Unit, those coming up to the Y Unit face? Some people face firing squads. Others face other things. But the people who are coming up the line now are not going to get out of the Y Unit until they get a clean needle on their pc with the pc's tone arm.
at the Clear read. And when they've got their pc like that, they get out of the Y Unit. Do it with the meter, I mean, we're not going to keep meterless auditing in, see? Going to be very standard auditing and probably never again will anybody ever get into the Z Unit. [laughter] I thought you would be cheered. That puts a – puts a cheery light on your termination here. See, you can go away with a smile now, because you at least have gotten through the Y Unit.

Future concentration of auditing supervision will be the X and the Y Unit. The X Unit is going to be tougher than the Y Unit. But we're going to let people through into the Y Unit. Up to that, the only thing that lets a person out of the Y Unit is pc's TA at Clear read – needle clean, free, pc's goal has already come up, it's all ready to be listed – on the second goal. [laughter]

No, we're not going to be quite that extreme. We don't absolutely demand that the pc's goal have come up in the Y Unit. Also the Y Unit's auditing hours are going to be expanded enormously. There'll be a minimum of twelve hours a week in the Y Unit – minimum – given and received. Because that's where auditing skill deteriorated here a little bit – was in the Y Unit, see? So we just go to extremes and let it ride that way and let people cope with it. So you're awful lucky to get out of here.

That's all I can answer off of that one. Let's see another one here. "When a t-e-r . . ." I suppose that's terminal, "in the bank is visible to the pc and it is constant, can this be used as a shortcut to the goal?"

That isn't any guarantee that that is the goals terminal. That is no guarantee that it is a terminal. It will have the goal somewhere in it. Now, how it could be used as a shortcut of the goal – if it's identified and if it is checked out with a rock slam and if these other things are true – that is, if standard procedure also backs this up – yeah, that'd be a very, very likely terminal. That would be a honey. If it's backed up with everything else. It, of course, every item you know has its own goal. Doesn't necessarily rocket read or anything like that. But it's quite amusing that if you have – if you have a rock slamming reliable item and it's "a tiger," see. And there it is, rock slamming item, "tiger," and everything's fine, you've got it, found it, reliable. And it's a terminal. If you listed its goals, amongst its goals you would find its goal.

Before every engram a person had a goal. Before every difficulty in life that he was confronting he had a goal. And similarly, every valence and item he runs into has a goal. And the weird part of it is if that goal is very, very close to the main channel goal, it'll rocket read – once, twice, six, eight times. And folds up, and you never see it again. Did you ever notice in going down a long goals list that you'll strike goals occasionally that rocket read? It goes pssww! There it is, there's a goal rocket reading. And you check it, and by golly, it'll go pssww! You say, "Boy, that's really something, you know," and you tiger drill the thing out, and you trot out Big Tiger, and you're going to groom this whole thing up, and it goes, pssww! And then it goes tick. And then it stops. And you say, "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" No read. "On this goal, anything you have been careful of?" No read. "To catch catfish." No read. Sad story.

I mean, a lot of you have attended the funeral of goals that went like that. Well, what you've struck there is the central goal of one of these items. You see, it's on the channel of the goal, see? It's very close to the goal. It's not much use to you till after the case is Clear. You
could go back and see this circled X, and you could say, "What relationship did this goal have, 'to spit,' have to do with 'catching catfish'" you see? "What was the relationship between these two goals?" And he could tell you. Well, naturally the best way to catch catfish is you spit first and that tells you whether or not you're going to be lucky or not, see? And he tells you all about it. Doesn't do you a bit of good. At the time you first find this he won't be able to integrate it worth a nickel, he'll give you some wild tale. And he actually doesn't know which way to go to find these goals.

But do you understand what I mean? Occasionally these things'll rocket read. And it's quite amusing. It's not really amusing, after you've seen four or five or six rocket reads or even eight or ten rocket reads, off of some item, and you're big tiger drilling it, and everything is fine and you're going to come back and you check it, and you come back the next morning and you check it and it doesn't do anything. It goes tick and phumph. And then you precheck it, you know, and you keeps asking the pc, "Do you have a pain? Do you have a pain?" you know? Pc keeps saying, "Yes, I do have pain, on the end of my nose," and so forth, and the end of the session or something like that, it doesn't tick, it isn't suppressed, nothing. There are no pains, there's no sensation. And it's gone.

That's fine. That's one of the – one of the liabilities of auditing. But that was the goal of a terminal or an oppterm. Mostly terminals rocket read, I don't know that oppterms ever rocket read. But I don't know that. They might. Now, the sad part of it is – this is the – this – you think that's – is a sad story. Well, there's a sadder story than this. After you've nulled another thousand goals and found thirty more items – you take all goals that went out hard and you accidentally put that goal back on the list. And you check it out and it's got pain and it rocket reads. And you look at the intervening thirty-five hours of hard labor, as totally useless. Actually, it's not. The thing was never in a condition to rocket read till you unburdened it. But it gives you a horrible sensation.

I had this happen to me twice in Washington. Pcs were delighted and I was spitting my teeth out. "What do you mean having that goal back again? That was out three days ago!" By the way, I'll give you another parting shot on goals. Pain reads below the meter. If there's pain on something it might not show up on the meter, but it'll show up on the pc with pain. And it is characteristic of all these goals which have faded out and then come back, that when you got the pain, (quote) all off of them (unquote), on Monday, you found pain on them on Tuesday. And when you got it all off of them on Tuesday you found pain on them on Wednesday. And then thirty days later you've abandoned it because you cleaned it all up – and thirty days later you happened to hit it again and it's got pain on it. This isn't a – this isn't a wonderful test, because also phony goals that are almost right will follow this to some degree.

But on a bad – on the wrong goal, if it's going to be the wrong goal, if the pain does persist for quite a while and you can get it several sessions and you can get pain back and all that sort of thing – it will eventually disappear and you can't get any back. But on the right goal you can never make this happen. You can never get the pain to go away and stay away. You can get it to go away, but you can't get it to stay away. It'll be back next session, it'll be back next week, it'll be back and so on. As long as that goal remains unfound it'll continue to give the pc pain. And that's something you might use sometime or another. It's a very, very useful point. You find an old list of goals and somebody says, "Well, I cleaned up Joe's goals.
I just got them all clean and Joe's just clean as the driven snow with his goals, see. All tiger drilled and so on, we precheck a couple of them, been listed all clean and so forth."

You say, "Well, that's fine, then I don't have to bother with any of those." Boy, have you made a mistake. Go back and read your Routine 3-21. It says you haul out the old goals, doesn't it? Why do you haul the old goals out? I'll let you in on why that step is in there. You haul them out and you just go down them as a list. Well, if they've all been cleaned up – see, you haven't found the pc's goal yet – and they've all been cleaned up and one of them's got pain on it – it isn't that the former auditor didn't get the pain off – he did. But the pain's come back. And boy, I would walk around that goal with the greatest of care. I'd really cuff that goal up. And I'd see, if after I got it all cleaned up, the pain came back – or if I could get it cleaned up. And I'd be very disappointed if I could get all the pain off of it and no pain came back, because obviously from then on it's no good.

But let's say those goals were all cleaned up last month and you've now got the pc to audit this month. You go down this list and so on, and there's "to catch catfish," and it's just like all these other goals, and you read "to catch catfish," and the pc goes ...

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Well, I've got a pain." Doesn't show on the meter. See, he – it hurts. And you just keep working it then. Work Suppress and other things, just kind of precheck it, you know. Next thing you know, its showing on the meter. And two things can happen: It is either the goal or will fade out – forever. But you mustn't omit the fact that there's a chance that it is the goal. That's why you always go over all those old goals again.

Now, on doing the second goal, there's a possibility that you had it on his first goals list, but it wasn't time for it to come up and take its bow. So it's always a good idea to go over goals that went out hard when you're looking for the second goal, as one of your first areas of action. And that's why 3-21 is written the way it is. You do everything on it that you did the first time when you're finding the second goal, including assembling all the old goals.

Actually, finding a second goal is ordinarily a very simple ... It is just exactly Routine 3-21. It is exactly what you do. There's no variation off Routine 3-21 on the second goal. There might be on the first goal because you have to find items and unburden and work like mad and you have to do 3GA Criss Cross where Step 4 is, you see. Second goal – why, you just write yourself a list of goals and start tiger drilling that list and that goal will be on it someplace. And you go on down the line and you might not have to find one or – more than one, two, three items and oppose them, before it's just Prehav level, Prehav level. Where's the goal? Where's the items? Where's the mass? Where's the meter reads? Dust it off with a Prepcheck and there she goes – she's gone. Second goal, by our experience, goes much, much faster. Oh, I don't know, by about a tenth, or a twentieth as fast as the first goal. And there's just that much reduction ratio apparently on the third goal. Fourth goal may start to go by inspection. What's your goal? And he says, "To catch waterbucks."

You say, "All right, let's check that out on the meter. Let's check it out on the meter. We're going to check it out on the meter now. All right, here you go: 'To catch waterbucks. To catch waterbucks.' Well, let's write a goals list." You're already doing the fifth goal and you
don't even know you're doing the fifth goal – the fourth one blew, see? [laughs] It had – it had three fires in it and they all went before you put him on the meter. Horrible, huh?

All right, here's another question. "How do you know which buttons of 19 buttons to use, when testing for pain or sen?" You don't use any buttons for testing for pain or sen. You don't use any buttons for testing for pain or sen. You don't test for pain or sen on buttons. Where did this come from? Who said this? What happened?

*Female voice: It's in a bulletin. It's in the bulletin on pain and sen.*

Must be a misprint. Must be a misprint. I don't mean to shame you. But I will tell you exactly how you test for it. You test for pain and sen only by saying the terminal or the oppterm, the item, to the pc. Now, there's numerous ways you can say it. You could say – you think it's an oppterm – so you say, "Would you consider – or would you – would you commit overts against a (blank)?" That's another way of saying it. If it's a terminal, well, "Would a (blank) commit overts?" That's just other ways of saying it. What do you want to do there is you want to just say it. You say all right, you say, "Hangman. Hangman. Hangman. Hangman. Hangman. Hangman." See if pain turns on. End of session. [laughter]

It doesn't matter how you say it. It doesn't matter how you say it. You understand? It doesn't matter how you say the item. But the only way you test the item – the only way you test the item is by saying the item. There are no buttons. The one most likely to turn pain on on an item is the one most fixated on the item. And the one most likely to turn on sensation on an item is the one most fixated by the item. You'll find in every Problems Intensive one or two buttons will run hotter than the rest.

*Female voice: The bulletin says you use – you could also use the seventeen buttons ...* Not to test for whether it's a – not to test for pain or sen.

That's just ways of asking it. See, what she doesn't get is the first part of it is it's just the method of asking the item.

*Female voice: What she's wondering about is ... [inaudible, seems to show something in the bulletin to LRH]*

Oh, dear! Oh, on page 3 of this – what this mystery is all about – is she's thinking that you ask many Prehav levels for this. No, you ask the Prehav level – let's say you've listed "Who or what would determine?" Let's say "determine" was the Prehav level. And you said, "Who or what would be – determine?" And you finally got an item, and now you want – you – you just use that "determine" in the test line. That test line – it's just "determine" would be the only one you use. But that's just a way of asking for it. You understand? You sure you do?

*Female voice: Well, I – I do understand that, but it says down here – uh – you're using your buttons – the Tiger Drill buttons. ...*  

*Female voice: She's asking you – the Tiger Drill buttons, you know, like would you say "Consider protesting." That's an overt, like a "Fail to reveal."

Listen, Listen. Don't leave this course thinking this. But the pain or the sen has nothing to do with the button. You understand? The button has nothing to do with it. It is the *item*
which turns on the pain or sen and you can ask the item in various ways to get the pc's attention on the item. So we don't care what buttons or levels are used with the item, it's just a mechanism of getting the pc's attention on the item. And when-but basically it's just "Waterbuck. Waterbuck. Waterbuck." And he says blaahhh! – sen, see? And you say, "Tiger. Tiger. Tiger." Ow! – pain. That's a terminal. Tiger – terminal: waterbuck. He's reversed. Now, you know, a reversed pc – tiger's always an oppterm. Every Scientologist knows that. All right, that's all there is to that. That's all I can tell you about it. But it doesn't matter, the other – it would just be a point.

[big part missing]

One thing I want you to know about all that is some people make it faster than others. And the best way—the best way to get cleared is actually to be a good auditor. You'll find that there's a direct relationship to this in most cases. Best way to get cleared is to be a good auditor. Of course, the way to be a good auditor is to deliver a good session.

And although the averages on this sometimes don't look like this to you, there'll be a lot of people asking you this question as to how to do it all, and so forth. And although they don't sometimes look like the averages are right—you're auditing well and you're getting lousy sessions—remember that you've given some lousy sessions when you were getting good auditing, too. The average balances out to a marked degree. And the very best way to get Clear is to give good auditing. Actually and truthfully so. Those people who do not give good auditing actually, oddly enough, are those who are making the least progress. Which I think is quite remarkable. It's sort of poetic. They sort of get averaged out along the line.

But more important than that arithmetical figure is just this—you can get Clear, yes, you can get up to the first-goal Clear. But how are you going to get to the second-goal Clear? All right, that's fine. That's fine. Now supposing you get to second-goal Clear, and you go along ten lives and so forth. Now let's ask the burning question: How are you going to get Clear? Well, your very best chance of getting Clear ten lives from now is having given good sessions now and taught good auditing now and kept it going. Because it'll still be here and it'll still be clearing people in ten lives.

I've looked at this any way I could look at it. And I've come to the conclusion that there is no substitute for good auditing and good dissemination. And also I see very clearly that there is just this as a factor. There is no arithmetical equivalent. There are people around who have been clearing people, who've been auditing like mad and who haven't been receiving good auditing, and the average isn't up. See, the average is not good for that particular person. Actually, to a marked degree it isn't for me. I've gotten some lousy sessions and I've given lots of good ones. You understand?

All right. But as time goes on that could reverse, too, couldn't it? Because actually, as far as my getting OT with exclamation points is concerned—it actually totally depends on me continuing to give good sessions. Do you see from that point of view? See? Now, whether or not I can hold out long enough to give enough good sessions to eventually have enough auditors so that I can have some auditing, too, this is one of the things which I have to worry about. But nevertheless it's true. As long as I go on auditing and giving good sessions I will someday make OT.
That's the way - that's the way the cookie crumbles, that's the way the wheel turns. And if you're worried sometime, desperately worried about getting Clear or clearer or something of that sort - you're really desperately worried, then audit like hell. See, that's my best advice to you. Because it's advice that I myself take.

All right, so you've audited many times longer and far better than the auditing you have received in your opinion. All right. Well, that's just how long you have to audit to get some. You see, who said it was an easy hill to climb? It is not an easy hill to climb. I think with horror of some of the kids in LA, 1950, used to tell me that the ideal clearing was to be able to insert a needle into somebody's gluteus maximus and give one single shot and that would make the person Clear. And they were actually hoping that some chemical research of some kind or another would wind up... Well, of course, at our stage of development we know that'd be totally silly. But they thought this would be ideal clearing. Well, actually, it wouldn't be ideal clearing because it wouldn't have done anything for anybody. It would have exteriorized them, wouldn't have returned anything to them at all.

Now causation of clearing breeds clearing. And that's all I can say about it. It does. Definitely. Now, to some degree, I have been laggardly in giving you techniques and so forth, in somebody's opinion - but in actual fact you got them about two or three thousand years before they were due. So, give me the credit of having developed them before any normal course of research procedure would have developed them.

Now, it's never an easy job to clear somebody, don't ever get the idea that it is. Don't ever try to persuade somebody that it is. This guy walks up and "Clear" - the worst thing in the world that you can say to this person is "Oh, well, yes, yes. Just pay your money over on the right, there, and come on through here, and we'll clear you."

Honest, you would find that the person would work much better in the line of clearing - would work extremely better in the line of clearing - if you looked at him with an entirely different approach. And said, "Are you sure you want to tackle it? It's a hard road. Once in a while somebody is just terribly lucky and finds it fairly easy, but ordinarily it's a very, very rough road. It has its ups and downs and it has its heartbreaks and it has this and that. The end product, well, if you stay with it, it can be delivered. It's well worth having at the other end of the line. Well worth having. But we don't want you coming into this co-audit or we don't want you coming into this HGC thinking that this is an easy thing to do. That all you have to do is roll up your sleeve and we punch you with a little needle and you are promptly Clear. Because that isn't the way it goes. Now, as long as you've lived and as much as you've done, how could it be easy?"

Person says, "Well, there's something to what you say." That it can be done at all is absolutely miraculous. Because it's never been done before on this planet. Never. So their approach to clearing, of course, is in the degree they seek clearing with the ease to the degree that they themselves cannot confront furnishing any effort. See, if the person can furnish no effort, can have no causative action of any kind whatsoever, you'll also find the person has never done anything, ever. And then you will find in addition to that, that this individual has also the longest road to go. The individual who's seeking the shortest route has the longest road to go. And the first way and easiest way you could break somebody's heart, now that we
— you know that people don't clear easily — and I think most of you've got a high reality on it that they can go Clear. You see yourselves approaching this on a gradient. It's a reality that it exists.

But you make it harder for somebody telling him how easy it is. Because he has the heartbreak — I can tell you this out of experience, of telling them all ways — all the different ways you can tell him. But he'd have the heartbreak of learning out that it was a tough road, having counted on it being an easy road.

Now, I think you would get a far better response from people if when they said, "Well, that's fine, now here's all this money and I've got five hundred and sixty-two pounds and I want you to audit me and I want you to get this wonderful thing called clearing, and so forth..." And so you say, "Oh, nothing to that. Sit down in the chair, and so forth. And here's the receipt and everything's fine." Instead of you going something like — just let the five hundred and twenty pounds sit right on the front of the desk. Just don't touch it, see. Have him sit down and say, "This — I want you to understand this. This is not an easy road. This is a tough road. It is not a short road. Its end product exceeds anything that has ever been exceeded — but it is not an easy road to travel. And it's going to have ups and downs and it's going to have heartbreaks."

And if that person puts that five hundred and twenty pounds back in his pocket and walks out the door, thank your stars he did. Because it would have cost you a thousand pounds in time to have gotten an adequate result. You see the difference here?

Now, there's a difference between certain clearing and easy clearing. Do you know the world wants from us — to know that we are doing something about things? You know, that's really what the world wants from us, that we are actually doing things about things. We're doing something about the world, we're doing something about man. We do know where we're going, we are getting someplace, we are making progress and so forth. We actually are living up to that degree of what people expect of us. Don't add to our burdens the fact that with a snap of the fingers, they're going to all be Clear. Because it isn't true and it never will be true. If it's only just the somatics a person is experiencing during the period of clearing, it'd drive most people off. They say they know they've got to go on through it, but do they have to?

Now, people expect of us to go on forward and do something about it. Yes, we're going on forward, we're doing something about it. We're doing something about it in a remarkably short period of time. This is very remarkable. That something can be done about it, proportional to the skill of administration of the technology, is absolutely certain. Things can be done. The only thing that's letting us down at all today is weak or imperfect application of technology, providing the auditor is willing to realize that a few lines dead-end and a few terminals don't represent and that he can get skunked and lay an egg and go on in and pitch again. He knows he can carve this way out. Sometimes goals are hard to find, sometimes the goals are easy to find. One fellow, the first goal he found on somebody took him fifty hours. Next goal took him three hours. Was that because he was more skilled? No, No, it just happened to be in a difference between the pcs. Next goal's going to take him seventy-five hours, maybe.
But the point I am making here is the goal can be attained. And if you tell people with that certainty we have attained it, we can attain it and it is attainable – and don't interpret that as something that is easy to do, because it is not. If it were easy to do, it would have been done many, many times before in man's history. And it's never been done in man's history. So, of course, a fellow has to be smart to do it, and of course it is a rough thing to do.

Now, there's where you sit on dissemination, and you sit along those lines – you'll be far, far better off than saying, "Well, all you have to do is sit down in the chair and I'm going to make a few magic passes." Seventy-five hours later, well, you're still making those few magic passes. You're heart's broken and now so is the pc's. So you told him it was a hard road and he gave you his goal in the second hour. And he listed out in twelve. So you made a liar out of yourself. Well, anytime you want to make a liar out of yourself that way, do so. It's the other way that you can't retract.

Well, I wish you all, those of you leaving, lots of luck. I'll probably see you before you go. And that's all we have from here tonight.

Thank you very, very much.
Thank you.

Thank you. Nov. 27, AD 12. I read my notes before the lecture! I have notes tonight. That's nice! Hasn't anything to do with the lecture, but I have notes. [laughs]

All right, this is lecture one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course,

and I have an announcement here, very interesting. Maybe you ought to go get audited at the HGC DC. Maybe you ought to go get audited there. I mean maybe you're just wasting your time here. Maybe you are. This is a letter from Voight. The fellow whose goal was found at the congress. And he'd been listed on the 40 lines, the 114 lines, and it had gone clear, and everybody ... Well, let me put it this way; go get audited at the HGC in Washington, DC, as long as I'm consulting on the cases there, see – have to add that, because it wouldn't be a true statement otherwise.

Anyway, he wrote me, and it looked like it was all clean lines as far as I was concerned. He was free needle everyplace. And instead of overrunning it, and instead of checking it out for four or five months, and instead of trying to find out if you couldn't key him in again on the goal, I said, "Well, go on and find his next goal, and get going."

So he says, "Dear Ron, thank you for the wonderful news that I can proceed with my second goal. I had cognited on my second goal on 24 October and didn't know what to do with it. It was checked out today at the HGC. We all agree, I have my second goal. I start listing in the morning. I'll take you up on that first OT in industry." There you are. Pretty good, huh?

Audience: Yeah.

Now, we get down to business. Ohhh! [laughter] Poor R2-12! This is a lecture on Routine 2-12. Now, for you cats that have been clawing around with 3GA Criss Cross, the first and fundamental error of R2-12 showed up. Now, I can take credit for making the first mistake, so you needn't feel so bad about it, see. I could admit that I made a mistake. I myself gave you a little length and breadth on List One. I shouldn't have done that. I should have put a – not a snaffle bit – but I should have put a curb bit in your teeth. Because what do you do? You right away find ways and means to add motivatorish items to the list and of course they are an additional damage, so of course that will wind you up with no item.

So I've just done List One, Issue Two. And I can tell you the ramifications of the first list. It must contain only nouns. It must not contain any verbs, adjectives or adverbs – only nouns. And you can take the one which you've got and strike out everything on it that isn't a
noun and strike out its adjectives and adverbs and strike out all of the lines you're supposed to fill in. Just strike those out at the back and you have List One, Issue Two of Routine 2-12.

It had escaped my notice when I expanded that, that a lot of 3GA Criss Cross practice would of course invite a lot of things to be entered in on the list by the pc, even though it says in R2-12 itself that it is not the pc's list, that it is the auditor's list. So a lot of items were entered in from the pc and of course a lot of people wound up skunked; or endless dirty needles or something of the sort, and didn't wind up nice and clean and clear the way it is.

Now, there's your List One, Issue Two. It must only contain Scientology nouns. Scientology, Dianetic organization nouns and no adjectives, verbs, adverbs on it. The big reason for that – I'll tell you more about it in a minute.

Now, the next mix-up on it brings us right straight to where we should be. When you're used to doing 3GA Criss Cross you get the illusion that you know something about R2-12. And you might as well just part company with that, because the actions are similar, in fact they're the same as far as Listing and Nulling is concerned. But R2-12 is a rote procedure, and is not susceptible to variation or auditor guesses.

This procedure was put together for HPA and HCA. Now, that's a big difference. And it's been my experience that if you could drill a HPA or an HCA in on a procedure, that he would do it. That's been my experience. Now, you can drill them and correct them and correct them and correct them, and all you have to pay attention to is the fact that: Is there a factual channel of action? Is there a factual series of actions to be performed?

Now, R2-12 is this kind of an activity. And listen, it's a beautiful, concrete causeway through the deepest muck that anybody ever tried to never come out of. And just about a sixteenth of an inch off the edge of that causeway brings you to nowhere. It is a rote procedure. The rationale back of 2-12 is quite different than that back of 3GA Criss Cross.

3GA Criss Cross is an activity engaged upon by the auditor to unburden the case and locate goals. That's 3GA Criss Cross, which is step 4A of Routine 3 -21.

And Routine 2-12 is to put the case in condition so that it can show progress toward clearing, specifically toward clearing, and does actually progress the case toward clearing, and is a clearing procedure, oddly enough.

But without 2-12 you will find a great many cases will make very slow progress. And that is what we are fighting today in clearing. We're fighting slow progress.

This slow progress combined, on the one hand, by auditors not getting in and pitching – to be critical – and on the other hand, by the mechanics which 2-12 is arranged to perform. Sooner or later you would get the item which was holding up the case with 3-21. Sooner or later you would get this item – sooner or later, sooner or later. And you're mostly getting it later.

And it's much better to get a clean fire off the launching pad and get the item straight away, because it's a very peculiar set of items that you are looking for. It's a very peculiar thing. And they are not items which necessarily lead to goals. They are items which unpin the pc's bank from present time so that he can be audited.
And the action of Routine 2-12 is not the key-out of the pc's bank, as in Prepchecking, but the actual eradication of those items which have been keyed in by present time, which then and thereafter keep the pc in the grip of a present time problem. We'll go into that further.

But this is a different thing you are doing. And although it looks the same, and the actions are the same, it isn't the same. Routine 2-12 is not Routine 3-21, step 4A, 3GA Criss Cross. It is not. They are not the same actions. You can even use similar lines.

Now, where they merge is in line of 2-12, 1B, C, D, E, F, see. Those additional lines merge and go over to 3GA Criss Cross. But you can't get to those lines and unpin the case from present time unless you do a very thorough over and over and over of List One and List 1A.

Now, this is all very esoteric to say they are this different, but what makes them this different? And I'd have to go into the mechanics – which I will do later this evening – of 2-12 to show you why they are this different, and the exact thing you're trying to do. Let it suffice, at this moment, that they are different, and that your approach is a terribly rote approach.

Now, we have a Security Check on Maisy Q., over in HCO, and she is found to rock slam madly on the subject of HCO Secretaries. So now she is sent to the HGC or staff clearing, or something like that, and in staff clearing we would get goof one.

Now, you almost universally made it today. Goof – goof one is they don't do 2-12. They take "HCO Secretary," see that it rock slams, and oppose it. And then they think they're doing 2-12. 2-12 is upsetting just to this degree: an almost-done 2-12 will produce some results, and that's what'll fool you. If it's almost done it'll produce – it'll still produce some results. See, that's why it's a perfectly safe technique to release, to – as long as they're not fooling around with goals on it – to release broadly to HPAs and HCAs and let it be taught in Academies, you see.

Because you can just list something, and you can get some results, you see. That however, that aspect of it tends to whip you. Because you say, "Well, that's a nice process. That's a nice process. It's nice. Case looked brighter at the end of session."

Well, look, the case wasn't sitting in it – a foot off the chair at the end of session. Well, that's what we expect out of the process.

No. The auditor grabs the item that he has heard the pc rock slams on, sees that it rock slams and then oppose it. Well, he must be doing 3GA Criss Cross or something. He's not doing 2-12.

No. The auditor has to start from scratch. We don't care what who found or anything of the sort. He just starts from scratch. And the first thing you want to learn about 2-12: you always start from scratch.

Now, this person sails in from lower Chicago, and says that he's had 2-12 run on him, and they found the items "Ron," and "pie," and a couple of other things, and it's all set, and he feels wonderful now, ha-ha, and everything's fine.
As a matter of fact he looks good and his TA is down and that sort of thing. And you are going to find goals on this pc and you're going to do this and that. All right, go ahead. Go ahead, go ahead – run 3-21 on it. We don't care anything about that. But, if you're going to do 2-12 on him you don't say he had List One run on him in lower Chicago and therefore we're going to start with List 1A. You just never do 2-12 that way. You take List One on this pc.

Now, there's several reasons for this. We don't care if he ran the whole gamut and found a pair of items on each one of the subsidiary lists. Well, he probably would just be ready to have List 1 run on him again. So you just never pick up anybody else's auditing on it, that's all. Just don't ever do that, and you'll all be always riding high. You'll be feeling wonderful about it.

Now, there's another difference. A 3GA Criss Cross item – you understand, just because he slammed against the HCO Secretary, means that you do List One assessment, see. Doesn't matter, see. You always do that. Why? Because the Security Check was probably done on an abbreviated set of items, and the rock slam would probably settle down somewhere else on the list, if you did a full list.

See, your rock slam probably will settle more securely on something else. There's that possibility, don't you see. And maybe she just rock slammed on the person being – that was security checking her, and doesn't have a rock slam on HCO Area Secretary. See, there's all kinds of wild little possibilities that could enter into it that would upset your 2-12 progress.

So what do you do? You just start from scratch. And you do exactly what it says. Now frankly, there is nothing more canned or rote than 2-12. It's just absolutely canned. If you find a rock slam on the first list – by the way, you call it the first list no matter what List One you use. But List One is the Scientology list. The others are List 1A, List 1B, and so on.

So you start in on the first list and you find a rock slam, and it slams like mad. All right, you oppose it, and you get rock slamming items and so forth. Well, that's just a bonus. You didn't have to do four, five and six. That's just a bonus; just three steps you didn't have to do.

But the main discovery here is that any time that you can get a whisper on a list, you can represent it and turn a rock slam on with it. Very interesting. Because then you don't have to be a supergenius at getting your first list.

Let's say you had some long, drawn-out list of, "Who's upsetting you these days?" you see, and so on. And you didn't get a key person on it at all. There wasn't a key person on it anywhere. No rock slams. There was hardly even a dirty needle.

Now, I'm trying to cure you of your skunks, see. This takes your skunks out. You won't get skunked as often with 2-12 as you do with 3GA Criss Cross.

All right, you go down this list, this first list, and you assess it – you've gotten it from the pc, now you're assessing it. And if you can find on it, after tiger drilling the last three or four items, a sporadic ghost of a speeded rise which is almost undetectable at the highest sensitivity of a Mark V, you can represent it and you'll find a rock slamming item. It's marvelous.
Now, that's the discovery that I suddenly broke through with, and therefore could put it together. The number of times which you will miss on this thing are far less.

Now, the rationale of 2-12 is based on the interesting proposition that so long as the GPM is keyed in, in present time, the pc is left with a full present time problem and will show no case gain. We're no longer interested in the rock slammers. We're just not interested. So Joe, or Pete or Bill or... So they're rock slammers. That means somebody won't have to do four, five and six with them. That's all that means.

Behaviorists will be very interested in rock slammers. But it becomes an ethnic study. It's very peculiar. If a person rock slams, why, they will do all sorts of very interesting things in their vicinity and all that sort of thing. But the fact of the case is, is you could straighten them out too fast to worry about it.

Now – actually, basically, it means their goal lies in some other direction, a lot of other things. But you don't have to find their goal to set them up straight.

So we're not interested in this aspect of it. We're even more interested in the tiniest dirty needles. See, we're – that's – we're very interested in that.

Now, this is all based on an observation I made in 1949. We're really – we're really inheriting now the benefit of tremendous quantities of research. In 1949 I made this interesting observation. There was always a little flag showing up. The key engram to be run on the case was always waving a little taximeter flag. There was a still picture of an empty chair. And the pc would often run across it. And one fine day we get him to run this as an engram. We'd just start into the beginning of this thing.

Oh, my God, what we'd find lying underneath that still chair in that little picture – it was just fascinating. You know? God! Tonsillectomies and murder and rape and arson, and all kinds of wild things. But always the reactive bank leaves out a little tag.

You've got this little tab there. It's like a little index card. The file may be a thousand feet thick down underneath it, and here's this little, tiny quarter-of-an-inch by quarter-of-an-inch blue tab, see. And you say, "What's this?"

Now look, there are thousands of these little blue tabs lying around in the bank, but if you went around pulling each one of these, pulling each one, the most of them would throw away, see. Just, you know, locks, little things, mannerisms, dislikes, upsets, so forth – most of them just throw away. And all of a sudden you'd get ahold of one, and you'd look like a very young robin trying to get ahold of his first worm, you know. And it just isn't going to come out of the ground, that's all. That's tied to something.

Now, that worked with engrams, but I didn't see any reason why it wouldn't work with a GPM. Because this horrendous calculation occurred: A case change won't occur in the presence of an unhandled present time problem.

And if you don't believe that, go ahead and get somebody who's having a lot of trouble with his wife, or her husband or something; get this person. And every time you see this person clang! on a present time problem, on that rudiment, why, just ignore it. Just say, "Well, we'll take that up later. That's – after all, we're processing the things that will handle your
problems, and we're not interested in hearing about that. Now let's get down to business here."
And then get your graph done at the end of that intensive. And if you haven't also ARC broken the pc, you will have gotten no graph change of any kind. This is an experiment that you could make with the greatest of ease.

Well, what would be the biggest present time problem a person could possibly have? The GPM is composed of mass-counter-mass. Actually it's in a bundle of four, but you can regard it as mass-counter-mass, a pair. So you have A versus B, and B versus A. And they're items, identities, circuits, whatever you want to call them. And here's one of them opposing the other one. And that is the GPM. And man, that's in there with concrete. To get Clear this fellow's got to pass all the way through the GPM.

So, why not have at it? Certainly it looks like a present time problem. Also we have the idea people who have overts against Scientology or against the auditor and so forth won't go Clear. Why is this?

Well, actually, it sets up a kind of a present time problem. There's the pc versus the auditor or something in the pc versus the auditor, and it sets up the idea of the personality versus the personality, the mass versus the mass and so forth. It looks like a present time problem.

Because this is so neatly and nicely balanced, the person can't slide out of it. Nothing unbalances it unless you actually locate it and identify it. The only way you get rid of the GPM is to get it very well identified in its various parts. Now, as soon as you get it identified in its various parts – particularly the goal and so forth – why, it tends to lose its bite.

But let's look at this, now. We know quite a bit about the GPM and its various formations and fundamentals and so forth, but let's look at something here that may not have met the eye. Supposing one piece of the GPM is walking around in present time. Supposing one of these masses is walking around in present time, and the other one is hidden in the bank. One of them is visible. He knows that's part of the GPM. Maybe it's his auditor. He knows that's part of the GPM. So he says, "That's why I'm not getting Clear. There! There! Over there! There! Over there! Over there! Over there!" No pc alive ever turns around and looks over his shoulder to find out what's opposing over there.

And now hear me: that item actually will remain so undisclosed that the person could go all the way Clear and still have it – if you could imagine going Clear while having a PT problem of that magnitude.

But by some fluke he might actually key out the rest of the GPM and still have this thing sitting in present time. And you'd get the crème de la crème of the bypassed item. This would be a bypassed item with exclamation points.

Of course the probabilities of this person keying out anything or going Clear of course are remote, amounting practically to zero. But in theory, allow it, you see.

He isn't actually going to go anywhere. He's got a present time problem. And he knows what's wrong with him. See, it's all these buildings or something, you know. There it is, all these buildings, and he knows it's the buildings, and he knows it's the buildings. But his
blindness never tells him what he is or what is opposing the buildings. And of course he isn't opposing the buildings, some item is opposing the buildings and it's on automatic. He never sees the item, he just goes on blaming the buildings.

You don't know somebody for two or three years and then have a rock slam on them. Let me assure you of that! The person could have hit you over the head every morning for breakfast, and you still wouldn't have a rock slam on them. See, that takes a while to build up.

So obviously the pc has confused something in present time with the opposition mass in the bank and hasn't even seen the terminal in the bank which faces the opposition mass. Have you got the idea?

He's made a mistake. Let's put it that way. He's just made a mistake. He's mistaken something in the environment for something in the bank and then he never looks over his shoulder to find out what he is that is opposing something in the bank, and of course that is the perfect present time problem.

And with that present time problem in existence he will not go Clear and he will not show case gains. If he does, they will be very slow gains and you have your finger on the slow gain – actually, also the slow student case. That is it.

I knew it was the bypassed item. I found the mechanism of the bypassed item, knew that people weren't listing themselves to Clear every time they bypassed an item. They would put some item over here on "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" They'd put that item down there, and then the opposition of that item would go begging, see, and it'd never be located, and they'd never confront it. And it's very hard to get a pc to confront a slamming item, by the way. And would never confront it. And they can be right in the middle of the slamming item. They can join up with the slamming item. The guy hates the United States Army, so he goes and joins it. But he never perceives it. You see, being in it and perceiving it are two entirely different things.

So you see, he's in this oppterm, and he never puts it on the list. He's got half of it. He's got "Who or what would oppose..." or, "Who or what wants to catch catfish?" He's got half of that. He hasn't got the other half, so it never blows.

You get a recurring item. You see this in verbal listing. The guy'll go a few hundred lines and then he'll say, "game warden." And then he goes a few hundred more items, he'll say, "game warden" again. And a few hundred more items and he'll say, "game warden," and "game warden," and "game warden," and "game warden." It's not quite the same thing as the rabbit; it's the recurrent item.

Well, why the recurrent item? Well, that's because there is something missing. The other half of the package is gone and he hasn't confronted it, and he hangs right there in mid-air. He keeps saying "game warden," "game warden," "game warden." And it just never occurs to him to turn around and look and see "fisherman." He just never sees "fisherman." "Fisherman" never occurs to him. Doesn't matter how often you ask him the question, "Well, who or what would oppose catching catfish?" He just never thinks of "fisherman." You see, he is a fisherman.
I don't know how many of you lately have inspected your own forehead without a mirror. But it's something like doing that trick. Things that a person is stuck in he doesn't look at. In fact that's how the bank stops to accumulate, and is the basic cumulative factor of a bank, is the person is too close to it to as-is it. He never looks at it. Somebody's walking around being a body, and they never as-is that body, don't you see. They can as-is other bodies, but they never as-is their own body.

So the mass the person is in, whether it's a term or oppterm... You see, a pc can be in his own oppterm. It doesn't matter much whether it's a terminal or oppterm, or any other kind of a mass, if he's in it he doesn't perceive it so he never announces it and never lists it.

And we call that a bypassed item. It's bypassed in the process, and so of course leaves a big chunk of the GPM sitting there non-as-ised. And actually, he now has a present time problem. It's the recurring item. He can't find the other half to the item, so he can't make a package out of it. This gets to be a present time problem, if it isn't at once, and that present time problem keeps him from going Clear.

All right, well, that's just in the process of just ordinary listing. Supposing the pc weren't even pinned to present time. He'd still have some of this trouble, and you'll run into some of this trouble in any listing that you do on a pc.

Now, let's look at this thing more fundamentally. Let's say that a rock slammer is somebody who slams on any item in present time that is part of the GPM. In other words, just instead of calling it a dirty word – just say he slams on a present time item.

Well, at first we can't tell what the present time item is and neither can he. That's it. You say to somebody, "What don't you really..." This person is nervous, see, person walking down the street, and nervous. And we say, "What's going on? What's going on here? And what are you nervous about?" And God, they'll say it's the cops. They'll say it's the store windows. They'll say it's shopkeepers. They say it's a wide-open space. They'd say this and they'd say that. And they never really will be able to tell you exactly what's making them nervous.

And the funny part of it is, one fine day, one fine day, you make a list of something and a part of that list doesn't immediately go out with the Tiger Drill, and so forth. The Tiger Drill is what saves our bacon. Because it tells us whether or not the worm is still half in the ground. This little tab is stuck.

If the Tiger Drill won't immediately knock it out, then the thing is stuck in something. And the only thing for it to be stuck in is the GPM. So of course, then it is very safe. This would not be safe to do by Assessment by Elimination – show you how rote this procedure is.

If you did Assessment by Elimination and had something that stayed in, the pc might have had a little ARC break on it, or something like that, and you hadn't given it the test of: Does the other half of this worm stay in the ground? See? We haven't given it that test. Tiger Drill gives it that test. The thing doesn't blow up at once on Tiger Drill, it must be part of the GPM. That's how you tell if it's a tab.

And one fine day, why, we get a list off this pc, and the pc accidentally puts on the list – it's marvelous, but he does it consistently; he does this accident consistently – but he usually
comes along afterwards and says: "You must have put that on the list, I didn't." And there's all kinds of arguments ensue after you found the item.

Well, that's an attestation of the fact that he couldn't have faced it. And he's rattling off the thing, and then he accidently says "fireplugs," you see. And he goes on down the line and "fireplug" is on this list, and you go down this list, and "fireplug" is one of the last four, and you tiger drill the other three, and he says, "Fireplugs, fireplug? Hey, what do you know! It's fireplugs." And right away he's no longer afraid to walk up and down the street. He knows what he's afraid of. It's fireplugs.

Well, that's so good, but he doesn't know why he's afraid of fireplugs. See, so far, so good with Routine 2-12. Now, you see, you just asked him for everything in his environment, and he gave you this long list and accidentally put in fireplugs. All right, well, when you assess it down the line, you've found fireplugs – it slammed. And so you opposed it, and now you find out what opposes fireplugs, you see. And what opposes fireplugs is "People who want to park." And you've got a package. And now the odd thing about it is he doesn't even avoid fireplugs. He says, "To hell with them," see. You've discharged the mass.

Now, here again is where Routine 2-12 varies from 3GA Criss Cross, is Routine 2-12 blows up. It just goes pfff! And you're accustomed to 3GA Criss Cross, to items staying in there in concrete and brass. That's because you're reaching for deeper items. That's because the pc is more concerned about his bank. He's not concerned about present time. And you're picking up deep items in the bank, and you're picking them up for goals and all that sort of thing, and so actually you get items that will deliver goals, but not present time.

When these packages are picked up, part of which is present time, it's the most squizzely-squib firecracker you ever ignited. You go down this list, and let's say it's List One. Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, down the list, and you find this ghost – ghost of a needle disturbance. When you read this item "fireplugs," well, the needle doesn't act the same as it does when you read other items. It's going slightly slower. And you just pick up the trace. It can be that faint. It isn't always, see.

You say, "Fine." So you list this item out. And you'll pick up a slamming item. You see, if it was accurately assessed it must have been stuck into the GPM or it would have blown out on the Tiger Drill. And if it stayed in even that slightly you can represent it. And now, in representing it, if your list is complete, you should have picked up slams on it. If you didn't pick up a slam on it, there was a goof in the assessment.

Now, the two goofs of an assessment are, of course (1) wrong question – the list is proceeding from the wrong question – or (2) the list isn't complete.

Now, there it is, and in 3D Criss Cross we'd expect that thing to hang around, but not in 2-12. We don't expect it to hang around at all. When we find it, we tiger drill it and it goes BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BAM, BA-BA-BA-BA bam, bam, bam, hamm-bam. And we say, "All right, now, consider committing o verts about" – bam! "Consider committing o verts against" – bam!

And you say, "Well, consider not giving things to this item." And it goes BAM-BAM BAM BAM, BAM... Bam... Bam. And we say, "All right, now, let's really get in there and
sweat now and let's clean this up and let's clean this up good. On this item has anything been invalidated? On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item..." – Bam! "On this item is there anything you failed to reveal? On this item 'fireplugs, fireplugs,' " or whatever it is, see. You haven't even found the other side of it yet, see?

You clean it up some more – "Anything been suppressed?" – and it goes dirty needle. Where the hell's the slam? Well, you idiot, you got rid of it. What are you auditing the fellow for if you don't want his bank to discharge?

And you start finding these things that are cozily up into present time and they go like that. So you oppose this thing industriously, see. I know, it went to a little dirty needle, but you saw a slam on it, didn't you? It slammed when you found it. When you tiger drilled it, it went blam, blam. All right, that's enough. Don't knock yourself to pieces on it.

Now you get the opposition to it. That opposition list slams like crazy while you're listing it. Slam, slam! And you go down over the list again and you don't find any slams on the list. And you find one final item, and you're tiger drilling this one item, and it goes SLAM SLAM, Slam, slip.

Now, this is one thing that is not given in the bulletins on R2-12 in detail. You must package the item with the pc. Now, you can get into an embarrassing situation on R2-12, where the opposition list which you have just been nulling has four items left in it. And you can't – and they're all worn out and you can't get anything to do anything and so forth.

Actually, what you do is ask the pc, one after the other, if they would oppose the item which you've listed them from. Which makes the package. And the pc says, "Well, that doesn't, and that doesn't, and that does. And that doesn't."

And you say, "All right, well, that's good. Now, it's this, is it? 'A man who wants to park' and 'a fireplug.' That's right. Is that the package?"

"Yeah, that's the package."

Now, you look at the fireplug and you can't get a whisper out of it. And you look at the man who wants to park and you can't get a whisper out of it. You've lost it, man. You can't get a whisper out of anything. The whole list went. The last dirty needles on the opposition list are also gone now, if you wanted to care and give it a look – mysterious. But you'll see an evaporating rock slam.

Now, trying to do something with it is where you'll get into the most trouble. Because it's gone. You've blown it. It's something like trying to run last year's engram. You're just not going to make it.

And that's where a 3GA Criss Cross artist would get into his most trouble. Because he's used to seeing the item there, he's used to seeing it hang around for a while, at least till the end of session, and R2-12 items off at the first couple of lists, for the first list, you know. List One and List 1A, the final combinations of those things are quite unlikely to do this. They're much more likely to go bzz-zzzz-pffft! Hhh! Pc's cognited and feels happy about everything.
Now, here's your other thing, is your case gain is disproportionate. I mean it's almost inverse to that. Because the whole slam evaporated, the amount of your case gain is sometimes absolutely fantastic. This individual's been worried sick. And now it's just evaporated, see.

My God, he's been walking down streets, and he's – all of his life he's been walking down streets, and they've made him very, very nervous, these streets have. And now, rather rapidly, in the course of four, five, six, eight hours of auditing or something like that, you've found the fireplugs. That took care of streets. And then, quite by accident, you also got maybe a bonus package. Maybe there were two items on that list that slammed against each other which had nothing to do with the final item. Because that happens very often in handling these near present time lists. In other words, you've got another pair out – a bonus pair.

There was "people who got angry at traffic," and "people who stopped traffic." And you saw both of these slam when you went down against them. You care to go back and ask the pc – and this is the other point about packaging it. You saw these two other items and they slammed wildly, and then they seemed to evaporate and so forth, remember which ones slammed that way.

Actually your nulling ought to be done with a different colored pencil, and what you do is take the wild R/Ses that you'll find that are marked "R/S" in the same color as your nulling slashes, and ask the pc if these fit together in any way. And you'll very often find a bonus package you wouldn't have suspected. And the pc didn't quite suspect it either.

And it'll go slam, slam, slam! And all of a sudden, why, his anger at police evaporates. And there he is. You've really blown something, you see. You've blown something well within his own reality. You haven't gotten "a knight in shining armor," and "a damsel in distress," you see, or something like this that he hasn't met for centuries.

See, you've got something nice like a fireplug. And boy, he can recognize that fireplug. So his gradient scale of confront comes in here, and he gets rather a terrific case gain.

Therefore, if you do it right and go right down the groove, you can expect a very rapid case gain if it's done just exactly right. And you can expect the pc to say, "Hey! What do you know, you know. Hey, whoa! This Scientology's really something. What's that? Uhh!" It's fast. Because you get this evaporating slam.

But you'll sometimes make a misassessment and you'll get deeper than you intended to. That's more likely on a list that the pc gives you in great detail. Let's supposing you were doing List 1A, and he lists "dragons." And man, he's got no present time problem about dragons. He hasn't seen a dragon for ages and ages, you know. But just somehow or another he put an associative item on the list, see, you're spattering along. "In present time, is there anything you're upset about?" see, and he put "dragons."

Well now look, he didn't answer the auditing question. And to that degree you're going to get in trouble. In 3GA Criss Cross you never interfere with the pc's listing. You just never do. And you've been taught that very thoroughly, and now, we get to 2-12, and we do.

On the first list he wants to put on it: "Auditors who are trying to ruin me." And you say, "Thank you very much." Write it on a piece of scrap paper and throw it away after the
session. On that second one, List 1A, why, he's giving you something-or-other, something-or-other, something-or-other, and "dragons."

"In present time what have you been upset about?"

"Dragons."

Well, the smart auditor of course can just scratch his fingernail on the paper for a moment or two, you see, and say, "Good." [laughter] But don't put it on the list! Because that list has got to be accurate and it'll lay you an egg. It'll mess you up.

You're going down the list, "Yes! Dragons." And it's got a much bigger reaction than anything you've got in present time, and these present time list reactions and the List One reactions are very faint, ordinarily.

It's actually quite rare for you to get rock slams and fireworks and so forth off those first two lists, there – first list – your Scientology list, and your 1A list – very rare. You won't see that very often. You just get a little ghost of some kind or another. And that thing will really open up.

And so he's given you "dragons." And there are no dragons in present time, so you're not doing R2-21 for present time items. And you get way back on the track in Marchipides or something, and you find yourself sitting there with "dragons." "Who or what would oppose dragons?"

And you get "blast pistols," and you get "knights in shining armor," and "women's screams," and so forth. And now, you've got two items that stay in and they go slam, and they'll slam, and they'll slam. You can use them to find goals with, but they're not going to do the pc as much good, you see, as if you'd found present time items. See how you can be led astray?

You have to have the rationale of 2-12 down pretty good or you could go astray with it. It is simply an effort to locate one of the GPM items as it seems to be in present time to the pc. It's an effort to locate that item in present time, and find its opposition. And if you succeed in doing that, you've taken away the present time problem.

Now, I suppose it's getting home to you that if you get a backtrack item, you're not solving a present time problem and therefore don't speed the case. You're actually – you got better materials to find a goal with. You've got all kinds of – it has a lot – it has uses, you understand?

But as far as solving this problem you're trying to solve with Routine 2-12, you don't solve it. You're trying to get rid of the present time problem for the pc. And if you don't get rid of all of those present time problems, why, the case isn't going to make a gain.

Now, this is below the surface of the pc's recognition of what problem he's worried about. And we've taken the hidden standard and all those other things that we've worked with in the past and we've gone right down below the surface.

Pc would never under God's green earth put the problem, if it was his problem and it was attached to the GPM, he just would never put the problem down if you were running present time problems. He just never would put the problem itself down.
He wouldn't put down any part of its elements. "Trying to park in town." See, he just would never put down anything like that problem. It would be something on the order of "to destroy all cities," or "get away into the country," or "to have an airplane that would fly high in the sky forever," "how to acquire enough money never to have to go for my own groc- eries," see.

You could trace it afterwards that he had thousands of problems associated with this problem, the elements of which were the fireplug and the guy trying to park. He would never see it. He just never perceives it.

You can list these things into being and it's rather easily and gently done. But never just talk the thing into being, which is a quite interesting thing. Even if he said it he wouldn't believe it was a problem of his. So all of a sudden there it is, clank.

You see, this is a whole subject of charge. And you've got charge on these things. It's heavy charge. It's remarkable the amount of stand-offness, a rock slam actually contains in it. There's stand-offishness connected with it.

Well it's – I don't know, did you ever try to look at – ever try to look at some guy who was throwing a flashlight in your face? That's a good example. Dark night and this guy's got a flashlight in your face and you're trying to see the guy. And you would very annoyedly tell him to "Take that thing out of my eyes!" you know. And so forth. But you don't see him. And you keep trying not to look toward the light. But notice that you always try to see who has got the light.

That's idiocy. What are you looking at it for? Well, the pc actually can't look away from one of these slams and can't look at it. And he's in a tremendous confusion of perception. And that perception has to be cared for very, very smoothly. If you don't care for the percep- tion smoothly, why, your pc isn't ever able to confront the thing.

So you rapidly see what the pc is up against in the business of trying to live in present time. He's got two or three items around him which have flashlights, very bright ones, shining in his face all the time.

And he's always trying to see who's holding these lights, except he doesn't know if anybody is, and he's not even aware of the fact there are any lights in present time. But he's sort of nervous and he goes around, you know. And he walks into buildings, and so forth. There's always somebody got the light in his eyes. And he's not sure what.

Unless you get that out of present time, he can't put enough concentration on the bank to lift his – list his bank out. Because it's pinned in present time. He has the – he just hasn't got enough attention units available to blow the rest of it.

I've been studying this for a long time. I couldn't conceive that some of the people who just went Clear on listing – mysteriously and marvelously – that some of these people were just less aberrated than others, more able to do this than others, able to do that... No, there was no vast difference except they just happened accidentally not to have a GPM PTP. They didn't have one.
And how faint that can be is also going to escape your notice. How faint that trace is. How faint that little blue tab is. How unnoticeable that worm is, that tail of that worm. And you say, "Well, that couldn't possibly be aberrative."

Well, you'd have the wrong idea of it. Actually, that it tabs at all, that it stays there at all, means you've got a piece of the GPM on the other end of it, and you can get it with a represent. See, if it stays at all it's a piece of the GPM.

Now, it might be too deep a piece of the GPM for the pc to have any reality on it. See, there's that possibility. But that would only happen in actuality if you were very crude.

Supposing we took the natural land animals of planets, and just arbitrarily assessed these things – nothing to do with the pc, not even in restimulation. We assess these things, and we find one, boy, that sticks there with a beautiful dirty needle.

And boy, we list a represent list on that, and we list for pages, and we list for more pages, and it's still a dirty needle – it never slams. And we list for more pages, and we list for more and more and more pages, and it never has a slam. And it's always got a dirty needle, and we can't get the list complete, and there we go, there we go, there we go, and so on, and you finally say, "To hell with it."

Later on in processing he comes up with it. You're trying to list a piece of the GPM that is completely beyond his sight, he can't even slam on it. You understand? Too tough for him.

Well now, if the person can recognize that he has a present time problem in present time without recognizing it, then it is within the zone or realm of his cognition.

In other words, a piece of his GPM floating in present time, that he is aware of enough to be nervous about it and react on it, why, therefore he will cognite on it, don't you see. So therefore you get very rapid, fast cognition, and the pc says, "Oh, yes, of course!" you know, "Fireplugs," and "Why didn't I think of that before?"

But this other thing, "Komodo dragons," he reminds you of somebody that hasn't even got enough sense to be scared, see. There's no recognition of them at all.

Later on, his confront's up – you find the item "Komodo dragon," and it goes wham! See, but his confront is way up, and the GPM has been very much tamed down. You understand? That's time for that.

Well, that's what makes 2-12 remarkable, is that it's run broadly on a great many pcs. It can be run broadly on any God's quantity of pcs, because if the pc is capable of finding a slightest trace on your first lists as you're assessing them, they're within his zone or realm of cognition. And if you do an accurate assessment, why, then he comes up with tremendous numbers of cognitions, and so forth.

I'd like to have a lot of these old cases that never cognited, never cognited, and run them on 2-12. Blow their silly heads off.

The score that you put up today, just on that, two auditors out of twelve this morning attacked R2-12 – they were all under orders to do it – head-on, and it was evidently going very successfully and very nice. Ten didn't. They did something odd or offbeat. But the odd
and offbeat things which they did can be all summed up in a few errors. And Mary Sue and I went to ground about this. She was looking over folders and picking up this data today.

But the errors that were noted in doing R2-12 are very noteworthy: Is auditors grabbing an item which R/Ses without assessing List One or completing assessment of List One. In other words, so the item R/Sed and they just grabbed it, and they went on from there. That's an error.

It's also, by the way, a tremendous error to take any item the pc simply gives you, I don't care how it performs on a meter or anything else. It just – so he gives you an item. So what? You take your items from assessment and you'll never lay an egg. But you just take these gratuitously handed up items, or heavily sold items... You see, you've only got it to slam for a minute, and now he's trying to sell you "popcorn," you see. And you – "popcorn" sort of dirty reads, because he's selling it to you, see. And you ignore the one – you say, "Well, it isn't slamming anymore-the one item I found isn't slamming anymore, so therefore I'm going to take 'popcorn.'" Kkk! See, never, just never take one the pc hands you gratuitously all by itself

Two: auditors allowing the pc to complete and add pc items to List One. Now, we've cared for that already by giving you a more canned, circumscribed List One. That is with exclamation points itself.

Three: auditors assessing out a motivator on List One. And page two additions and doing a represent on it which produces no R/S. Well, of course in view of the fact that R/Ses are – consist of – we don't care about people listing motivators or otherwise; it just happens that if you do list a motivator you never get an R/S. You're probably listing from the pc's oppterm, see.

That's what basically we find wrong with somebody getting rid of motivators all the time. In actual fact, a person who's getting rid of motivators is being an oppterm to himself. He's out of valence. He's not even in his own terminal line, see.

I had an interesting example of that. Last night I accidentally listed one in reverse – there was not really any accident about it, I'd already determined – an item that had pain and sen on it. And I listed it in reverse, after I had gotten it straightened out so that it was 99 percent pain.

See, it should have been listed the reverse way. So I went out and relisted it as though it were an oppterm. And man, let me tell you, the terminal is always at cause. I never saw a stucker stuck needle in my life than trying to list that thing in reverse.

You want a confirmation of this, take some time and say: "Who or what would the oppterm do something to?" see. "Who or what would the oppterm oppose?" you know. Instead of "Who or what would oppose the oppterm." Just "Who or what would the oppterm oppose?" And you'll have a ball. You sit there and look at a totally stuck needle and a totally stuck tone arm, and that's it.

If you ever wanted a confirmation of how the pc must be at cause, that's certainly an interesting little sidelight on it. So any time a pc's giving you motivators, he's giving it to you from the oppterm side, and if he gives you a motivator item on your List One – it doesn't matter so much on the others, because you haven't gotten motivator or overt items, you see, and
you're liable to get either one – but on this one, if he puts a motivatorish thing on first list, why, of course he gives it from the oppterm side. And man, he'll turn on sen all over the place. We had somebody do it today. Sen, sen, sen, sen, misemotion, upset, misemotion, sen, see. Goes half around the bend.

So, and four, which is quite interesting, and this is the main crime – is auditors not doing it at all. And that was – that condensed any little flubs or upsets that went into here in R2-12.

I did broaden the door here a little bit, and I closed it back, because all experimental data on it contained nothing but nounal lists. And they never contained adjectives or verbs. Just didn't occur to me; it just got by me. I thought I'd give you a little more complete Scientology list, you see, and let you complete it a little bit.

Well, up went the balloon. R2-12 itself is very precisely worked out. And so I am the one who added the first additive. I let you put a few additives on the first list. We have now taken them off.

All right. Now, you recognize that if you get rid of some problem on which the pc has a great reality, that he will get a tremendous resurgence as a case. That's pretty obvious, isn't it?

Let's say he's going around just sick – you know, just sick, about this thing. The cops are going to get him or something of the sort. He's just sick about it, all the time, all the time; he's just dying in his tracks, you know, just quivering, and so forth. And all of a sudden you handle that as a present time problem. So all of its elements disappear. He'd go, "Whew! Hu-hu-hu," you know.

And the funny part of it is when you do a very skilled R2-12, that's exactly what happens to the pc. He's very nervous, but it's about a problem he doesn't even know he's got. And he's so nervous on the subject of this problem that he's just about out through his skull. And you can take him and grab that and handle it.

Now, actually, he mustn't have a problem in order to get the problems in his own personal environment. He mustn't have a problem on Scientology. And because the session is closer than his environment while R2-12 is being done, therefore you have to take the Scientology problems away before you take the environmental problems away. Always has to be in that sequence. And you just get these problems that he's really panting and upset about and so forth, that are right there quivering in present time, and of course he says, "Whew! What a relief, man! Hu-hu." If you don't get that kind of a result, either you're doing assessments wrong, or something is awry, or you're not completing lists, or something of the sort.

I'll go into the mechanics of doing R2-12 a little more thoroughly in the next lecture.

Right now, thank you.
Routine 2-12,
Part II

A lecture given on 27 November 1962

Okay, here we are, second lecture November 27th, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is a talk about R2-12.

There have been an awful lot of queries about R2-12. I have actually audited this procedure and audited it and audited it and reviewed it and given out pieces of it to be audited, actually for about eighteen months. A long time to audit a procedure. And I've made every mistake that you're going to make. I made them all and followed them over the hills and far away and finally found out why they're mistakes. And the only thing that I have mapped here is an invariable procedure. I have mapped an invariable procedure. I have not mapped all the mistakes. There isn't enough paper in Christendom; there just isn't enough to map all the mistakes that you could make with this.

People can always dream up more mistakes than you can circumvent. And the only thing you can do is to try to get it down to a terrifically invariable action.

Now, as training becomes advanced you of course expect people to be able to exercise judgment. You give them more judgment factors to handle and so on. Remember that this one is designed for the HPA/HCA level of action and it is very, very close to a totally muzzled, totally invariable procedure. And if you just stay on it as a line, why, you will arrive at the other end. Now, that it is an invariable procedure does not mean that it occasionally won't lay an egg. You're going to get an occasional egg laid with it even though it's done perfectly.

Now, why is this? Well, put it this way: You've picked up an item on your first list by some sort of an assessment which was not part of the GPM. You could almost classify it as a mistake, but a mistake that you would make. You tiger drilled it, and it had some withholds on it, and it stayed in. See, it wasn't well cleaned up.

Now, it actually isn't worthwhile to well clean up these items. You don't have to sit there and polish up one of these items with a Tiger Drill for three hours and a half, you understand? You're mainly interested in the session withholds and suppressions, you understand?

Now, in view of the fact that you're not going to tiger drill these things forever with Big Tiger and run a Prepcheck on the first list assessment item, you're occasionally going to get one that is simply held down by a couple of withholds or a misdemeanor that's not connected to the GPM, at which time you will lay an egg. That's all right, if you know that you can lay an egg with it, why, fine. And that is the phenomenon which we have been calling in 3GA Criss Cross "currying a dead horse."
You can go on and curry this dead horse, and polish up and gild his hoofs and polish his harness and do all sorts of things with him and buy him wreathes and so forth. But it doesn't make him any less dead. And you're not – also – you're not going anywhere while you are currying the dead horse.

So you have to learn to recognize a dead horse. Now, the source of the dead horse is just what I have just given you. There was something in on the list because it wasn't well cleaned up on the Tiger Drill and therefore the thing continued to read as the only thing in. So you started busily and methodically to list this thing, and so on. It'll happen sometimes that somebody will miss a read or something like that on it or imagine he saw a read or something or the meter will need new batteries or something goofy will occur, you see, that doesn't have anything to do with the technology. And it gets something like this.

So you have to know this one. It doesn't matter how come you've got a dead horse, you have to recognize what is a dead horse. And it's an integral part of 2-12 – dead horses. It is a list, whether a represent or an oppose list, which contains no wide slams. And that is a dead horse.

You've gotten this thing – you see, you don't have a slam on your List One. It's rare that you would have a slam on your List One, but three cheers, you do have a slam on One and you just omit 4, 5 and 6. But that's the only thing that happens. So you have a big slam going along on List One. All right, well, you just omit 4, 5 and 6 and directly oppose what you had on List One. But that slam, of course, only occurs after assessment. Because that slam can shift around, as you will rapidly learn.

What I mean by a dead horse is a represent or oppose list that does not slam after you've given it a chance in listing. If no slam occurs anywhere on a listing list, with the mid ruds in for the session, that's a dead horse.

Well, how far do you have to go on a list to find out if something is going to slam? Well frankly, you can go as far as fifty. If you haven't got any – if nothing has slammed by the time you get to fifty items, (that's by the way about twice as long as I go) but if you haven't slammed – if you haven't read a slam on this thing by the time that you get up to fifty items or something like that, there's just little dirty needles, dirty needles, dirty read, dirty read, I should be saying, you're going to lay an egg. That list is going exactly nowhere. And the best thing to do with it is carry it to fifty; if there's no rock slam has appeared and the meter is hooked in, abandon it.

Now, how do you read – if that's the case – then, how do you read a slam while you're listing? Well, it's very simple. On a Mark IV meter you turn it back to sensitivity 8 and carry your tone arm so that it is somewhere around the middle of the dial. So you've got a sensitivity 8 is your best action on a Mark IV meter. That doesn't mean then that the needle is going to wander so far off that while you're listing you're in a continuous and continual nervous prostration about catching up with this meter.

Now, what can throw you off? A pc who does calisthenics in the auditing chair can throw this off. The best way to handle the pc is to say, "Put the cans in your lap and sit still." These pcs that scratch their head with cans and scratch their knees with cans and do this with cans and that with cans are actually in a kind of a rock slam all the time. But you can cope
with this and there's no particular reason why you should permit this to be loused up. Just – you can put it in your R-factor and it won't surprise the pc, you see. "You start throwing these cans around while I'm listing on a list and I won't be able to see whether or not it's a valid list or not, so I'm going to have to tell you to sit still, put the cans in your lap." And it won't break your pc's heart. But don't go along with a superpermissiveness that permits this all the time so that you never get a rock slam visible.

Now, on a Mark V, you set it at sensitivity 8 with the knob furthest to the left. In other words, you set that knob furthest to the left and sensitivity 8. Actually the sensitivity could be a little bit lower than 8. It could actually be down to about 6 and you would still be all right. You would still see your rock slam.

That keeps your – that's to keep your needle from drifting around so madly and so wildly that you can't keep it on the dial and you're always having to adjust it and so forth. Well, you can very visibly see a rock slam if your sensitivities are as I have mentioned.

It's necessary that you list with the pc on the meter. Otherwise you will never notice this. And the meter should be turned on. There are lots of – lots of ways that you can get a dead horse list. You can get them a lot of ways and the most popular of these ways is not the way I mentioned, but to get a wrong assessment. You get yourself a wrong assessment and you're liable to get all manner of dead horse lists.

A fellow can't go down and just sit there comfortably and read these things off, bark-bark-bark-bark, and mark those that are in and winds up – misses a read, misses two reads, misses three reads, as he's going down the list. Doesn't repeat, find out if they did read or not, just made up his mind that they didn't read. And of course the item that he missed is the item which would have stayed in and he gets down to the end of the line and he becomes very wroth with the pc because he can't quite get anything to tiger drill in. So he ARC breaks the pc enough to get one of them to read. Now, that is a successful action in getting an item to read but it's not going to be successful in listing that item. And you're liable to have some item that shouldn't be reading anyway.

An E-Meter has the peculiar characteristic of spotting for you what a pc can have reality on. It's actually a reality indicator, and if the thing reads well on an E-Meter or reads at all on an E-Meter, you can get somewhere into the pc's zone of reality. But supposing you have an ARC broke item, which is simply because the pc's never heard of it. Let's say MEST. We're auditing a raw meat pc and "MEST" were on List One. And he's never heard of MEST. And he doesn't know what it is.

Well, it's been a long time since we've stressed clearing the auditing command and somebody was writing me as an emergency from an Academy that all around him he saw pcs trying to answer questions in the Academy that they didn't understand. Well, I don't know anything about that. I do know that somebody had neglected this old factor of clear the auditing command. If the pc can't answer it, why, you have to word it up so the pc can answer it. And you're going to get something like this sooner or later. You're going to get something like MEST. Let's say that was on the list – it isn't. And the pc doesn't know what it is. So every time you say it he wonders what it is. And then he withholds asking you and of course at the end of the assessment it stays in.
Now you say, "Who or what represents MIEST to you?" And this is going to be a wonderful mishmash, believe me. That will breed more dead horses that can be easily buried. That is going to be a tough one, is the misassessment, the misassessment. Now, a misassessment will be caused because the pc didn't understand something. It can also be caused because when the pc gave the word, the auditor mistook the word and wrote down something else and of course when the auditor's nulling the list he calls down the something else. The pc doesn't recognize that as being in proper sequence and so tends to protest it, which will therefore make it read.

There's another way of getting a dead horse. If you don't understand what the pc says, even though the pc ARC breaks every time you ask the pc what he said – you understand – if the pc ARC breaks every time, the way to really ruin his case is to put down something he said that you didn't understand. That really ruins the lot, you understand? It's much better to ARC break him every word that he says than to write a bad one on the list. You'll at least get a list of sorts that has some possibility of having an item on it.

But you get one of them with an improper item on it, the pc said "cats" and you wrote down "scratch." You're in a mess. I don't care if he says "rrrh" and that was supposed to be "cats." Now, the way you ask a pc to repeat something is of interest to any auditor. The way you ask him to repeat something is, don't say, "You didn't say that clearly. Say it again," see? The pc's in-session; is very susceptible to comments of this particular kind. You always say, "I didn't understand that, what was it?"

Now, a pc very often believes that you have challenged him on the properness of the item on that list. See, he said, "bwrrr" and that was supposed to be "cats." Then you say, "I didn't understand that, what did you say?" He very often thinks that you are telling him that cats don't belong on the list and that he shouldn't put it on the list. So if a pc is getting of this frame of mind, you say, "I didn't understand – I didn't understand that. Would you please spell it for me?" You're going to be a lot better off. Got it? Then you do want it on the list, we want him to spell it. If he can't spell, you've had it! [laughter]

Now, you mustn't – you mustn't say, "You didn't say it clearly," and put the burden of responsibility for its incorrectness on the pc. That is very improper. And another thing that you mustn't do is repeat the item after the pc. You just mustn't repeat the item after the pc. He says, "Cats," you say, "Cats, thank you." He says, "Game warden," you say, "Game warden, thank you." He says, "Tiger," you say, "Tiger, thank you." Man, it'll drive him round the bend.

The highest point of psychology, the tremendous zenith that they reached in all of their researches was a machine that drove people crazy. You said a word into it and it said the word back. And after that they had achieved the zenith and they stopped their researches. But they did achieve something. It's wicked of you to continue to insist that the psychologist never, never accomplished anything. He did do this. There's a monument I think, somewhere in the Middle West – been covered up during these last centuries – but it says, "On this spot they invented the machine that drove people mad." We put it there back in 2052 – anyhow, space opera.
No, I just – all jokes aside, the idea of repeating something back – particularly a little bit out of phase with the pc – can make him feel like he's spinning, particularly in a susceptible condition in-session. So you mustn't repeat items to the pc. It's all right to null them, but repeating them back to the pc every time he says them has a tendency to shut him up.

I know you can play this game with little kids and they get a big gag out of it. Remember you're playing it in the spirit of a big gag. It's a quite different proposition when you're just in there and you're writing down solemnly: he says "Cats," you say "Cats," so forth, see?

Now, the wrong way, really, to get an item straightened out is to say, "Did you say 'interim'?" He says "anteroom," see, and you say, "Did you say 'interim'?" Now he immediately has to protest that, doesn't he? And it will leave a mark on the list that will show up during its nulling. He'll sometimes forget that he did it and it'll still register. You'll get it off eventually, but it takes a lot of time.

So the saying words back to him which you didn't underst... saying words back to him always carries the liability of your not having understood them and saying them differently – aside from its factor of making him feel spinny – why, it looks like you're correcting him. And hell take vast unction to it.

Now, that goes so far as never point to an item on a list. Not: "Did you mean this one?" Just never do that. In the first place you should never make motions toward the pc anyway. His anchor points are peculiarly liable to being driven in by you, the auditor, to whom he has granted a great deal of responsibility and power. And you start pointing up the list in his direction he gets feeling – his whole theta beams will be pressed down against the end of your finger trying to bring your finger down to the point on the list where your finger should have stopped. And you get the effort of that will read on the item you're discussing.

That's a marvelous way to get a wrong goal. I myself have had a wrong goal found on me that way one day. The auditor pointed to the wrong goal and said, "You mean that one?" I made a remark – I made a remark and the remark was misinterpreted as to applying to another goal and the auditor pointed to the other goal and it stayed in by protest. And it took the devil's own time to find that protest when it was finally cleaned up. It was just dug in but deep. And you'll find a lot of items can be pushed in on a list by the auditor pointing to items.

Now, the pc can put anything he likes on a list but he must never take anything off of a list. He can put anything he likes on one; he must never be able to take anything off of one. He wants a word changed. You write the whole thing down with the changed word in it as a brand-new item. That's an invariable action.

He says, "To dance the hornpipe." And then he says, "To be able to dance the hornpipe is what I meant." And you're nulling "To dance the hornpipe."

You say, "Thank you very much," and you write, "To be able to dance the hornpipe" down underneath the one you're clearing, and go on and finish clearing "To dance the hornpipe." And then take up the next one. If it's completely disrelated you put it at the end of the list. He's got a new one, so you put it at the end of the list.
Now, that's – he wants a "the" changed to an "a." Well now, if you're sitting from the high pinnacle of always having put it down right first, then this is a change of the list. And you won't run into any ARC breaks to amount to anything if the pc tells you, "Well, that's 'to be able to dance the hornpipe.'"

And you say, "All right, you want that on the list? Thank you very much." And you put it on the list, see.

Pc says he doesn't want it on the list, don't put it on the list.

"No," he says, "Just change that one." And you say, "I'm awfully sorry, the rules of the game, I can't do that. I've got to put it on the list down below here, and I will, I'll write it down 'To be able to dance the hornpipe.' We'll see if that isn't it, or not, okay?" It's usually okay with the pc.

These are the little – the little points of listing that get overlooked that hang pcs with wrong items and that give you dead horses and other things like that. So you just do the thing, do a good clean job on listing it and then do a good clean job on nulling it and with right assessments it just runs like a ball.

We haven't made allowances for all of the ways that you can go reverse-wise. See, we haven't – we haven't said, "Now, these..." It so happens that if you null a list which has given you a consistently dirty needle and you take a dirty needle final angle on the thing and then you oppose that, that you won't wind up with very much and so forth and all of that has more or less been cut out of this thing. We say, "You get a clean assessment, you take what stays in, and you represent it, you get a rock slamming item and you oppose it." In other words, you've got an invariable action there.

If you can't carry out that invariable action don't try to carry out something else. Scrub your dead horse, in other words. You've been listing on this thing, and man, it's just going no place. There's no slam on it. Get your mid ruds in. Get your mid ruds in. "On this list has anything been suppressed?" and so forth. Get your mid ruds in, make sure they're nice and clean, everything is fine. And by the way, never put mid ruds in when the pc originates. That is absolutely against the law. Pc originates, say, "You know, I had an interesting thought then, I thought that – I thought that cats never got that big, actually."

And the auditor, "All right, on this list has anything been suppressed?"

Man, if you want to drive a pc out of session, just try that. He's keeping his own ruds in, so what? So what? He'll eventually get so he won't. It's not you – up to you to use mid ruds for punishment. But at the same time don't shy off getting mid ruds in. You know, the reverse can happen. "Every time I open my mouth..." If you operate from the armor-plated turret of always doing a good helpful job and doing everything you can do for the pc and doing everything you're supposed to be doing right and using very reliable processes, believe me, you don't have any qualms about heading the pc's attention this way or that or straightening out something or other or going on and doing something.

If you're auditing with a guilty conscience of not knowing quite whether you're doing right or not, you are very vulnerable as an auditor, because you think you might be commit-
ting overt. And therefore you tend to withdraw from them. And even an auditor who's audit-
ing almost letter-perfectly can sometimes be shaken up by a pc who says, "Oh, there goes those damn mid ruds again! All I'm doing is sitting here getting in mid ruds and mo-raooww!"

See, mid ruds.

Well, all right, so you had to get in your mid ruds too often. Tell your pc, "I'm awful sorry. I'm sorry." Treat it as an origin, don't ask him – don't punish him now with the random missed withhold question. See, that's the other – that's the other mark of a tyro. Say, "I'm aw-

fully sorry. But just exactly what are you doing there?"

"Well, I just... and so on and so on."

"All right. What haven't I found out about that?" see?

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so – and that's what I'm trying to tell you."

You say, "All right. I'm trying to get these in so I can get this needle straightened out, and we can go on, you know? And I've got to put them in. I'm sorry." And go right on in and put them in.

Well, that's good auditing, see? But I've actua lly had pcs try to scold me out of getting my rudiments in and yap at it. And I don't care whether it was one reason or another, I found out the way to handle the pc was to go ahead and put them in. And the way to mess it all up was to try not to, you know, try to Q-and-A with the pc's objection.

Nope, if you're operating from the certainty of being right – you're doing your best for the pc, and so forth, and your pc starts to ream you out. And you know very well you haven't been using mid ruds to punish his withholds, you see. You know, to punish him every time he originated – excuse me. And you know you haven't been misusing this and you've been handling him all right and the pc's going straight through the roof. Well, don't Q-and-A by going straight through the roof yourself. Go on and do what you're supposed to do. He'll simmer down. Sometimes has a legitimate beef; most of the time not. Get in your mid ruds.

Now, the next big source of dead horses is this incomplete list. And I don't know how to tell you emphatically enough what an incomplete list is, because actually I've been bleating and nattering and beating my gums and splintering bits of enamel out here for a long time on the subject of incomplete lists and really nobody hears me. But I finally caught up with one thing that I mean to be very emphatic about. I have caught out the auditor who says: "The pc said he put it on the list and therefore I stopped the list." I've caught up with it. If the pc says the last one he put on the list was it, I will guarantee you that the list is not complete. It's that reversed. Pc says the list is complete, just volunteers it, I will absolutely guarantee you that the list is not complete.

I will guarantee you also that this has happened, that coming right over the horizon is a nice big rock slamming item and the pc has just chickened. The pc hits the silk, Man. He unloads right there. And part of the sensation is, is that he has put it on the list. He's fooled himself. What he really has said is he's put the last safe item on the list. And I've tested this out some times now, and I finally got the number. Because I've heard this for a long time. And I finally got this thing straight, and made some tests on it. And it's ARC broken the pc I made the test on, "Well, it does no good for me to tell you the list is complete, because then I
put that on the list, because you just keep on going on," and that sort of thing. Yeah, but here's the test of the pudding: are we getting the package? And that's always the test of the auditing. Have we got the package that made the pc well?

This pc could have screamed, bawled, howled, shouted through the entire session, and if at the end of the session you have got an item to show for it, I guarantee you that if it was the good item, that everything is fine – the pc will just – it'll all evaporate. All the bad, everything evaporates. The one thing you can do wrong is not to get a package. Not to get items, reliable items that's what you can do wrong. You knock off doing that and the pc will never forgive you.

"What do you mean," he's liable to say to you. "You mean just because I yelled and screamed and so forth, you knocked off and didn't get the item? What are you trying to do, get even with me?"

Unreasonable beast, see? You're handling a very unreasonable breed of cat. The pc is not forgiving you for getting the item and will never forgive you for not having gotten one. So you take your choice.

Now, this is particularly true on a Scientology list where somebody is slamming a bit on the list. Maybe they're not slamming enough to make it really interesting or have a rock slamming item, but there's just quivers, you know, and "zzz" and quarter-inch "zzz" and you go down, zzz, bang-bang, dirty reads, big dirty reads, you know, that sort of thing, and you're going on down the line.

Man, when you start representing that, you're liable to run yourself into more tears and protests and upsets than you've seen in a long time. Pc just digs their heels into the auditing room floor and just isn't going to go forward from there. Won't list, and so forth.

Well, anything short of mayhem, make them list. That's the answer to it. The answer to it is to get the list because that's the only road out, unless the pc has a legitimate beef. Pc might have a legitimate beef, say, "Well, I – you – you just keep doing that, you – you just keep reading that particular item, and I tell you that's in because I'm just protesting it. I don't believe that is it."

Get the protest off the item and then test it again. Pc may be right, see. Don't throw it down his throat. But you're listing something and it seems to be quite a legitimate list, the pc all of a sudden sets his heels, he isn't going to go on. Well, I don't know what you have to do to make some pcs go on. But let me tell you that whatever you have to do to make them go on, the only thing you'll never be forgiven for is not having made them go on. That's what you'll never be forgiven for. That will really shock them and upset them.

I don't care. So a pc cries. So the pc emotes. So the pc gets mad. So the pc does this. So pcs are pcs. Get the list. Pc says, "I'm not going to list any more and that's it, that's it. That's the last item. That's the last item you're going to get out of me."

You say, "All right, I understand how you feel. Let's see, what are we listing from, now? Turnip seeds. All right, listing from turnip seeds. Okay. What do you think about them?"
"Well, I think it's silly! The whole thing is preposterous."

"All right. All right."

Don't turn their cases around, just keep them talking, see, keep them talking. [laughter] And more times you'll be startled out of your wits. They'll suddenly say, "Well, there's field hands, there's feed stores, there's this, and..." You're back there listing again, see. Don't try to take words out of what they are saying to you and list them. They consider that a terrible betrayal, because they didn't give you the item. Therefore you have robbed them.

But you get yourself a good – a good list, that list is going to look in a certain way. As you are listing a list – now here's the way a list looks – as you're listing a list, and you go down the line, you're liable to run into a dwindling rock slam. Or you're liable to run into a sporadic, occasional rock slam. We don't care which you run into. But if you don't get an item that slams when the list is being written down by you, you've got no list. There's got to be some on it that slam, man.

Now, how many is some? Well, three or four in a row, one or two occasionally on the thing that aren't attributable to the pc's moving his hands, and you'll find out that very often you run into the textbook dwindling rock slam. Every one rock slams a little bit less. Every item he gives you, you get a little smaller rock slam on. Starts from a dial wide or something like that, goes to three-quarters of a dial and goes to half a dial, goes to a quarter of a dial, goes to dirty reads. Dirty reads dwindle on down and go absolutely clean and slick as a whistle. And you say, "Boy, we've really done it now." And you close your book and you start nulling and you are horrified to behold that you get a dirty needle. Not dirty reads, but you get a dirty needle. What the hell's this dirty needle all about?

Well, it's the list isn't complete, that's what it's all about. Lists go in through phases of looking flat. Now, there are various tests. You can get the mid ruds in and ask the question that you're listing from to see if it produces a read. That is really not an absolute guarantee that that list is listed out. That is a good indicator. That's a good indicator. The absolute guarantee that it is an incomplete list occurs on this test: When you go down the list nulling items you can clean up a dirty needle – not a dirty read, but a dirty needle – by simply asking the pc if he thought of something.

You say to the pc, "Did you think of something?" Pc fishes around, finally digs it up and says yes and your needle goes clean again. If you have to use more mid rud than that, that list is incomplete. You see, it's not even mid ruds. It's just the off-hand two-way comm question. You just say, "Well, did you think of something?"

Pc said, "Yes, so-and-so and so-and-so," and your needle cleans again.

Now, even that one, if you have to pull it two or three times for ten items or twelve items, no, man, that list is not complete. So you want to go at it this way, is "Did you think of something?" This is also – this is an invitation, you see, it's a two-edged sword. It's an invitation to give you his withhold or what he just thought or what he invalidated or something like that. It's an invitation to do that. Also an invitation to give you more items. See? "Did you think of something?" And then you can write this new item down at the end of the list.
But let me tell you that a pc's ARC breaks about not completing the list do not stem from the auditing or auditing flubs. They come entirely from the pc's unwillingness to confront, because when a list is complete the pc will list forever. So when he ends listing is not a test of complete list. If a list were complete he would go on listing. But when a list isn't complete, he blows his stack. He balks.

So any balk by the pc is an indication of an incomplete list. Simple. Just over the hill – you watch it. You'll see this manifestation from time to time. You'll be going down the line, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, and all of a sudden the pc will say, "Well, that's strawberries. That's it."

You say, "Huh?" You know, your pencil screams to a rubbery stop.

He says, "Yeah, that's the item. That-that-that's-that is the one. That-that is the one."

Well, just for fun sometimes, null the list you've just done. You want to get skunked? Just null what you've just done. You aren't going to get anything. It's going to be one of these horrible things. I'm going to put this in some bulletins so it can be spread more broadly. I'm going to put some actual patterns of incomplete list nullings and some actual patterns of some actual complete list nullings. Boy, they sure look different.

I did a list the other night that was a real complete list, man. I think on the whole list there were five items in and some fifteen pages on the first pass. And boy, the one that showed up at the end of that was the nicest juiciest matched-up item you ever saw. Yum-yum, you know. Was just out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, "Did you think of something?", you know.

"Oh, no, no. So and so on. Suppressed something, I thought that was funny."

"All right." – Out, out, out, out, out, out – "All right, did you think of something?"

"Yeah, it was this brrt ..."

"Good. All right." Third, fourth page, all of a sudden one's in. That's all right, mark it in. Next one, in. Uh-uh, uh-uh-uh.

"Well, what have you been up to here? What do you think about it?" and so on. "Here's the list. Have you invalidated any of these things or anything like that?"

"I don't know. Oh, that one! That one. Ha-ha-ha! Yeah, ha-ha! Thought that one was awful funny. Ha-ha-ha!"

An auditor gets an awful lot of "you clowns" and that sort of thing, suppressed in doing this sort of thing.

Anyway, they just go right on down the line, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa- poketa-pocketa-pocketa. One read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, see? Just nothing, nothing, nothing. Two in consecutively, mid ruds went out.

Imagine my embarrassment on one sector of it, though, I had two in consecutively. Two were actually in, one after the other. I'd gotten so cocky by that time I was pestering the pc because the second one was in, of course. You know. Then you say, "Pardon me!" you see,
and really – really apologize, and keep on going. But that's – that is a very ideal situation to get into.

And Mary Sue dragged out, the other day, some of the old 3D Criss Cross lists, and I really am going to have to post them for you because you'll scream, man! Twelve items long, this list is, up to the point where the pc said didactically, "Well that is it. I have now put it on the list." And then we have as many as twenty-four to twenty-eight slant marks after each item.

Oh, you thought I was going to say, "The one that was in." Oh, no, no, it went around to the back of the page. And no items resulted. And we could never understand why the case wasn't getting anywhere. That was why the case wasn't getting anywhere. Every time the pc'd say, "Well it's on the list," the auditor would stop and that was it. And then start this arduous nulling, you see. Three sessions later still trying to null twelve. Wild business, man!

So anyway, the pc – the pc actually slows down, sees that just over the horizon there is the smell of danger. One shouldn't go over that rise and so instantly gets up the one that's it, presents it to the auditor and says they aren't going to go any further than that. They'll say it in various ways. When you try to persuade the pc to go further than that they say it in various ways. They just don't want to go any further.

Now, you shove them – well, this is the other test you should make – you shove them just a few inches further and they start listing again – slam! You won't go four or five items beyond where they put it on the list, before you are looking at the first rock slam you saw in the session, in many cases. That's quite amazing, see? Marvelous. And now here's another one for you. You can have as many as about three groups of slams and a slam will dwindle two or three times on a list. That's not common but it can be expected. So that you have had a dwindling slam is no test at all, except that's a valid thing to list from. You just keep going.

Well, how far do you keep going? Well, until you don't have to get the mid ruds in to null it. Well, how far is that? Well, that's as far as it is. How long is a piece of string? Some pcs seem specialized in terribly long lists. They just love these 589 lists, you know? Let me tell you, no pc has short lists.

There aren't no such things as lists of ten, twelve, fifteen or twenty, twenty-five. There are no such lists. You don't get short lists like that. The person would be almost to OT before they'd give you lists like that. You understand? And then their confront would be up so high that you wouldn't have anything to know. They would have blown them all anyhow.

So you just don't get short lists. You get these longer lists. And a pc that works somewhere in the neighborhood of eighty to a hundred and fifty on a list is just dandy. You can have a list complete as short as sixty or seventy, but not very often. It's eighty up.

Some of these pcs go five hundred – I think there are some who have gone as long as a thousand – are actually habitual. They're habitual. I mean, you ask for their next list and they give you five hundred, you know? Well, I'm sorry for it and I'm sorry that they do this. They happen to be rare. It's much commoner to have a pc that will run around a hundred, see. But you've had it, I'd up their auditing rates at once.
But anything that restrains a pc or tries to keep the pc from doing a proper length list will wreck your R2-12, just as it will wreck 3D-3GA Criss Cross. You say, "Well, your lists are too long. I don't want to audit you." They'll give you short lists with no items on them. Then you're really wasting your auditing time, see. You find out they'll suppress items, and put them out of sight. Then you never can get the needle cleaned up.

And you finally say, "Well how come you suppressed all those items? I mean, you know, they seem perfectly good items and we've now got them on the list. But how come you suppressed them?" If you asked them something like that, that's too jabbery and talky to for an auditing session. But if you were to say something like that they'd say, "Well, we'd get through so much faster if the list weren't so long."

See, if they'd given you their normal list you would have gotten through it and nulled it and found their item in two hours and a half, you see. Everything would have been dandy, you see, so on. This is the second session which you've still been battling with this. You've now burned up five auditing hours. And the pc is trying to save you time!

I'm afraid as an auditor I never have quite measured up to the ideal auditor. The ideal auditor would never say anything about it. He would never say anything about it. And I'm afraid, after a pc has done this to me a few times, and so forth, I'm liable to say to the pc, "Thank you so much for your help." [laughter, laughs] I'm afraid I'm not completely – not completely proof against doing that.

That's the one that really gets me, though. The pc is trying to help you out so that you can't even vaguely do your job. Oh! What can you say, you know? And you sit there and you sweat it out and that's as far as I'd go there, is just to thank them a little too loudly. They sometimes get the point. And they say, "Oh well, you didn't want me to do that. You mean it would have got done faster if I'd just – just gone ahead and let you do it?"

"Yeah, that's what I mean."

"Ah, well. I'll help you out next time."

"No thank you. Just – just sit there and answer the auditing question, will you please?"

But actually, the more you beat up a pc, the less you're going to get done. The more you harass a pc, the more you worry a pc, the more you yap at a pc about a dirty needle, and so forth, the less you're going to get done. You should never yap at a pc about a dirty needle. Now, you'll rapidly come off of that and it won't be one of your sins. As soon as you learn to complete a list, you'll stop chopping up pcs for having a dirty needle.

Now, although the ideal auditor, the perfect auditor, would never cause any ARC break at all, a good auditor inevitably causes a little bit – inevitably. It's just part of the business. You're going down the line and there you sit there and you're going down the line and you're checking this and that and you're saying, "Catfish, tigers, waterbucks," so forth. And you're going down the line, and all of a sudden this thing is going bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzzzz. Your list is already 320, see.

Now, the ideal auditor would have completed the list in the first place.
But an actual auditor very often finds it out in mid-flight. In other words, there's a difference between perfect ideal form and the form that you can achieve. You can come awful close to perfect form but this one will always throw you. The thing was clean, everything was clean, there was no indicator, no clouds on the horizon, everything was beautiful, the sun was shining, you're going down the list like mad and all of a sudden, *clank!* You got a dirty needle.

Now, if you say to the pc, "All right, let's list some more items," you're not going to get too much cooperation. But frankly, the more monkeying around you do, why, the less cooperation you're going to get. So it's almost that abrupt. You say, "All right, now I see here you've probably got some more items that you thought of in progress and we're going to turn it over to the next page and now, all right, just give me some more items."

And the pc says, "But we've done that twice!"

And you say, "Yeah, I'm awful sorry, but we have..." and so forth. "We'll just go back and, you know, kind of pick up one item there that you – that you thought of when I was going along."

"Well, 'gophers'."

And you say, "'Gophers,' yeah, give me some more."

And the pc's all of a sudden going a-a-a-a-a-a, you know, straight down the line. Marvelous to behold. Sometimes they overlist. Five would have cleaned it up, see, and they give you twenty. But never stop a pc from listing. You'll – because it's too hard to get them started in the first place. You never stop a pc from listing. Never. They go on and on and on and on and on, well, just sit there and take the items down.

Now, you can have as many as three dwindling rock slams from the same item. That is a little discovery that is quite interesting. You thought there it was and it disappeared and it went to a perfectly clean needle and you say, "I've got it made in the shade." Don't be too smug. You keep on listing as long as the pc wants to list. And you get your mid ruds in, make a test of the thing and so forth, and watch that carefully because any slightest disturbance of that needle on that test means more items on that list.

The test simply consists of getting your mid ruds in and asking the question from which you were getting the items. And you just ask that question, and man, watch that meter. Because if there's any rough-up ... That needle was flowing and you asked the question and it stopped flowing, and just sort of souped. Didn't read. There's more items on the list.

And you say, "Well, all right." Try to sound happy about it. Say, "All right, good. Well, all right. All right. Well, I see you've got some more here. And here we go." And let's just write them up, see. Get your mid ruds in and test the thing again. It's always an invariable action. You get your mid ruds in and you test.

Now, on List One there is an accidental that you must know about. On 3GA Criss Cross, on all other steps of Routine 2-12, you probably won't notice that before you start to null you have put in your mid ruds. You see, because you wrote the list and then you put in your mid ruds and tested the list, so your mid ruds are in, aren't they? And on List One, the
Scientology List, before you do it, you haven't completed any list so you haven't put in the mid ruds. So it becomes absolutely vital to get your mid ruds in on the Scientology List.

Now, one of the reasons why you can't add anything to the Scientology List turns up that if you ask the pc to add as much as one, two or three items, you have started the pc listing and will have to continue the pc listing it to get rid of your dirty needle. But if it never occurred to the pc to list, you won't have a dirty needle. But you get your mid ruds in, not on the list, you just get your mid ruds in for the session, so forth. But that becomes a little extra piece of stuff that has to go on ahead of it, just because in all other lists it occurs inevitably that you accidentally have gotten your mid ruds in at the beginning of the list, see, before you started nulling.

Now, if you add nothing to the Scientology List you won't have a dirty needle to worry about unless it's just the dirty needle of missed withholds or the dirty needle of out mid ruds. Otherwise than that, there's nothing different on handling the first list than handling any subsequent or successive lists.

Now, the thing to do in doing Routine 2-12 is just keep your eye on what you're trying to do. You're trying to find a trace first in Scientology because – areas, because that's closest to the session and then in the present time environment of the pc. You're trying to find a trace of the GPM and where it might be keyed in because the individual will then have a chronic and consistent present time problem. Now, having found this trace in present time, you recognize that the other side of the package – the second sphere, the second valence – that is opposing that thing in present time is keyed in all the time.

But also recognize, please, as an auditor, that it is a complete lie that it is in present time. It is only keyed into present time. So the moment you start listing a represent list, your pc is going to fly out of present time. But of course the thing isn't in present time; where else could he go but out of present time.

He only thinks it's in present time. It only appears to be into present time to him, and as soon as you represent, why, you'll carry him out of present time. But don't get too disturbed if for all his understanding of present time somebody starts to list backtrack like crazy. Well, what else is there to list?

You don't think this life had enough duress in it, even with the Democrats in power, you see, and the Republicans about to succeed them. You see, I mean even with combinations like that, you still don't get masses of the GPM in this lifetime. Let me assure you of that. There couldn't be anyplace but the backtrack.

Probably the thing he thinks is keyed-in in present time actually was a million years old, at the very youngest. So, of course, you're going to go backtrack. That you're going backtrack doesn't invalidate it as wiping out the present time problem.

Now, one other thing you should realize is in 1938 there was this matter of identities, similarities and differences. And you saw it first in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*: $A = A = A$. See, $A = A = A$. In other words, everything is identical to everything, see. Everything is identified with everything. Well, of course, this is the reason the present time problem is in present time. He has got the GPM mass identified with the present time item.
Nothing is wilder than this one that occurs in Scientology organizations. You're trying to help this guy out, you see, and he keeps shoving a dirk in your back.

Why? Well, because you're the king of the "Glu-Klocks" or something. Of course, he's been dead several million years, but somehow or another you restimulated him, minds being minds.

Now, the $A = A = A$ factor is terribly interesting to you from the viewpoint of the represent step of 2-12. You can represent anything and you will peel identifications off of it. So the representing alone is auditing. Listing is auditing. And by taking anything somebody is worried about and just representing items – you see, oppose, no, no, no. See? You can't say, "What would oppose it?"

This fellow says, "I'm awfully worried about ice cream cones." I'm showing you now a little shortcut, goofball assist use of this, just to teach you the principle, see?

You can't say, "What would oppose ice cream cones?" and wind up anywhere. Because there is no such package as something versus ice cream cones. It doesn't exist. He'd have to invent it. But you can say, "What would represent ice cream cones to you?" and he'll give you the scale of substitutes for ice cream cones. This helps him to differentiate so he sees they're only similarities, not identities.

Now, you can always use represent as an assist. The fellow's got a bellyache. You say, "All right, now, what's a bellyache represent to you?" See, you haven't got him on the meter, you haven't done anything with him, so "What's a bellyache represent to you?"

"Well, it represents this and that and the fact that I am dying, and-ha-ha! That's real funny, I'm not dying," and he feels better. You understand?

But you're handling now one of the most fundamental fundamentals there are with that represent list and any time you say, "Who or what would (do something)," you're still writing a list and it's still got some represent in it. And you're actually using items to separate them out and get the pc to differentiate. And therefore he can see what is what and what is true and what is false. So you're handling all of these factors while you're handling R2-12. And the factors are in there and hidden, but they're quite startling. When you get a full parade of how many factors you're handling in R2-12, it's dizzying. So the best answer to it is just do it and you'll see those things peel off.

But it's very funny. Somebody will be absolutely sure his wife is an ogre. You've heard of this, you see. Well, actually he's just got an $A = A = A$. And you say, "Well, what does your wife represent to you?"

He'd say, "A thuh and a thuh and a thuh and a thuh and a thuh," well, he'd feel better just from doing that. And, of course, that's very short of what R2-12 could do and the wrong way to do it, actually. But you could use it that way and he'd differentiate.

So remember now, while you – while you're cursing there at the length of a list, remember the more identification on an item, the more items are going to come off on the list. The more identified the person is with something, the more items you're going to get coming
off of it. And all the time you're listing those items you're auditing him like crazy – whether it's represent or oppose – because the oppose, too, is stripping down a certain idea or concept.

And don't lose sight of the fact that all the time you're listing you're auditing him like mad. And now we'll take nulling and every time you go down this list he thinks there and he reintegrates this stuff and you're auditing him like mad. So it's all auditing, solid auditing, and about the soundest and most condensed auditing that you could do – gain per unit of time.

Now, done right, and arriving with items, this is absolutely wonderful. I mean, you get someplace with this – it's fabulous. Now where – how many, how fast should something like this go? Well, I'd say, in an HGC, an auditor who was accustomed to it or something like that should be able to get two packages very easily in a twenty-five-hour intensive. Two packages. That's four items. You know, A versus B and C versus D, in a twenty-five-hour intensive. He would really be loafing, see. He would have run into a lot of hard luck. He would have had to have done this. He would have had to have done that. It was a tough pc. You understand, all these things.

But I notice, I notice that to get a complete package that I'm – with long items and 2-12 and that sort of thing and with not being too careful or meticulous or trying to make time, actually loafing a bit on the job, and so forth – I notice it's going about 7 1/2 item – hours per pair for me. That would be for you 2 1/2 sessions of 3 – hour sessions for a pair. That's really loafing. You understand? And so I say, then, for 2 pairs, for a twenty-five-hour intensive, that is – should be pretty close to a minimal expectancy. Of course you can always go up from there.

Of course you can gear in, and of course you can really get flying. I can do a list and get an item, if I want to really sit down and sweat at it, in one hour and ten minutes. But this is, of course, putting on the pressure of this, really, really knocking it out, man. Your voice is such a blur you can hardly hear it yourself, you know – but just to give you some kind of a level of expectancy.

And when you get two items you've got to make a package out of them, so when you say two packages you mean two pair. So you get two packages in a twenty-five-hour intensive, that would be very slow going indeed. Actually, you'll find your better leading auditors will get up to about six in twenty-five-hour intensive.

But, actually, in terms of case gain, two packages of R2-12 well listed, perfect, they are the items that should have been gotten, and that sort of thing, do more for the pc than a thousand hours of anything we've ever had before. Because you've removed the present time problem out of his road and now he can get gains from auditing. Those are the reasons for fast results.

Now do you understand this technique a little better?

*Audience: Yes.*

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it.

Thank you very much.
R2-12 Theory And Practice
Part I

A lecture given on 29 November 1962

Well. I've got some notes tonight. And again they have nothing to do with the lecture, they just have to do with you.

All right, what is this?

Audience: 29 November.

Twenty-nine Nov. AD 12, Saint Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

All right. This is a talk about R2-12. Now, there's – the first thing you should know about R2-12 is there are many indications and few stabilities so far as the condition of a list. And I only know of one absolute rule about lists. A list must be nullable. It must be susceptible to being nulled. You must be able to be able to null a list. That isn't you the auditor, that's the list.

Some lists are not nullable. Now, right away we should make a differentiation here between an indication and a rule. An indication is something like tracking, and there's a bit of grass bent over and that's an indication, you see, and there's a stone disturbed in the middle of the sand pit and so you decide that something went across there and so forth. Those are indications. They're not like signposts. And these are some indications. If there's no R/S on the list, if there's no rock slam on the list, why, you're in trouble, that's just a dead horse and there's no particular reason to groom it up and gild the hooves and polish the harness and wash the teeth and all that sort of thing; it's – you just – it's just a dead horse.

And if you suddenly look up as you go along and find out the ground is awfully close to you and – and the – it doesn't seem that it's moving any, why of course you'd unload off that dead horse. And sometimes you can save some of the harness, but that's about all. And usually you don't even bother to pick up the harness, don't you see, you just skip it. Dead horse. And actually dead horses are what consume most of the time in R2-12. You will spend two and three times as much time on a dead horse as you will spend on an active list, so therefore these indications are of interest. They are not rules, you understand, they are just indications, and they're of interest.

So, although you say that if you don't develop a rock slam in the first fifty items, although – that's an indication, you see – and the pc's still awfully interested in the list and so forth, well, go on up to seventy, eighty-five items, see. Go on up a ways. Go on further. The pc seems to be interested and engrossed and that sort of thing, why, go a little bit further, still no rock slam, why just unload. Because a list that doesn't rock slam occasionally, here or there, sporadically, once in a blue moon – doesn't matter whether the slam is a dwindling slam
or otherwise – won't produce an item. It just won't do it. So, although it is true that a non-rock slamming list, a list without rock slams on it, will not produce an item, it is not true that because it produced a rock slam it will produce an item. Got that?

Just because a list rock slams is no guarantee of anything. It's just a better indication that there's an item on the list. Look at it in reverse, if a list doesn't rock slam it won't produce an item. You've got to have an occasional rock slam on that list to get a rock slamming item off the list and of course you're only interested in rock slamming items.

Now you go on and list, of course, and as you go on and list, so it produces a rock slam. Well, that's a hopeful indication, that is not a rule that it will produce an item! That it produces no rock slam, it is very positive, very positive that it will not produce an item. But that the list rock slams simply is an indicator that it might produce an item. You got that? If you just – if you get these indicators in their right focus, why all becomes easy.

Now, what do we mean by a nullable list? Well, it means one that you can go down without getting your mid ruds in every few items. Now, you'll want numbers, but unfortunately the number varies from pc to pc; but if you can't go on a list more than eight, nine or ten items without putting in your mid ruds and cleaning up a dirty needle, once more you have a very, very good indication that the ground is getting closer to you and it isn't going by at any speed at all. And what you do about that time is start loosening your feet in the stirrups.

Now, it's all right to go down a few. Now, let's talk about the sources of these non-nullable lists. A list that cannot be nulled. What are the sources of this? They are three in number: (1) That thing from which they are being listed – that thing from which the list is being listed – was improper. Well, oddly enough there is no establishing this on your early List One assessment. If something kicks or activates, you of course, represent it and get a representing list. But there is no indication of any kind from that original indication, that original needle read, that original indication, that original needle read, that will tell you at once whether this list is going to produce an item.

In other words, sometimes you get the faintest trace in the world, it's a sporadic speeded rise or a sporadic speeded fall, and you list the thing down, it slams like mad and winds you up with a nice big juicy reliable item. And the next time you have one that dirty reads and it's clicking and it even looks like it has an occasional spit!, you know, a sort of a reverse rocket read, or something like that, the beginnings of a slam, it looks hot, it looks tense and you go on and you list it and you list it and it list it and list it, it produces a slam, and you list it and list it and list it and list it and list it and list it and list it, and you go back to the beginning of it and the pc says that's it and you say that's it and it's a clean read and you start nulling and it goes out, out, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle. So it's, well, we'll add to this list.

So we get in our – we add to the list, you see, and we get in our mid ruds again and we test the question, bzzzzt, question goes, whatever the list question was, and you add to it and add to it and add to it and you go back, it's all – test the question again. Flat. Not a whisper. And you go back and you start in at the beginning of the list, you're all set to go and it goes item null, item null, item null, dirty read, dirty needle. Dirty needle.

Now the unwise auditor at this point begins to hound the pc for missed withholds. Now the missed withhold is, is there isn't going to ever be anything on this list, you see. The item which you are listing from is not really going into the GPM. It's just paralleling it. And
it's going to go on forever. Well, you've already got this list out to 585 items and the question is still bzzzzt. There were slams on the list, everything else, but you can't list more than a handful before you get another charged up dirty needle, as opposed and different than the dirty read, see. Just dirty read, dirty needle, dirty needle. That ground has now greeted the soles of your shoes. That horse will not go any place else. It doesn't matter what you do to this horse, you can feed him full of phenobarbital, calm his nerves, Dexedrine to speed him up, hormones, and not a thing is going to happen.

That list would probably go to 1,595 items and still be producing the same confounded manifestations, driving you stark, staring mad. Now, that's wrong source. That's wrong source. See? That – there was no telling whether or not that thing you were going to represent, off an assessment, was going to produce a good list or not. There was no indicator in that, it just didn't produce a decent list.

All right, now there's another type of wrong source. There is the – what you're opposing is wrong. That can be a wrong source. Well, let's say you've wound up with the item "waterbuck" and you saw it slam and it faded away and it isn't there any more, and you can't get a single click, tick or snick out of "waterbuck." Yet because it slammed you're hopeful. So you say, "Who or what would oppose a waterbuck?" You've tested it out and you found out that it did turn on some sen, actually it's still turning on some sen, and you say, "Well, it's still turning on some sen so therefore, of course, there's still something there, and maybe the rock slam has just been eaten up in the middle of it all." So you say, "Who or what would oppose a waterbuck?" And this list of 300 is apparently ended as far as the pc is concerned, the question is clean, everything appears to be going along fine, it produced a slam, it looks wonderful and you start in at the beginning of it and it goes, item null, item null, item in, item null, item, dirty needle.

So you continue the list, to be safe for another hundred, which is perfectly legitimate. The question's clean again, everything is fine, everything's marvelous so you go up to where you ended off and it goes, item null, item null, item null, item null, item in, item null, item null, dirty needle. Dirty needle? Put in the mid ruds in a hurry, say, "What are you thinking about?" The pc says, "Well, I thought of an extra item. A goon." You say, "All right. We'll put a goon on the list." About this time you should be getting nervous, you know, because you can get your leg caught underneath a horse, you know, and... [laughter] So you put this on the list and you go a little bit further and you test the question and it's fine and you go back and you start to do this and it's item null, item, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle.

Let me tell you, that can produce a dwindling slam three, four and five times as you list, and that list will never be nullable. I cannot give you any other characteristics than just that, it's just not nullable. What in actual fact is occurring? Well, as you see, a rock slam requires something to lean on to finally wind up with something.

Now, you've got this wall here, see, that was the reliable item and you're listing against this wall. Man, those rock slams are discharging, those rock slams are doing interesting things, you finally wind up and you're going to find the item that is pressing against that wall. That's because it had something to lean on, but this other thing, it was a clean read you were getting on the thing finally, although it did slam; and it was an item and it looked like an item
but it's a clean read now, you can't get anything off of it, and you just adventurously go on and oppose it. Of course, it's just going out into thin air. There's nothing for that list to lean on, you get the idea?

Nothing for it to come up against and so it's never going to end. It's just going to constantly miss on the GPM. What you're doing, kind of, is cutting out paper dolls that are hanging on the concrete lampposts in the GPM, don't you see? And every once in a while they come on close enough to the GPM to make something slam. And actually what you're doing is just walking round and round the GPM picking locks off of it and you can go on and do it forever. Now, sometimes the pc turns on sen, very, very heavy sen, while you're doing such a list and you would be very, very unwise not to list the list till the sen turned off.

Don't stop listing because the pc has a bad stomach or something. You'll find out that these lists, even when they're going no place and will result in no reliable item, hold the pc's interest, are producing cognitions, everything is dandy except they're never going to be nullable. And if you stop listing them at the moment the pc has a sick stomach or he feels all caved in, or you've made a mistake, actually if you keep on listing the pc will pass out of it to a light case of sen. That's the time to unload. And then unload from that horse, push the horse in the ditch, or do anything you please with the horse, but go and find another horse. And of course you have to go back to your – a first list again to continue on. Do you understand?

As you have been seeing here then, that a list rock slams is not a guarantee that it's going to hand you an item. That a list produces cognitions is only an indicator, like the rock slam is. So the pc's cogniting, fine. But that's only an indicator; it doesn't guarantee a thing. But if the pc doesn't cognite at all while listing the list or seem interested in it, that's an indicator, that becomes a rule. You see? So again you have, no rock slam on the list and no cognitions from the pc. Well, this amounts to a rule: That's going to be a dead horse for sure. But again, that the pc does get cognitions is not a guarantee of anything; it's just an indicator. You understand? All right.

Now, wrong assessment, that is to say a wrong assessment divides into auditor mistake, which winds up with a wrong assessment – the auditor just didn't assess right – and also unfortunateness. The failure to get out of bed and make the magic sign in the air before you start the day. That's just unfortunate, because you can make a right assessment and wind up with a non-nullable list. So, proceeding from the wrong point includes, for either reason, a wrong assessment or a nonreliable item. Using a nonreliable item, you see, to oppose – and that's going to wind you up in the soup.

Then of course, there is this one. There is auditing the case in the presence of tremendous missed withholds. And that's going to louse you up, but believe me, that is the rarer thing. That is a rarer thing than you would at first think. You start in a session, you pull "nearly found outs" on the pc, that's enough, man, just like you'd handle it in ruds. Don't go using missed withholds to comb the pc apart in the body of the session, because the missed withhold is the fact that the item isn't there. Now, you could drive him round the bend. He'll feel like he has missed withholds! He'll be certain he has got a missed withhold. You'll be certain of it, too! But the missed withhold is the missing item and that missing item may never
arrive on the list. You understand then that missing your missed withhold does play a role in this, but it actually plays no further a role than getting your rudiments in.

That is getting in your beginning rudiments. Make sure your pc doesn't... isn't being audited with missed withholds and you won't run into this one at all, because you don't suddenly wind up in the middle of the session. In one case out of a thousand the pc may suddenly say, "Oh my God, I'd forgotten it myself, you nearly found out I'd robbed the bank." But the funny part of it is he'd just remembered it and he told you. It isn't something you have to dredge for.

Now, your third source of travail, trouble, upset, is the incomplete list. Now, you see this incomplete list. I do wish and I must get hold of some of the old 3D Criss Cross folders to show you a real incomplete list. Man, they are championship lists; they are just marvelous. You've ju... I've looked at them and I've laughed to myself since – at it and so on because they'll have something like twelve items, you see, and about every third time over the list one of them would go out, which resulted in every item on the list having tremendous strings of slant marks, tremendous strings of slant marks, long things and of course, they wind up with exactly nothing.

Now, your incomplete list is in contest, however, with the non-nullable list, which introduces an interesting point of confusion for you. Now, it is a rule that a list must be nullable. That is the rule. And that is a stable datum. The list you get must be nullable, or you unload. What you do with a non-nullable list, which is eventually proven to be non-nullable, is you just unload off that list. You go back then and do a new first step. You don't do anything else that's fancy or try to patch this up, you just throw your blowout patches, and all of that kind of thing, throw them in the garbage can, you've got no use for them. You can spend the rest of your life trying to figure out why something is, why the thing didn't null out to that. You can drive yourself batty. You get down to the end of a list, you didn't find any item on the list and the pc all of a sudden in a frantic state of spurt thinks they're guilty for not having put the reliable item on the list, so they start giving you spates of reliable items.

Well, go ahead, put them down – well, go ahead and put all of them. They'll give you five, six, eight, ten variations on the last item that was in on the list and they just keep fading and folding up, and – oh, you can do this forever. You can come down to the last item on the list, it doesn't have any action on it to amount to anything, but you decide that you'd better represent it, and get yourself some place, don't you see? You decide your assessment might have been wrong and you missed the boat in doing your nulling, that something was in and you missed the read, something like that, so you decide you're going to do the whole list again, oh, that's just currying dead horses, man.

The proper action on Routine 2-12 is when you wind up at the crossroads of nowhere, the only map you have left is the step one of 2-12, whatever you're using for the first list, whatever should now come up as the first list, don't you see. That is always your guiding post. Now you can waste more time and do less for the pc, in all cases, by trying to patch up something you believe must be pursuing from an error, and the more time you use patching that up the more trouble you're going to get into.
The thing to do, if you get nowhere, straighten out the pc, straighten out the pc, put in your mid ruds for the list that you did, you see and so on, explain the situation to the pc, go back and take off again. You see. No crash will find – wind up fatal. That's quite interesting. The only time you can get the pc into serious trouble is you're listing a list and the pc is kind of sick and you don't go on and list the sen out of the thing, or the pc is terrified or something like this, and you don't list that sen out. Then you're in trouble. And then the only remedy is just keep listing when the pc feels horrible, just keep listing till he doesn't and then if you can't null that list even yet, and so forth, just unload and go back to your first step. I'd say that's the only thing that I would do if I found I was on an un-nulable list, so I'd ask the pc, "How do you feel?" and the pc says, "Oh, my God, ohhhhhhhhh.

You say, "All right, who or what would oppose a waterbuck?" see. And after a while, "How do you feel?" "Oh, I feel much better." "All right, you got some sen, anything like that?" "Yeah, I feel a little bit dizzy." Oh, I'll settle for that, to hell with it. Unload. Realize you're carrying a dead horse that whole length of time. You got hold of his bridle and you're dragging him down the road with one hand, you see.

Recognize what you're doing; you're not about to get an item. It is not that... a pc can turn on sen and you can get an item, but this list is already proving un-nulable, non-nulable; the list is not going to be nulled. It can't be nulled. Every time you try to null it, dirty needle, $bzzzz$, $bzzzz$, $bzzzz$, $bzzzz$, $bzzzz$. Oh, to hell with it. See what I mean?

Now, when you run into that ask the pc how the pc feels, and if the pc feels ill, sick, dizzy, terrified, furious, misemotional, any of these connotations, or if the pc has pain, why, just list it till the pc feels better and then get off of that dead horse – you're not even on him, see – and go on back to your first step. See, that's a very simple adjudication you can make.

So what you should do is keep fully in mind that a list must be nulable. A list must be nulable. And now a nulable list is one where items just go out very easily, and the needle doesn't dirty up to amount to anything and usually can be put back in by just saying to the pc offhandedly, "Is there something there you wanted to give me or something you want to tell me?" You understand? Just that, just that. And it cleans up, and once in a blue moon there's been a jam-up. You yourself should recognize these jam-ups and what they do to rudiments.

You've said – this thing has got "a helper" see, that's the item you're reading – and you've gotten cross-eyed in the thing somehow or another and you've put "a scalper" and the pc dimly remembers that this is wrong, and you say, "a helper" – you should have said, "a helper," you say, "a scalper," and a scalper has nothing to do with this list. It's "Who or what would be pleasing to mother," or something like that, you know. And "scalper," the pc says. And if you happen to look up and see a pc looking dazed or upset and your needle has gone dirty and so forth, there's always a chance that you made a mistake on the list somehow or another in reading it, and you've muddied it up, well, you go and get your mid ruds in and get your protest off of it or your mistake off the thing and keep on going, you'll find the thing will keep on nulling.

You can go on nulling this thing, you get on down to about four items and they're all giving a dirty read, and you don't have a rock slam on anything. Well, that didn't mean you got skunked, not on these light, surface readings which we're taking here on 2-12. You can't
do anything with these. Well, just ask the pc, "Does the first one" – that's on an opposition list – "does the first one oppose a mother, does the second one oppose a mother and the third one oppose a mother?" And the pc finally says, "Ah, ah, oh yes, the second one, ha, ha." And you go and you look at this mother, and it's evaporated, there's no read on "mother," there's no read on any of it. That's the packaging step which we are not particularly covering at this time.

You'll find out that blew up. Well, you've finished, that's it. That's how to get rid of the read off the last three or four when they've all evaporated; that all comes under packaging.

So that is not part of the nullability of a list. When I'm talking about the nullability of a list I'm talking about being able to proceed down this list, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, one call you see, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, in, out, out, out, in. Whenever I strike a "in" and then an "in" and then a "in," and then a "in," I get in my mid ruds. Imagine my embarrassment occasionally to find out that those three in a line were all hot. But there'd be no telling.

Now, its very, very good practice to occasionally, and I'd say once a – once a page or something like this, ask "Suppress." You see, a complete list is going out just skit, skit, skit, skit, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, you see? And a suppressed list will also go out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, you know. So it's good practice, it's good practice to ask the pc, "On this list is there anything you've suppressed?" And you just – you don't take him by sudden storm, you just – you're running your meter and you say, "Well now, on – I'm going to ask the Suppress button." And you say, "On this list is there anything you've suppressed?" and you say, "That's clean," and you carry on. Got the idea?

Don't even bother to prepcheck it. See, you don't do anything with it, you just ask it, because if it's that lightly suppressed the butt on will read and if it's suppressed then you clean that suppress off of it. And then you'll find out that you're fairly safe. Now do you go back and go over anything because you found the Suppress button out? I haven't been and I haven't gotten in trouble. Usually carry on.

A nullable list, that becomes a stable datum with you. And therefore a study of what makes lists non-nullable gives you a point of orientation from which to study assessment. You're trying to achieve a nullable list. Well, if the pc's got beaucoup missed withholds, you're not going to get a nullable list.

In fact, you're not going to be getting an assessable anything. That's going to produce lots of dirty needles. If the list proceeds from a wrong source whether it was by the first assessment or because what you're opposing has no charge on it, you're going to get a dirty needle list. And that's going to be not nullable. And your incompleteness of the list is going to produce a non-nullability. Your judgment is only invited at this one point, is how long does the list have to be to be complete? And that's a question like how long is a piece of string? How high is the sky?

Now the more jammed up the pc is, which we'll go into in a moment, the more jammed up and messed up is the pc, the longer the pc's going to go with the list. The list is directly proportional to the difficulties the pc has. Therefore to lay down a rule that you must produce a rock slam in exactly so many items is a little bit adventurous. That is again only an
indicator. After a while even on the pc you're doing, you say after a while, "There should have been a rock slam here someplace. I'll carry it on a little bit further." Well, how much is a little bit further? We know this pc is not really producing very much of anything. You know, I mean, identification is fantastic on this case. Ahh, I don't know you might list 150, 175 on some very strange, peculiar case; this would be the odd case, you see.

And all of a sudden there's a rock slam, wow, wow, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, see? And this other case is not so superidentified in the bank and you soon learn that if this case doesn't produce a rock slam in the first fifteen or twenty you've had it. So you see, cases vary. It's actually case density, and that density isn't even tone arm density, unfortunately; I wish it were. Just because a case is a high tone arm case is no particular reason why they're a totally identified case, you see.

Mass is simply mass and although mass is also produced by identification, that isn't the only source of mass, so therefore we don't have a reliable indicator in the tone arm. You get that? This fellow has an item called "solid steel" and that's a reliable item. Man, that's really reliable. And when you get anywhere in the vicinity of this item, or if you're sitting on this item for several lists before you finally arrive at the thing, you're going to get one of the staggerest highest tone arms you ever wanted to consult. And all of a su... there isn't anything wrong with the case.

And all of a sudden you're getting items, everything's going along fine, the pc's feeling better and then one day you're saying, "Who or what would oppose the government?" And he says, "Solid steel." And actually at the moment he says this you'll see this arm start to come down; then it will come down and down and down and finally when you get the item out and pair it up and so on, it goes, phooof! Clear read. Got the idea?

It happens to be a very massive item. So the tone arm is not an indicator of how dug in a case is, which is unfortunate. Now, we have a case that starts out in a total apathy of Clear read; this is the dead thetan case spoke of in E-Meter Essentials. Now, this character will require – and let's get into the rest of this thing – this case is going to require represent list after represent list, assessment after assessment, represent list after represent list! There are no slams anywhere, you're just listing, listing, listing, listing! The case is feeling a little bit better and case is feeling a little bit better and you finally decide that's a dead horse and you go on to the next one and you list that one all the way down, the case is feeling a little bit better, and you couldn't get anywhere with that one.

You go on to the next one and so forth and you'll see all of a sudden the thing you're assessing from is beginning to go live. In other words your Scientology List One is getting hotter and hotter and hotter. You've actually done list after list after list and you didn't get anything on any of them.

Now, all of that is very interesting, but what are the mechanics involved with all this, and why? Well frankly, it's the invention of a new therapy. Although we've had it for a long time we haven't recognized it as a therapy, and I finally spotted this thing for what it was. And, I didn't recognize it completely even when I gave it the definition the first time, which is: listing is auditing. Listing is auditing.
Well, I knew that listing on a goal was auditing, and that was for sure auditing, but how about the rest of this, how about the rest of this? Just listing is auditing. Simple. Listing is auditing. And let's not worry about goals or anything else. Just listing is auditing. And listing an opposition list to anything that rock slams, anything that rock slams, that continues to rock slam, it's a reliable item definition, listing an opposition list to that, is auditing. That's auditing.

Well, how much listing is auditing and what is this new process that's called listing? Well, you just sit there and list. Well, how is it circumscribed? You've got an E-Meter, the pc can get a reality on something that will read on the E-Meter. All right, he can get his highest reality on that which rock slams on the E-Meter. The more read on the E-Meter, the more capable of reality on that he is. If for these purposes you call it a reality meter, you've got it made.

Well, I think you'd find out if you haunted a hospital that you would be doing better with your meter than they were doing with their scalpels. It's taking a lot less time and you didn't get – nobody's getting their hands bloody. Now, that's a great deal of benefit, of course, to some parts of the society – laundries and that sort of thing, but it doesn't do anybody else
any good. Now, let's do it without a meter – let's do it without a meter. Let's take it at its earli-
est gradient.

We say to this individual, "What's bothering you?" "Cough, well," he says, "cough, cough, got lung trouble, cough, cough." You say, "Well, anybody say you had lung trouble you were talking to?" "Well yeah, the doctors all say so." "Well, what trouble do you think you have?" "Oh well, it, ahhhh, it's my back actually." That's interest. You find out he'll go on and on and talk about his back. So you could assess it without a meter by interest. And you say, "Who or what represents a back to you?" And you'll find out he'll spew out items down the chute man, they just avalanche out of him. And you'd make him well. And there's with no meter.

Now, the thing that combines interest and reality is the rock slam. So that if we really did a searching one, searching for the pc's interest and where it lay, and we had him on the meter, when we finally hit that point you're going to get a rock slam. Now he not only has a high reality on this, he also has a great deal of interest in this and along with these two things it is jammed up like a Sherman tank hitting a concrete bulkhead. It is cram-jam packed. You're looking at a ridge. Now everything is identified with this. He will tell you, "Actually if people in the world took better care of their backs." What's this tell you? This tells you the fourth dynamic is collapsed on his back!

Gayelord Hauser, you could run him for a day or two on the subject of food because he's got everything identified with food, don't you see? He's very interested in it, selling it like mad, attributes everything to food. Well, what's food represent to you? Oh man, he wouldn't even be able to not answer your question! [laughter] Now, the second that you hit this button you get an automatic release, and you think the pc's thinking something when he's releasing this, but he is not thinking anything when he is releasing this; he's just shoveling it out, man.

Now, I can give you an indicator for a nullable list. It comes out with interest and posi-
tiveness. So we find another rule – this is a rule: That a list must not be continued that is be-
ing invalidated by the pc. Now that is overlisting. There are several symptoms of overlisting. In R2-12 you run into the first one and skip it, which is comm lag. Who cares. But it's the be-
ginning of an overlist. We don't care about it, however. You would if you were listing goals, but not with R2-12.

The second one is: He is groping for the exact name for it. You're now getting near the danger point, but once more we're not interested in this in R2-12. This we can force and be all right. The one we can't force is the one the manifestation which immediately follows those other two manifestations. See, it's the cycle of manifestations: You see the pc there, the pc first starts to comm lag, then he starts to get the exact word for it and he hasn't quite got it, and the next line that he goes into is invalidation. If your pc is invalidating items then you are not taking them off the front of the cash register, you're trying to pull them out of the back of the machine or something.

And it just tells you that there's no list, the items of which are being invalidated by the pc, will ever prove to be a nullable list. Now, what do we mean by invalidate? Well, it's as faint as this, "waterbuck, well I don't know whether that would do that or not – ah, tiger, no, I don't think a tiger should belong on the list, let's see. It really doesn't seem too real to me that
a waterbuck would belong on the list but you say go on listing, so all right, game warden, game warden, game warden, you can put it on the list... I guess.”

Any such manifestation as that is leading to a non-nullable list. If the list is not nullable at the time you get there it might have been nullable and he's now just invalidating. Now you can go back before he started invalidating and take that much of the list and see if it's nullable. But you've sure overlisted. Don't pay any attention to this grope around for the right word, don't pay any attention to the comm lags. We are getting very esoteric. You can pay attention to those when listing goals but not in R2-12, see, it's getting too esoteric.

The pc is indifferently in-session; this or that or the other thing's going wrong. You can't be that nice. But for sure if the pc is invalidating and being unsure of what item is on, just recognize you're trying to pull them out of the back of the cash register and it's just not going to wind up in the GPM. The most uncertain person in the world when listing from a proper source will be the most certain person you ever saw on listing. So you're looking for this old factor that we used to have over here in England, certainty. You're looking for this factor. Interest, certainty, rock slams – these things are beautiful indicators.

And a list then is not nullable if it does not produce a rock slam, and a list is also not nullable if it is being delivered with great uncertainty by the pc. So the big factors that you look for are no rock slam and uncertainty. And then if you're lucky and you got out of bed that morning and you've made your peace properly with the church and a lot of other things, why, you will get a list that will wind up in an item.

But we're actually not terribly fascinated with whether this thing on R2-12 winds up with an item or not. I've just given you an example here of how you could cure somebody's back. Well, you get a lot of cases that are below rock slam; you have to audit them quite a while before they rock slam. All you do with such a case is, you just keep assessing. Taking the most you've got, doing your best to get a complete list, you never make a list that is apparently going to result in anything, and they've got no rock slams, pc's interest is, well, it's good in session but out of session it might have collapsed, see. In session they're going, "Pow, pow, pow," and "Bang, bang, bang," and "I've just this," and "Pow and bang, bang," and "Yes, yes, and bowwow-wow, yes, yes, bow, bow, bow, bow," they get out of session and, "I don't get any gains out of this; I don't know what the hell you're talking about. Totally unreal to me."

See, you can expect some kind of a manifestation like that. You don't care what the manifestation was. You get what I mean? You don't care what the out-of-session manifestation of the pc is ever on R2-12. You're only interested in his in-session manifestation. He's sailing, he's interested, he's this, man, you're sailing. So he falls on his head and develops a cornea of the thrombosis and a lumbosis of the cornea and – after the session, who cares? I say you're not interested in out of sessionness, because if you're going on auditing him and you've had to quit in the middle of an opposition list, you can expect some of the fanciest somatics you ever heard of. All you want to do is complete each cycle to the best of your ability. You understand this? Complete each cycle to the best of your ability. If you're satisfied, that's it.

Pc can turn on fantastic coldness. The room could be eighty-five degrees and the pc is just shaking to pieces with chill, cold, and you had to end the session and they go around for
the next twenty-four hours shivering their nuts and bolts loose, and you give them a fancy
goal the next day, bang, folds up, and the list is not a nullable list. I don't care; it ran out this
cold. You get what I mean?

See, we care nothing about that. We care nothing about actually whether the list was a
nullable list or not, we did it and it did something for the pc. We did that and may have tried
to the best of our ability to make it a nullable list. We tried to the best of our ability to get an
item, but if we did not get an item at any time, this is not reason for auditor suicide, D of P
criticism or anything else. You should get that fairly straight because you're going to find pcs
that'll go fifteen lists off of List One, fifteen of them without producing a single R/S. And then
all of a sudden produce one on the list itself. You find your reliable item was Scientology.
You're all set to give up. And the next time you assessed, you just said, "Scientology" and it
began to rock slam and then it didn't stop rock slamming either.

You see what you're heading for? In the first place you're doing a tremendously thera-
peutic action. That's the first thing that you've got to drill into the heads of people who are
doing R2-12. No matter what you do, if you do it anywhere near right, you've got a therapeu-
tic action which is marvelous. Going to make the pc feel fine. You just keep it up and do it to
the best of your ability. Now, that's what we expect of R2-12, just what I just said, see. Now,
if we also wind up on that represent list with a reliable item that just goes on slamming, and it
slams like mad – marvelous, and we take off from that and we do an opposition list and that
thing winds up in a... You see, that's already good that we got a reliable item, that's pretty
darn good, you see, that doesn't happen every time you do it but, there it is, see. Gorgeous. All
right. And then we take it out on the opposition list and so help me Pete, the exact reliable
item shows up on the opposition list that should have been there, and it all packages up and it
all goes bzzzttt, phump. And the pc says, "Wow!" you know, "Wowwww," see. That's pretty
marvelous. He'll feel like he's going Clear and he is, if you kept up that sort of thing.

Now, how often should you expect to get both items? Well, this is a factor which is
monitored by the accuracy of the auditor. The accuracy of the auditor. An auditor who makes
an inaccurate – inaccurate assessments, who doesn't have his pc in-session, who is making
mistakes – I mean, making mistakes in his session form, and he's Q-and-Aing and he's doing
things, he's got the pc on protest. The pc thinks of a lot of items but doesn't put them on the
list and the auditor never finds out that the pc was thinking of and suppressing items. That's
pretty corny.

An auditor should be able to find out things like this without big Qs and As and upset-
ting the pc. An auditor who does those things is going to find far fewer reliable items and
packages than an auditor who is sitting right there on the ball, bangity-bangity-bang. Now, for
an auditor who is definitely on the ball and doing everything right and using good judgment
and being careful about the thing and doing his stuff accurately and easily and so forth, for
that auditor how often – how often should you be dead on the beam? About fifty percent. This
is your perfect auditor, because that fifty percent is the pc's bank.

And the pc's bank has been a crazy quilt for a long time, wadded up and thrown in a
dark closet and the things that start to lead in from A to B actually go from A to Z, and it –
everything looks exactly as though this course from C to D – you couldn't miss on this course,
and you suddenly find yourself at R or G. Now why is that? That's the A = A = A = A factor which we'll talk about a little more later. So if you're batting 50 percent, in other words, half of the represent lists you do wind up with a reliable item – and that means, that means you're a pretty doggone good auditor – and if 50 percent of the opposition lists which you do after you got the first thing wind up with a reliable item and therefore you wind up with a package, man, you're a gee-whizzer from a way back. You're good. You're good. But what should be your expectancy about that?

Now what about what about the guy who's terrible? You know, he picks up the meter and you're there as the Instructor running the co-audit or whatever it is being run in, you don't know whether you ought to let him pick it up or not, you know, because he's sort of picked it up like this, you know. Well, about 10 percent of the time he will wind up with a reliable item. He had to make enough mistakes to equalize it out, about 10 percent of the time he'll wind up with a reliable item, and about 10 percent of the oppositions he does will wind up with a reliable item and somebody sooner or later will have to straighten out the case. But the odd part is – but the odd part of it all is, the case will feel better and be making gains. That's why it's a safe process and that's why it's been released to the HCA/HPA level of auditing.

Now, of course you guys who know your business and who can audit and that sort of thing, why I expect 50 percent. See, I expect 50 percent just like that. I mean, you should be able to deal that out pretty good, without too much trouble. Except on pcs who are obviously so dug in that a tremendous amount of action of representing has to be done before they can tell the auditor from the pc. You'd be surprised, but these people don't even know they're in an auditing session. And you do enough represent on them they eventually differentiate, and they say, "Ohhh, I'm over here and he's over there and ohhh, what do you know."

On such a pc, well, I might forgive you and give you – let you drop to 45 percent. Now, that's about the way a nullable list goes. That's actually the key data of nullable lists. Then when you look over the lecture, your notes, I think you will find there are not too many oddball variables along this line, that they're fairly easily assimilable. Now, if any more data turns up which are – which make rules out of anything, I'll sure be the first to let you know.

Thank you.
Okay, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 29 Nov. AD 12. And going now into some more of the theory and discussion of Routine 2-12.

Routine 2-12 bridges over into 3GA Criss Cross, Step 4 of Routine 3-21 very easily. But the purpose of finding items in Routine 2-12 is to cure the present time problems which might be impinged upon the GPM.

Where you have an individual with a great, big gorgeous fixation on the National Insurance Company and how it must be destroyed before the end of the world can take place, he will continue to be fixated on the National Insurance Company.

Now, what you don't recognize, that he is looking at something which represents to him one-half of a dumbbell package of the GPM. And he will never look at the other side. He will never say, "Who am I?" He will only continue to say, "Damn the National Insurance Company."

Well, this appears very reasonable to everybody because everybody knows that the National Insurance Company has been doing all kinds of frauds and swindles and so forth. And everybody gets so reasonable about this that unless you really bear down on the new auditor, he makes a very fundamental error in doing 2-12 – makes a very fundamental error. He does an "of course," and ignores that thing reading on an assessment.

Let's take somebody, who is having an awful lot of trouble with her husband, being audited by somebody who has an awful lot of trouble with her husband. And we will get one of these reasonable "of course" situations. And the funny part of it is that this auditor, who has the duplicate problem of the pc, will say "of course" and not pay any attention to it because it doesn't seem aberrative to her and will ignore it.

This is most manifest when you can't find – you get rock slammers that can't find rock slams on rock slammers. See, this is the mechanism behind it, it's an "of course."

Of course everybody would be mad at a Scientology organization, you see? They both slam on the same thing, you see, naturally. So that – we needn't pay any attention to that. And this oddly enough, aside from all the mechanics of it will be your most fruitful source of error, is this "of course," not this reasonableness. We're only interested in the mechanics of the thing, not the ethnic difficulties.

So we have this fellow mad at the National Insurance Company audited by somebody who knows that the National Insurance Company is no good.
And they're going to assess everything in the world but the National Insurance Company and they're going to miss. You'll find this will happen, and when you're using this in Academies, and so forth, it will happen all too often – the reasonableness of it.

Now, what the actual mechanic of the situation is, that's all we're interested in. If this fellow has his attention, his overtness, fixated on any present time thing, then we assume that that present time thing represents a piece of the GPM. And that hidden and out of sight is it's opposing piece. This person never asks himself, "Who or what would oppose the National Insurance Company." That he never asks, because in the first place he is Joe Jones and he is opposing the National Insurance Company and he's keyed in the terminal arsonist and the opp term is insurers. See, it's a nice game and it's buried right there in the GPM.

But this thing is so keyed in to present time that this individual is being audited continuously with a present time problem. In session he always – some part of some session his thinkingness will fixate on the National Insurance Company. He'll compare all this as to how it relates to the National Insurance Company. He will want to get well so that he can be powerful enough to blow the top of the building off. All of his auditing is being coned in toward this.

In other words, his fixation on present time is such that he never goes backtrack. He's trying to audit himself up to something or other. In other words, he's dramatizing the companion dumbbell, see? The other ball there that is opposing that thing, insurers.

Now, the National Insurance Company is not part of the bank. It is a key-in. It is a substitute for, a lock on, this GPM thing that keeps it in continuous restimulation.

Therefore, because one side of it's in restimulation, hidden and out of sight we have the pc's terminal. And there's the pc's terminal. Pc never recognizes it. Every time he strikes a box of matches he always holds the match too long or drops it on your favorite carpet. Or he's always in trouble, one way or the other. You see him with burned fingers. And he strikes a match and it ignites the matchbox and he drops that on your carpet. And he lights a gas stove by turning on the oven full blast and then he looks around the kitchen for a while for some matches. [laughter]

You see this bird day after day, month in and month out, without his eyebrows. [laughter] But in spite of this occurring all the time, all the time, all the time, he will never dream, think of, assume, nothing, about this terminal arsonist. And yet there it is in full restimulation.

Now, your little tab that shows up is his dislike of the National Insurance Company. And as you're running "Who or what would bilk people" or some question, he puts down the National Insurance Company. And as you go down the line with an assessment you suddenly find yourself looking at an item – National Insurance Company. And this thing rock slams, which means fixation, overts against, withholds from, games condition, that's what that rock slam means. It means the pc has a terrific reality on this thing. And it means the pc will shell out items on this thing like a Las Vegas blackjack dealer.

So there he is, that item, National Insurance Company. Well, we test it out and we find out when we say to him "National Insurance Company," that he turns on sen. We say, "National Insurance Company," he sort of gets gritty toothed, you know. And he sort of at the
same time feels a little dizzy, feels a little tipped over. Anchor points seem to be kind of out of balance. Things begin to go into motion in his vicinity – sen.

So, this thing still slamming nicely, we say, "Who or what would oppose the National Insurance Company?" Man, we get a beauty. This list goes bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang, and finally item number 289 – or something like that – he puts on the list his arsonist. We go ahead. The list is obviously complete, reacts to it because it's nullable and we go down and we null the thing out. And there we're staring in the face arsonist, and it's rock slamming like mad.

All right. Now, if National Insurance Company was a reliable item you would just go directly at it. But supposing National Insurance Company is just a tick-tick-tick-tick on the assessment when we finally find it, doing a represent or an assessment of a represent list. And we do a represent and it gets down to insurers, see. Then that will slam.

All right, the final end of it is, is regardless of whether we had to represent it to get the rock slam or whether it was just rock slamming in the first place, we've got a package. And this package means that we have found the two ends of the dumbbell. And this thing will discharge. Now, it won't necessarily evaporate totally. But usually if it's that close to present time we can count on it going absolutely numb – nothing. It'll wash right out as he begins to think this over.

There are other things we could do with these if they kept on slamming and so forth. Why, we could represent the slamming items and they'd lead us deeper into the GPM. We can do other things with these. We could even list goals against any – either of these reliable items, you see. We've got other uses for these. We're not interested in those uses in R2-21 – R2-12 rather. Only in 3-21 are we interested in that, which is Step 4A, 3GA Criss Cross. So our main concern in doing 2-21 [2-12] is that there are two pieces of the GPM.

Now, why is it called a GPM? It's called a Goals Problem Mass. It is a mass which is composed of identities which oppose identities. And they are so delicately faced against each other on the track that they don't slip. They're right there and they finally compose a great big, gaudy, black mass.

And you are going to have pcs tell you, "Oh these black masses that Ron talks about and so forth, probably he has an oppterm religion or something like that. And he probably – black masses," so on or something or other ... Then, "Nobody's ever seen one of these things." After a while, all of a sudden this – all this phenomena will start showing up for the pc.

I had somebody tell me that, "Well, I sort of parted company with your work back in 1952 when you started talking about ridges and things and I had no reality on that," years later all of a sudden collide with a ridge. They are black, they are round, they do oppose each other. In other words, these are not allegorical or metaphorical actions. They do have mass. And the anatomy of a problem is item versus item, postulate versus postulate. It's a game, in other words, where you have two sides equally opposed.

A problem does not become a problem as long – until one is unable to overwhelm and won't be overwhelmed. In other words, a problem is a matter of balance. You don't find peo-
ple having problems with the government of Russia. In Russia you have no problems with the government. You are simply completely overwhelmed all the time. No problem.

You talk to a Russian, "Do you have any problems with your government?"

"No, no, no, never have any problems with the government. Fine government, fine government, fine government. What other government is there?"

"You mean you're free? How do you stand it?" You know, you find all kinds of weird arguments.

Now, in that case you find some girl who has won in a marriage. Marriage is no problem to her. Got her husband completely overwhelmed. He cooks dinner, he earns the money, takes care of the children, everything. And she never lifts a foot, sits in the dining room, sits in the living room eating bonbons. She's got that licked. Marriage is no problem to her. You see here's your case of overwhelm or be overwhelmed. Well, that doesn't make a problem.

No, her husband works and makes money. And she works and makes money. And the husband doesn't like housework but thinks the other party should do it. And she doesn't like housework and thinks the other party should do it. She likes to go to movies and the husband likes to sit home and read books. They are more or less of equal strength; Saturdays she wins the fisticuffs, Sundays he does.

This thing is never resolved – never resolved. Nobody ever overwhelms anybody. It goes on and on and on. If you spoke to either one of them and you said "a problem?" – they would say "wives" or "husbands" or "marriage," something like that. See, it's got to be an equally balanced affair. That's the point I'm making here.

Well, now, don't underestimate the age of a pair of items in a – in the Goals Problem Mass. This thing – this whole thing is built up, basically, on the alter-is-ness of goals. So you say at once, "Well, why don't we just find the pc's goal and then everything will resolve."

Well, unfortunately that is not the case. Because even if you found the pc's goal on the bulk of the pcs, he has still got two items which are present time problems. And the goal doesn't instantly and immediately resolve those items. And so you're trying to audit somebody with a screaming present time problem, even though you have this person's goal. And you'll find out this goal just doesn't ever list to free needle. And he just doesn't ever go Clear. So that's why. Now, these bypassed items, and so forth, are pinned into PT one way or the other and they're beyond the pc's reach or confront.

So here – here is what we get. We get this equally balanced pair, one against the other. And being an equally balanced pair there's no slip. Neither one of them has ever overwhelmed the other one. But the age of this, how long has this been going on? Well, it may have been going on for trillions and trillions of years on a single pair. And the game just before that – all based on the same goal – is another pair and it has gone on for trillions. And there's another pair before that. And how long has that game gone on? Trillions. And there's ... See?

Some pc who tells you that he has totally accumulated his aberration in this lifetime because you've been mean to him – never been done and it never will be done. It takes a long time to get in that kind of condition. Takes a long time.
Now, let's take this one that's right up at the top: arsonist and insurers as a package. Take this one right up to the top of the bag of walnuts. This thing is a billion years old, see, or a trillion. And boy is it massive and boy is it beefy and boy has he lived a lot of lives in that pair. Lots of types of lives. Why, this guy has even sunk so low as to become an employee of insurers. Had the most seniest life of all. [laughter]

He's been anything and everything, you see. But these items are cumulative. So you have two principal valences, perfectly balanced, one against the other. One is thrusting just as hard as the other is thrusting. Neither one of them are overwhelming the other. And to those are accumulated thousands of additional little ones. And those things also oppose those things. And you can just – it's just almost endless, numerically. You get staggering figures out of this sort of thing.

Now, this – this composition of the GPM would be very nice if it just consisted of a dumbbell and then below that a slightly bigger dumbbell. And below that a slightly bigger dumbbell and below that a slightly bigger dumbbell. And there were sixty dumbbells in numbers – sixty pairs – and that was the whole lot of it. And then we went into the second goal below that and then there were forty-two pairs that went into the second goal, you see, and so on. And this was all laid out and perfectly plotted against the time track and so on. They'd be very easy to find. But they aren't plotted that way. If it was all straightened out it would be plotted that way.

But this pc is a case of scrunch. The characteristic of the reactive mind is instantaneousness. There is no time in the reactive mind. This happens to be one of the highest characteristics of a thetan. Actually a thetan has no time. And the lower scale mockery of that particular characteristic is no time, everything in this instant.

Now, you've got the whole of this Goals Problem Mass, to the pc, is dated this instant. It could be sixty trillion years' worth of this instant. There is no time differential in this thing. Therefore when you null, you say one of these things to the pc, it reacts on the meter as this instant. One of the reasons we call them instant reads. Soon as the thought gets across it reacts. How could it possibly react? Well that's the marvelous thing about it. It's just the instantaneousness of the reactive bank.

The analytical mind would require a lot of time. So you'll find out that your latent reads are analytical reads. The more time is connected to a read or the more time is apparent in reads – and this is only a rough approximation, not a hard and fast rule – why the more analytical it would be.

But you don't find slow reads on the reactive bank. Now, the motto of the reactive bank is A=A=A=A, à la Book One. And according to the Dianetic Axiom, time is the single source of human aberration – and it is. You have this A – prime thing that is the most aberrative about it is the time. So that time equals time equals time equals time; 1870 equals 1920 equals 1736 equals the year zero. They're all the same instant – not the same year. The pc isn't confused about these things. On this level of reactivity they are all the same instant! And a hundred trillion years ago is this instant. And everything is this instant. It's the most gorgeous, instantaneous current reaction that you ever wanted to have anything to do with.
Well, if time is all the same, what differentiation can we find that we can work on? The differentiation we can find is in reality on. Actually, in theory, every time you say *boo* to the pc the whole reactive bank reacts. Every item in the reactive bank reacts. But this is one of these "absolutes are unobtainable" and it's a nonsensical statement. You see, it's like "you stamp against the Earth, the Earth stamps against you," you know. It's this type of statement. In actual fact, the situation as we look at the meter is only saved by the reality of the pc – saved by the reality of the pc – because the meter reads on what the pc has reality on, not what the pc is momentarily in.

As far as the GPM is concerned – you see, there's free track running alongside of the GPM and the pc can move up and down that track – and Dianetics is the study of that free track. We're now studying the GPM; we're not studying engrams. What we're studying is covered in Book One under valences and circuits. And all that talk about circuits in one chapter there, those are all items right out of the GPM. They are right there in Book One.

I was aware of this thing but not to the extent that it pervaded the mind. And not to the extent that the free track can be neglected. You can do a lot for somebody running free track, but it's this instantaneous track. See, free track is timed.

The reality of the pc is governed by the pc's tolerance of force. So your pc is not recognizing that which is closest to him in the moment of time or any of these other things. It's not that one thing reads because it is later than the other or earlier than the other. It's a thing reads because it most closely approximates the pc's limit of reality on force.

And you can always run against the ceiling of that limit; just the ceiling against that reality on force. And that ceiling is marked by the rock slam. That's how much force can this pc bear to confront? You'll find out a person is as sane, not as he uses force, but he is as sane as he can tolerate force. A direct relationship between force and sanity.

You start running around banning bombs. You run into a very interesting proposition. You're not going to get very much support because the bulk of the population of Earth doesn't believe in them. There's too much force contained in an atomic bomb and they just can't confront it so it just isn't real.

Actually, if the population were capable of tolerating force they would have long since have torn both the governments of the United States and Russia to pieces, limb from limb. The reason wars can occur is because people can't tolerate force. So they have no reality on what they're doing. They don't know how much force they're going to turn loose. It's an irresponsible action.

So a sanity is very far from measurable on the degree that an individual can throw out force – not handle force but throw out force, see? The amount of force that an individual will let loose is no index of his sanity. But the amount of force that the individual can confront or tolerate is a direct measurement of his sanity.

And as the individual has come down the track through the GPM he has been less and less capable of tolerating force. And so the PT terminals and oppterms that are stuck right in present time are usually quite insurmountable to the pc until you've audited him with 2-12. Why?
Well, all preclears suffer from some sort of a reaction like this: They think there is more to it than there is. It is inevitable. That's one of the – one of the guiding idiocies of a thetan. A thetan has several nuttinesses. He was born that way. And one of the things he was born with is just the – he thinks there is more to it than there is. He's always trying to make more of it than he can make out of it.

Now, you'll have many a pc – you've had this experience – you've had some pc sitting there – his pc is saying, "Oh well, let's see now, I'm trying to get off this withhold and it must be pretty bad," he's saying to himself. "And if I just get off this big withhold," and so forth, "I'd smooth out the needle. And I'm just always having to have mid ruds put in on me. And I must have done something very, very bad and I must have some big, dramatic withhold of some kind or another."

He goes on and on and on and on and on with this nonsense. And then eventually says, "Well, I noticed your tie was crooked," and the needle straightens out. You get what I'm – what I'm driving at here.

Now, this – auditors do this sometimes, they will hound the pc trying to pick up the missed withhold because the pc's got a dirty needle. And they – this girl, why heavens, she must have had all sorts of clandestine second dynamic withholds of various kinds and considerations which are catastrophic and fantastic and so forth. And the auditor is in there trying to straighten out with magnitude of dramatic effect, what in essence, would straighten out simply with a confrontation of something rather minor.

You've sat there sometimes, I'm sure, and had been certain that this pc must have done something gigantic. And if you were lucky you eventually got what the pc did and it was very often neither gigantic nor not gigantic. And sometimes the pc upset you by giving you something gigantic. But the point – but the point I'm making here is it bore – actually the amount of dramatic content had little or nothing to do with the aberrative effect apparently on the needle. It just didn't have that relationship.

Well, similarly, the only thing that will react on the needle is what the pc can get reality on. It isn't what's there or what isn't there.

In this lifetime this pc has got very little drama. That I can assure you. But now we go into the GPM; I'm afraid that life was not quite as represented. This person is putting on a marvelous show. They go down and they always, inevitably are the first volunteer on the scene to sell poppies on Poppy Day. And they're nice to stray cats. And they do this and they're all subscribing to this and that and – crutches for aged policemen, and all kinds of fun. And they're always around working, joining the United Nations, you know. Going to straighten out Katanga and all kinds of wild, incredible things these birds are up to, see?

And you look it over and you've got this pc in the auditing chair, see? And this pc is good, this pc is kind, this pc is sweet, this pc is that. Well, your ideas of this are rather excited. You say, "Well, it can't be this true," and if you try to pick it up as straight withholds you're going to lay an egg. Because boy they've been good for a long time. Hundreds of years, see, they've been good. And underlying all this will be the exact reverse of something or other, you see?
They were – they were the person – they were the person who solicited the bribes for
the axman from the relatives of the about to be deceased. You know, a gold piece for a good
clean stroke. You know, this kind of thing. And then that was the deteriorated end of some-
body who made a profession out of getting nobility murdered so they could have their estates
given to them, see? You find out on the whole track they've been pretty, pretty interesting.

Now, you do find dramatic stuff in the GPM. The overts are with magnitude. But you
don't pull them bit by bit, don't you see? They turn up as a whole package. There you got it.

And we've been disappointed for so long – been disappointed for so long – in looking
for something gargantuan out of the pc on a Security Check or something like that, that we
may have gone into apathy about this point – and we shouldn't. Because your reliable items,
as you pair them up and keep going, why the blood starts flicking out of both sides of the
E-Meter after a while, you know, because they inherited the GPM quite honestly.

And the reason they're trying to make much out of it or more out of it, they're trying to
match up with what's in the GPM, don't you see? The GPM restimulates them to believe that
they have done something, but they can't put their finger on it. Well, it's in the GPM. There's
drama in that mess. But frankly it isn't drama which happened over the last two or three hun-
dred years.

It's been going on for a long, long time. And it's accumulated an awful lot of identities.
And to be able to cut into this thing at all and release it as far as it exists in present time as a
present time problem, is utterly fantastic. And to think that somebody was – knowing the exis-
tence of this – to think that somebody was going to go Clear by sitting and reverently re-
garding his own navel for a long enough period of time becomes utter asininity. It does!

Some of the technologies or techniques which have existed on this planet that were
supposed to free people, you begin to wonder who the hell was swindling who? Because just
try and represent some of these lists some day. Know how much skill it takes to actually strip
one of the things down, look at the resulting items, put the thing together, recognize what the
mechanics of the thing are and you become stonied. And you say, "Somebody was going to
get well by sitting in a chair and saying the number of times he was interfered with as a little
boy?" No, couldn't possibly have happened.

And for us to get an inroad on this, to even get sight of the GPM... You realize we
would have done enough just to have a description of the GPM, say "This is what's wrong
with me," much less tackle it. So actually we're really doing something here which is quite
fantastic. Because when the pc starts getting mixed up with this, an auditor has to go steady
on sometimes. Pcs actually get pretty upset, sometimes, in handling this because it's very up-
setting, very. So it requires an auditor who will complete the job. He's got to go as far as he
can go, honestly, before he goes and goes as far as he can go.

And there is no room here for an auditor who quits because the pc twitters or because
the pc's got a somatic. There is no room here for an auditor who won't complete a cycle of
action. He's got to complete a cycle of action to the degree that he can complete it. Or recog-
nize arriving at a point where you realize that it's a non-nullable list – you did complete the
cycle of action. Particularly if you nulled it out long enough to take most of the sen off the pc.
You've completed the action that was in progress to the degree that it could be completed. And you should always do that.

Now, R2-12 tries to unpin these great big PTPs out of present time. And people are going to say this very interesting thing to you countless times. You're going to get sick of this. I've gotten sick of it already. They're going to say, "But look, the pcs gives the list that goes backtrack when you're trying to solve a present time problem."

One of the reasons I've been giving you this much anatomy of the GPM is simply this: where the hell else is there to go? [laughter, laughs] Somebody must be operating on the basis that this person has had enough sin, crime and overts since he was born in this lifetime to aberrate himself. I assure you that isn't the case. Couldn't be the case.

Some fellows I know have put in some good licks, and some of them find this lifetime as a little, black ball. They've got no track. They can't go back earlier than this. They will have done something there, sometime or another, that already have started or put a wart on one of the main dumbbells. See, you'll find this; you'll find this every once in a while, not rare. But for one to have formed a whole sphere, a whole black mass in one lifetime? Oh no, not possible.

Had somebody – say on old 3D Criss Cross one time, "I don't think that I have thought up or found out a new idea for the last million years." He suddenly collided with what was his thinkingness. And all the ideas he had in this lifetime were in that lifetime. Well, if he'd kept on going he'd have found them earlier than that. He hadn't thought of any original ideas for a lot longer than that. It isn't that it's impossible to think of original ideas, but to have original aberrations is pretty far flung.

Now, what we want to take a look at here in the GPM is not only that we could clear somebody by continuing to find item versus item, because we could – if we found reliable item versus reliable item and then found another reliable item and got its oppterm and kept going and going and going – slow job, but we could clear somebody that way. A point you mustn't overlook.

You're walking down the rock slam road. Person eventually, you get about – oh, I don't know – you get twenty, thirty pairs and this person is saying, "Well, here's my goal." You couldn't go any further than that without him giving your goal. I mean he'd just say, "Well, that's my goal." Well, of course you can use the goal to find reliable items easier than you can use arbitrary lines. And you just go on with the same thing. I mean, you just could go on using his goal as the source of lines in all cases. But now you would be into 3-21. You'd have shifted gears over to 3-21, bypassing 3-21 Step 4. See, that's where you'd be.

So, 2-12 cuts into Routine 3-21 at a place which is determined by the extent that 2-12 is run. The more 2-12 is run the lower it cuts into 3-21. I mean, if you just undid the present time problems of the pc, snap-snap, and got a couple of reliable items and they paired up and so forth, and you find the pc's tone arm now moves and a lot of other things occur that's highly beneficial, then you would cut into a Prepcheck and then you would cut into a goals list and you could go right on with 3-21.
See, in other words we straighten it out so the case would get a rapid gain. Just got rid of the present time problem and so forth. We move right over into top of 3-21.

All right, or let's supposing now, that we went ahead with problem 2-12 and we got six items. That's three packages, one kind or another. These are all pretty surface packages. Well, we've already done at least one package that could be used in Step 4A, 3GA Criss Cross of Routine 3-21. So we take one of those oppterms, the – one of those advanced oppterms – and we just list goals 1 to – list goals list 1 to 10. Usually it would simply be 1 and 6 of the old goals list of 3GA Criss Cross. We list it against that beefiest oppterm and we turn up with the pc's goal. And then we would carry on from there.

But if a case were even rougher and harder and we didn't succeed at that... Well, actually, you would go into 3GA Criss Cross from that point there on, just getting more items. Quite a similar operation but you would be using the Prehav Scale with which to do that.

And a little more succinctly, supposing we did 2-12, and boy, we really had this case flying. We had found a dozen items, six pairs, and they were nice reliable items and the case was really flying and everything was swell and here we go. That would be about the earliest you could expect the pc to be laying his goal on the desk. There's – you've bypassed assessment. You've arrived at Step 5 without ever finding the pc's goal because he gave it to you. You go very much further with 2-12 and you're going to start getting the goal whether you would it or not it. Pc will tell you what it is.

Well, now, some pcs are so stacked up and identified and so much into the bank and so forth, that it might take many more pairs than that before the pc gives you his or her goal. But averagely along somewhere around a dozen items, reliable items and so forth, why pc's speculating – even raw meat will start speculating – and very often just hand you his goal and checks out bang, bang.

Now, this then could be carried to a ne plus ultra. Let's supposing we completely neglected the pc's goal. Let's supposing we never gave the pc a break. Every time the pc has hazarded on the goal we acknowledged him very politely. And we didn't do anything with the goal at all. And we kept on finding items that paired with items, and so on, and we just kept on finding. We'll eventually get the Rock and opprock on the first goal. And the pc then would blow the rest of the bank and go free just by the recognition that is his goal with total reality. Don't you see?

Now, which is the best one of those things to do? Well, you just do what you do. There is no best one of those things. You don't necessarily – you wouldn't see eye to eye with sitting there on your hands while the pc gave you his goal. And you certainly wouldn't drive a pc halfway round the bend – but he says, "My goal is to catch catfish."

And you say, "Well fine. Now, we're going to list another Prehav Scale here. We're going to see if we can't get a couple more items. I think you've got a problem in present time. And we've only found twenty-two pairs, and so forth, and..."

"But-but this is just-just-my goal is to catch catfish!" see.

He won't go Clear then either because he's now got a protest on his goal and that would effectively stop the whole operation on the same basis that any assessment or anything
else would be stopped; the mid ruds are wildly out and they'll be out from then on. And you just wouldn't advance because the pc is out of session. So sooner or later the practicality of 2-12 ceases because the goal is being laid in your lap.

Now, that give you some kind of an idea of its uses?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Your next point of examination here, that might be of considerable interest to you, is that 2-12 is usable as an assist. Now, there's one process which is senior to and superior to 2-12 or 3-21- although it is part of 3-21. There's one process that is superior to it, and outranks it when these conditions exist: When the pc has had found or been run on a wrong goal, or you suspect that the condition of the pc evolves from a wrong goal that has been found or run on the pc, you get rid of that wrong goal.

That is senior to any action of 2-12. Even if you suspect it – you understand? Because the pc may still be in some kind of a fog on the subject of "Is it his goal?" and "Isn't it his goal?" and "Does it or doesn't it?" or something like this. And try to bend 2-12 over into trying to do something with his goal and he's worried about it.

Well, what's your present time problem there? See, the present time problem is the pc's goal. You're not going to find that with 2-12 because a goal is senior to items. So you suspect wrong goal? You run wrong goal. You don't run 2-12.

Now, how do you run wrong goal? Well, the rule is that you run it with Big Tiger. And you run a wrong goal with Big Tiger if it's just been found. And you run it with a Prepccheck if it has been found and listed. Those are very easy things to remember in the handling of a wrong goal. If a goal has just been found and nothing much has been done with it and yet the pc thought it was his goal for a while and so forth, why, just Big Tiger, slam-bang at it for a while, get rid of it and slick it up. But in actual fact if it's been listed you've got to do a Prepccheck.

Now, that – if a goal has been listed it is senseless to do Big Tiger against it. It isn't just relatively ineffective. It is senseless. It won't move anyplace.

So, now, when you got a pc who has bad auditing as his history – this isn't a question of goals now – when he's got bad auditing (it must be so because he says so), and when the pc is all fouled up ever since that session in which he was run on an engram or ever since that session, etc., etc., or ever since the first Foundation when, etc., etc. – R2-12. We don't care how much bad auditing he's had; R2-12 will handle it. This is one of the things that gives this an importance: is despite the fact that it won't handle a wrong goal, which it won't, it'll handle every other breed of auditing there is.

And the reason for that was – because I don't care if the auditing was good auditing or bad auditing or any other kind of auditing and the fellow felt loused up about it – an item was loused up, not the pc. An item was loused up. It was the item that ARC broke, not the pc, you understand? It was the item which was getting its engrams run, not the pc. See? You see why this is then?
Goals are senior to items and items are senior to every other kind of auditing we've ever had. So that gives you your seniorities of use.

Now, because everything is $A=A=A=A$, this can be used as an assist as its lightest action as goofily as, "What illness of yours have you been interested in?" This is just crazy, see.

"My lumbosis."

"All right. Who or what does lumbosis represent to you?" Unwritten list, unnull, anything else, see. That's a meterless assist using the principles of 2-12.

I want you to recognize that 2-12 has certain principles connected with it, don't you see? That's why I gave you that assist. Not so you will use that assist but so you will get the idea of what you're doing on it. Well how come? Well, the pc must have been interested in it so it must be identified like mad. He must have an $A=A=A$. If he's got a psychosomatic illness he must have the past in present time. Therefore an instantaneousness is in connection with it. See, the present time is the past time. Therefore it must have some impingement on the GPM because it has an instantaneousness; isn't in a proper position on the time track. Must be held there by some instantaneousness. What's he doing making a mistake like this? What's he doing with a scar? That's an interesting question isn't it?

$A=A=A$, and the first "identification of" is where you put time instead of $A$. In other words time equals time equals time. What's he doing with an engram in restimulation? Well, if he's got an engram in restimulation and it stays in restimulation – it doesn't go out of restimulation – then one tag end of that engram must be headed into the GPM. Otherwise it couldn't be in restimulation forever.

Those engrams which don't fade out in from three to ten days after being contacted, run, butchered, bad session, anything else you want to call it, didn't key out because of the GPM. Somebody got ahold of a piece of the GPM and tried to erase it. Any other engram would have disappeared.

Supposing you have an automobile accident and this brings you back and all of a sudden you've got a mysterious backache. Well, from three to ten days if you've still got a mysterious backache and it doesn't disappear, then that automobile accident must have keyed in the GPM. If you easily got well and don't have a backache three to ten days later, of course it wasn't part of the GPM. You see how you separate the sheeps from the goats.

So all right, now let's get a more practical assist. Let's look over the chronic somatics of this individual. Chronic. Chronic, man, that have been going on and on and on and on. It is *timelessness* we are looking for.

"Ever since I was a little boy I've had this tic." See, it's an indicator, see? Must be hooked into the GPM. Must be, otherwise it would have – whatever happened to him – would have disappeared in from three to ten days. He's still got it, some kind of a psychosomatic something or other. Therefore it must be hooked into the GPM.

A little kid contracts some sort of a habit. This habit has been going on for years. Spits at everybody. Nobody can cure him of spitting at anybody. Part of the GPM, man. I'm not kidding about that, I mean it is. It just is part of the GPM. And the GPM can never be edu-
cated out of anybody. Can't be done. What no society has been able to cure anybody of is part of the GPM. That you can make up your mind about.

All right. This fellow stole a bag of groceries and went to jail for eighteen months. And he's come out and he's been straight ever since. Well, it happens to people. Nothing to do with the GPM.

This fellow stole a bag of groceries, went to jail for a year, came out of jail, stole a bag of groceries, went to jail for eighteen months. Got out of jail, stole a bag of groceries. And we have the common order of action which occurs in our modern societies, which is considerably interesting, the repetitive character of criminality. The two-timers and that sort of thing. These birds didn't become criminals in this lifetime. They've been like that for a long time.

And let me tell you, the State, cops, hobbyists, prisons, psychologists [laughter] – none of these things are going to cure any part of it.

And let me tell you that you'll wind up just as much criminals in this lifetime, next lifetime, next lifetime, next lifetime as you ever want. This is what breaks the heart of the do-gooder; this repetitive action.

Of course they have some wins. They have the guy that's had a bad break. And the identity which he seems to have because of this bad break isn't part of the GPM. It passes away and it keys out and that's it. So they've had a break, they actually helped this guy out, see. So they know they helped him out. And it straightened him out and everything is fine. So they're led on. They're given a win. They get stuck with a win.

Next guy they picked up is straight in the middle of the identity of the GPM, man. He knows what stores are for, to put in trucks at night. And you could help this guy out. And you could help this guy out. And you could help this guy out and it's just the same cycles would happen again and again and again. You cannot educate the GPM out of anybody.

Now, some of the processes we have, when properly used, oddly enough are capable of keying it out, which is a fantastic attestation to the power of Dianetic and Scientology techniques as they've existed in the last dozen years. I'm overawed. We actually have been able to key out this confounded thing without direct attack at all.

The interesting thing is, is our first-goal Clears, MEST Clears that have sprung up from time to time along the track. That these people can be made at all is fantastic because we had no process that could take apart the GPM, which I think is quite interesting. Some of these characters are still having a marvelous run of it.

But because A=A=A, both in time – we should look at the other three factors of the GPM: matter, energy and space. Now, those three things are also in the GPM. And probably the GPM has mass simply because time becomes nothing and the energy and so forth isn't yet nothing.

This adds up in very interesting mathematical proposition. It'd take Einstein to wrap his wits around how exactly this would occur. You see, if time were actually zero, if time were actually zero, then there would be no matter, there'd be no energy and possibly no space.
So it's an *apparency* of zero that we are handling in the A=A=A. So although there's an *apparency* of no matter, there is mass. Although there's *apparency* of no energy, there is energy. Although there's *apparency* of no space, there is space. And there's *apparency* of no time, there is yet time.

So, you find matter, energy, space and time are in this GPM. Now, the moment that you restore any differentiation, no matter if it's just from identity to slight similarity or, you know, it isn't quite exact anymore. Apple A doesn't equal apple B. Person vaguely sees there might be a little bit of difference between apple A and apple B. And if that's the case, heh! It's interesting but you get more matter, more energy and more space because you've got more time.

So this fellow's sitting there saying, "There are no black masses." And the second that you establish a similarity, they seem to materialize from nowhere. And there's many a dub-in case is going to be very upset with 2-12. And it's true what auditors over in England used to observe, that a case very often goes black before it goes back to pictures again.

Well, here's this case with all kinds of dub-in pictures like crazy and everything is fine and they dub, dub, dub, dub. And all of a sudden it all goes black. And then all goes white and then all goes this and all goes that. You see what's happening here. As you add differentiation you get more mass apparent – greater apparency of mass then takes place. Stuff ceases to read exactly and instantly on the E-Meter.

You'll see a goal do this. The goal is the thing which actually drifts on the track harder than an item. And you'll see the goal as it's being three-quarters run out will all of a sudden begin to read early and late and on and then very early and then very late and then on. And you won't quite know what the devil this goal is all about.

Now, smooth auditing is absolutely required in the handling of the GPM, otherwise the individual's ability to confront the matter, energy, space and time which is increasing in his bank is not invited, but repressed. And so the individual would tend to hang fire if he were being beat up at the same time he was being audited. In other words, auditing could take the place of a present time problem.

There'll be some cases that will hang up. They'll see things will – all of a sudden are going to become tougher for them. They're being asked to confront more pain than they care to confront. They're being asked this. They're being asked that. And they all of a sudden try to turn off the reality that has been turning on. And all cases go over a sort of a roll-y coaster. It keeps getting better and better; their confront keeps getting better and better, but it sometimes will get worser – momentarily get worser. They'll come into session and they would rather be whipped than list another single goddamn line on that blankety-blank plot.

Why? It's getting tough. The more they list, the more matter, energy, space and time is materializing. Of course time permits them to escape from the pressure of it. It was probably the only thing that makes the process work at all; it's because time becomes less identified and therefore the pc isn't being subjected to all the matter, all the energy and all the space that is there incipiently in the bank ready to tear him apart.
But sometimes your pc will be sitting there with a blinding ball of fire heading straight for him. And the next thing you know he's sitting there very calmly. He's just slid himself down scale, hard. He's ducked. He's done a bunk. You can still dig it out, but every once in a – it requires no special action. That's just the kind of roly-poly action he takes. He just didn't feel like having his head knocked off with a meteor that day, see? Because there is no meteor. It is only the mental image picture of a meteor which burned out a trillion years ago. It's just because this bank was opening up and it's what this valence was knocked off by. You've gotten to the death moment of a valence or something like that. And he dramatizes the valence and does a bunk. You've still moved on the time track but he still made it less visible. He's still gone less confront on it. Don't you see?

So if we use this on any kind of an assist, we are increasing the pc's ability to differentiate. And our bacon is served because he's also differentiating moments of time and this gives him more time to go into than he had before. And so he is now capable of being there or not being there as the case may be.

There is still this factor of increasing ability to confront which must be handled in 2-12. And the only way that it is handled is just give the pc good sessions and don't hit him over the head every time he has a win, and his confront will keep coming on up.

There are many pcs will have to go on and on and on and on and on before they get a win. Because they open that eye just a little bit and they decide they'd better not look today.

You can do a half a dozen, ten lists from List One without a rock slam on any one of them. The list getting more and more alive before you finally have a rock slam. That's very extreme, but that can happen. Right now you have some statistics: sixteen out of twenty-five people on this R2-12 are successful with either items found or listing on lists which are producing rock slams.

Error: One auditor had three items in with rock slams after nulling a list and didn't put the package or anything together as the R/S went and disappeared. Well, of course, the package slithered together, somehow or another. He simply should have put it together.

We have four out of five cases listing on items who have been listing on 2-12 who have found no R/S as yet. That's four of the five cases mentioned here. But that is actually four out of twenty-five or one-eighth in the first few hours of doing 2-12 have yet to turn on a rock slam. Those cases are benefiting, however. And two cases have such a dirty needle or stuck needle that no assessment has occurred since a dead horse was listed on each.

Well, naturally, that's a mid ruds situation on that particular list. That could be cleaned up like a bomb. Or the list could be further run or you listed a little bit further. Something like that could happen so as to take the charge of the thing off.

The summary on it is R2-12 is a great success as even those who have had no R/S are making gains with the exception of one pc who is making gains in session, but out of session is not.

Now, the – in other words, with minimal checkout, with minimal action in training – and disallowing for the fact that the auditors here are pretty good auditors – you haven't got a
bunch of loses on your hands. You haven't even had all the gen, you haven't been checked out on the gen and that sort of thing; you're still winning on the thing.

With a little bit of experience you find out how to really fly with this thing because most of your time is wasted on dead horses. The auditing – the amount of time the auditing takes in relationship to the amount of time wasted by dead horses and so on, you'll find quite disproportionate. But all of a sudden you will be able to get these things into better focus.

Now, from where I sit, why, we've got some cases cracking right now on R2-12 that have been on everything else in the shop, even 3GA Criss Cross. And you say, "Well, how can a case benefit from R2-12 that was not – when it wasn't benefiting on 3GA Criss Cross?"

Well, R2-12 has this listing, is auditing, it's listing directly from something which is giving the pc an awful present time problem. And it's actually easing up the pc's present time problem and the pc is starting to make a gain for the first time.

In other words, it's attacking the present time environment of the pc, which of course 3GA Criss Cross doesn't even pretend to do.

So there is where we sit with this particular technology and I wish you very well with it.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.
Okay. This is the what?

*Audience: 11 December.*

The 10th Dec.?

*Audience: 11th.*

The 11th? How did you get up into the 11th? The things you've been doing!
First lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, December the 11th, AD 12.

Okay. Well, if it hadn't been for the work done in the V Unit, I wouldn't be able to give you this lecture. There was a little bit of an odd bit. I wanted to know if these oppose lists that have been laying eggs on Routine 2-12 – and you just didn't get anything – if those things, extended, would give you an item. And on case after case, both on the oppose and represent lists, when you think you are skunked, all you have to do is continue the list. Very simple. Very simple.

Now, a lot of you think 2-12 is very complicated. You think it's a very complicated activity. Frankly, you can get experience with great rapidity on 2-12; I'd say within 150 hours of auditing on it. If you're doing it right, you ought to become quite an expert. I said 150 hours of auditing because that's how long it took me. But of course, remember I was piloting it from scratch and didn't know anything about it at the beginning. So I think you ought to make it in a hundred and fifty hours knowing all about it before you start. Isn't that terrible?

That's not a snide professorial comment – that's just fact. Now, your troubles aren't with 2-12. That's what we're learning. You're not having any trouble with 2-12 – you're just having trouble with auditing. I think that's quite interesting.

Mary Sue pulled one tonight at the supper table that really had me laughing. She said offhandedly, she says, "Well, they're still using mid ruds for style." That's marvelous, you know. Gives you this gorgeous picture, you see, of the auditor sitting there busily getting in mid ruds for style, see. [laughs] And it's little things like: pc's got 1,825 missed withholds, and 16 overt on the auditor, and the list is incomplete, and – there you're getting into 2-12; the list doesn't even have to be incomplete – and the auditor gets in the mid ruds and the needle is still good and dirty.

Oh, we had a remark on a report the other day – actually we're having a ball with this stuff – we had a remark on a report the other day that is an indicator of using the mid rud for style. The auditor said, "Well, I got in the mid ruds for the session and got in the mid ruds for
the list, but I still had a dirty needle, so I determined..." and he went off in some other wild direction. He's already handed you a complete imponderable: How in the name of God could you get in the mid ruds, see, for the session and get it in for the list and still have a dirty needle? See, it wouldn't even matter if your list was incomplete. You're not talking about a list, you're just talking about mid ruds to this pc, and so there it is.

Might take the random rudiment or something like that on some cases to pull the missed withholds, but you sure couldn't wind up with anything less than a clean needle.

So what I picked up about the middle of the week – what I picked up about the middle of the week was the fact that people were trying to start nulling lists that had dirty needles, see. There was a dirty needle, and they take the thing, and the needle's going zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz, and they start the first one, "Tiger, waterbuck." I don't know what they're doing. I don't know what they could be doing, because they couldn't tell if it was reading or not reading.

Now, the only time you have to be able to learn to read through a dirty needle is when the needle is so dirty that you can't tell what mid rud is out. Now, you can do that. That does pose a problem. It's going tick, tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, and you say, "Has anything been suppressed?" and it just keeps up the same tickety-tick, and you say, "Is it invalidated?" and it keeps up the same tickety-tick; and then you get to Suggest, and it's doing the same tickety-tick, and you say, well, it's probably Fail to reveal, and you get Fail to reveal and it's still the same tickety-tick, and actually it was the Suppress and the Invalidate, but he had answers but didn't...

This is wild, see. Trying to read through one of these needles to get the mid ruds in – that I'll grant you takes some doing as an auditor. That is sometimes a little bit hard. But I will tell you how to do that. There is nothing much to it. You just put the E-Meter aside and put in the mid ruds. Then come back and see if your needle's clean. You understand? And very often you will have caught it. The needle still won't be going tickety-tick.

Now, a variation of this is "Have you thought of anything?" But have you ever realized that this puts an awful lot of responsibility on the pc? If you overuse that or try to make that substitute for the mid ruds, you get this kind of a situation: "Will you please self-audit for a moment to straighten things out so that I can go on auditing you?"

Pc has no guidance or anything like that. You just say, "Well, I'm having a rough time here. Let's see if you can help me out," something like that – "Anything been suppressed?" and he tells you something. "Anything being invalidated?" and he tells you something. "Anything been suggested?" and he says no. And you say, "Well, anything you failed to reveal?" and he says, I "Well, yes, as a matter of fact there was..." and so forth. Well, he's giving you some answers, isn't he? Well, it certainly is going to change the characteristics of that needle.

Now, you come back and look at the needle, and it's in – it's sufficiently clean so that you can read the remainders. Now, you can run a cross-check – something like that.

You say, "Let's just – now, let me make sure that all the suppressions are off of this." This is the one most commonly neglected by the pc, because suppress equals forget. And you saw me on a demonstration one night, and the pc did wonderfully. I actually cleaned up every question I asked except the Suppress. Remember that TV demonstration? I had about a quar-
ter-of-a-dial drop on Suppress and the pc said that's clean. Now, why is that? That's because suppress equals forget.

You realize, some pc says to you, "I had an item a moment ago, but I sure don't know what it was." He's told you that he's suppressed something.

Now, that's no time for you to jump in there with all four feet and try to do this and that. You make awful mistakes when the pc said, "I had an item but now I've forgotten it," and you say, "What was it?" Oh, brother. That's the time to wish that you hadn't gotten up that morning because your rudiments are going to go out from there on in, see, because the pc will earnestly try to remember this thing, see. Actually, it's just an origin – so you just acknowledge it, see. Later on he'll think of it. You've listed a few more items and all of a sudden the pc will probably startle you out of your stance as an auditor, say, "Hey! Hey, wait a minute, wait a minute! That was a pig. Pig!"

What pig? You see, you've forgotten about the whole thing. That was fifteen minutes ago, you know. It eventually percolates on up to the surface.

But oddly enough, if – I've made a direct test of this for your benefit. The pc says, "I had an item a moment ago, but I've forgotten it."

And you say, "Okay." It doesn't now show up as a missed withhold or it doesn't show up as a withhold, which is very peculiar.

All right, the pc says, "I had an item a moment ago, but now I've forgotten it."

And you say, "Well, what was it? Does anything suppress it? Did you suppress it," or something?

"Well, I must have suppressed it. Let me see what it was." And now it registers as a missed withhold. In other words, you can key it in with your question of "What was it?"

You get too busy. That's the trouble with you in handling your mid rudiments and that sort of thing. You're using them for style – a wonderful gag. "He looked awfully good using the mid rudiments," you know. Didn't have any effect on the pc's needle, but it looked awfully good.

Your most flagrant fault then is just failing to get a clean needle, which is an element of auditing, before you start in. You fail to get a clean needle, that's all, and you're trying to take off and null a list with the needle dirtied up with things that have nothing to do with the list. And then you wonder if the list is complete or not and try to use the dirtiness of the needle to test whether or not the list is complete. Well, it all – a great many faults and errors can stem from just this one fact: that you haven't got a clean needle. What are the mid rudiments for? Clean needle. That's what they're for. They clean it up.

Now, Goal Finder's Model Session is actually better than old Model Session providing you always put in big mid rudiments.

Now, in R2-12 there is no substitute for an auditor who knows his basic mechanics. And we're talking now about the basic mechanics of auditing. Auditor knows TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. Auditor doesn't Q-and-A. Auditor knows an E-Meter. Auditor can smooth out a needle. Used to say "put in the rudiments." Well, actually, don't care whether you put the rudiments in or not – smooth out the needle. And then that makes sense, see. Putting in the rudiments is not
something that can be plumbed, measured and weighed. But you can sure take a look at this needle and know that the rudiments have been put in – or not. If that needle has any kind of a pattern of any kind whatsoever, the rudiments are not in on that pc, period. That's all.

Well, that makes it pretty tough, because most of the pcs that show up have got some kind of a tick and a tock and a plish and a plock. Well, that's all caused by missed withholds. So we're back into the basics of auditing – pulling missed withholds and so forth, that sort of thing. These are just fundamentals of auditing – has nothing to do with 2-12.

Now, we utterly neglect the fundamentals of auditing and let some guy fumble all over the place with the fundamentals, and then we add 2-12 on top of it as a complication, and of course, we've got a cow's breakfast, man. It is a mess. Well, your needle is dirty from the fundamentals of auditing, and it's being dirtied up by an incomplete list and the last list you didn't complete. Now, how the hell are you going to make any sense out of this?

Well, you've got to start in at the beginning and get in the fundamentals of auditing, that's all.

Now, posing the problem of how to clean up a needle: How do you clean up a needle? You of course are just posing the problem of fundamental auditing. And don't ever make a mistake about this, see. You're just saying, "This is fundamental auditing." You pull the missed withholds, you straighten out auditing on this person, you do this and you do that. You actually could do it this way: You could take an old-time Prepcheck, take some period, or no period. You just say, "In auditing, has anything been suppressed?" or something like this. You run an eighteen-button Prepcheck; something like this, and you're going to clean up the needle. Of course, that's the long way to do it, but it sure can be done.

It's – you could – you could do it meterless except for the Suppress button which would get you in trouble because it means forget, and you'd wind up at the other end of this… Well, if you just did Suppress and Invalidate on this guy, you know, gave him a "Prepcheck assist" – this is getting very popular in New York right now. People turning up after a lot of auditing and the CCHs and that sort of thing, and their needle is just filthy and one of the boys in! New York got the idea of a "Prepcheck assist." He straightened out one or two of these needles, and he noticed that they were straightening out in just, you know, just four or five hours, and he'd had them straight – you know, it was all smooth and fine. So he's got a… they're given a Prepcheck assist, whereby they merely clean up Suppress and Invalidate. And that's quite interesting.

I don't know how far they'd get with that sort of thing because out of the eighteen buttons there's always one of them that's hotter than the remainder, and it's not always Suppress and it's not always Invalidate. But if you were to take an assessment of the eighteen buttons and get the couple that fell the most, or get one that fell the most, and then ran that for a couple of hours, and then assess it again, and get the other one and ran that for an hour or two, or whenever the pc said it was flat, why, you'd clean up a needle.

Now, this idea of a needle pattern, then, is not something that you should be blowing your brains out over. Similarly, a very, very high tone arm is not something to go on worrying about because the exact activity, which I just gave you, will knock a tone arm down. This has nothing to do with 2-12, the data I'm giving you here. It just has to do with basic stuff. I mean,
we got a lot of this stuff around. I don't know, maybe you can straighten out a dirty, needle with a Touch Assist. Well, we've had a lot of stuff here for a long time. Now, just add this up and benefit from it and here's riches for you, you see.

So this pc, it goes tick-tock, bzz, brrr, bzzz, tick-tock, and he's sitting down there, and you try to put "in this session," see. Oh, man, that isn't going to go anyplace because it was dirty when he came into session, see. And you say, well, let's pull some missed withholds and this sort of straightens it out a little bit and it's still going tick and it's still going tock and that sort of thing. Well, you could sit down and pull missed withholds until it got clean, but you also could run a couple – the first two buttons, just Suppress, and you know, just "In auditing has anything been suppressed?" you know. We don't care if he's been audited for twelve years or one year, see. You're going to get someplace with this thing. And then pull some missed withholds, you see. This is all basic, fundamental stuff. You put it all together and you don't get a dog's breakfast, you get a very nice looking clean needle.

In other words, don't try to run something fancy on a case before the case is ready to run. Well, how many hours should be invested in straightening out a case before you start auditing them on something, and so forth. Well damn few, let me tell you, very, very few. Very few indeed! If you're very good at pulling missed missed withholds – "missed square" withholds – you're very, very good at that, you could probably straighten up the whole needle on that.

But I'll tell you something else, I've straightened out a needle with 2-12. And that's a weird one. Well, how do you assess it? Well, just genius! [laughter]

You know, you can read down a list of stuff and if you're not stone blind and a rock slammer, you can see that something ticks more than something else. You know, that dead-easy.

So let's just be sensible about the thing, you see. Let's take the old-time rock slam test, and let's hope we've got a rock slammer sitting in front of us. That's the easiest one to straighten out. Anybody can straighten out a rock slammer. That's dead-easy, because you just simply find out whatever slams, and oppose it, see. And crash, crash! The only time a rock slammer gives you any trouble is when some other rock slammer has been trying to give him a clean bill of health and hasn't reported that he slammed on "Scientology," "Ron," "Auditing," and "Sessions," see. He hasn't reported this fact, but he says he's clean.

Well, by this time the guy has got this all suppressed and you don't catch it right off the bat and then the case lays dead horses, and after a while in desperation you just suddenly pull it out of the hat; decide to give him the old test – tiger drilling the buttons and see if one dirty-needles.

Well, if he's had a lot of dead horses and so forth, do you know you'd practically be justified, even though it laid another egg, just in picking the biggest read on the fundamental items and just opposing it.

Just supposing the guy has been a rock slammer. See, he didn't make progress so let's – well, let's just treat him like a rock slammer. See if we make any fun there, see?
I've been working on it – this isn't a rule that I can forecast, but it very well may become one – that if a case makes no progress on 2-12, you treat him like a rock slammer and oppose Scientology – if you can't get the first three, four key buttons, you know. See, "Ron," "Auditing," "Scientology," "Scientology organizations," something like that – if you can't even pick out a dirty needle, see, a read – a dirty read or something on one of those things, well, hell, just at least oppose Scientology. That looks like it might, one of these days become a rule, because we've wasted quite a bit of time on just this factor of somebody says we'll save this bird's bacon.

Well now, today nobody gives a damn whether anybody was a rock slammer or not. Particularly after you see that after a person's been audited for a little while he starts rock slamming on List One.

I don't know. I'm going to get checked out on me myself. [laughter] So there's no disgrace in this. This is a cute trick some people have been pulling on this. They say – because they don't want to seem socially déclassé, they say it turns on pain, and then you list it as though it's a terminal and it's actually an oppterm, and you just get loused up like fire drill.

So I have a little rule that I will do on that sort of thing. After somebody tells me pain or sen on List One... See, if they tell me pain then I'm going to give them a lie test. You know, "Is there anything here that you disagree with now?" "Have you told me anything in session that you thought I'd like to hear?" you know?

We've laid two or three eggs on this lately. Two cases right in this room, opposed wrong way to, see. Opposed as though they were terminals, and actually it just gave the pc hell, see. Because you oppose them – you've opposed an oppterm as though it's a terminal. And of course, you're writing a backwards list. You're putting the pc at effect. And if you don't think that doesn't tear up their ears! You get what I mean?

This thing actually is an oppterm, and the pc says it's a terminal for some reason or other, and then you treat it as a terminal. "Who or what would that terminal oppose?" And it just puts – of course, it's an oppterm, so in actual fact you're putting the pc at effect; you're not putting the pc at cause and it messes them up.

Well, those are just some little things in passing on 2-12.

But this needle is dirty. I can't seem to make any headway out of the thing. I'm not going to spend the next twenty-five hours straightening out a needle, because with one list with 2-12 it'll get all dirty again anyhow. See, it'll go through a cycle of being clean and then getting dirty and then going clean again. So you certainly don't want to waste the rest of your natural life poking around just trying to straighten out this needle. So you need some method of straightening out the needle.

So you pull enough missed withholds off the pc so that you can do some kind of an assessment on List One and get into 2-12 as fast as you can – if you take my advice on the thing – and the first reliable item you find would deliver into your hands one of the cleanest looking needles you've seen in many a day. It's as simple as that, see. I've seen a needle, now – I've seen a needle that was just bzz-bzzz-bzz-bzz-bzzz-bzz-bzzzzzzz. Everything's stuck up, couldn't get old Model Session rudiments in. You know, everything sort of hung up and messed up
and so forth and I couldn't do any assessment and I couldn't even go over the dynamics, and so forth. One list that rock slammed and at the end of that list I had a clean needle. I hadn't even nulled the thing out yet. You get what I'm talking about now?

I just listed it out till it was clean. And there it was, clean. Well, what happened to all this pc's withholds and everything else? Well, I was sitting dead center in the case, and I actually found an item – took some charge off the bank – and there went a clean needle, see. There went your dirty needle – disappeared.

So, here are two ways of approaching this thing. There's not knowing any 2-12, not being able to enter the case, not being able to assess, being balked, not having anything that... way to turn, something like that. And not having an auditor around who can pull missed withholds or something – they haven't got the word yet, you know, something like this.

There's still something you could tell this auditor to do. Well, just spend a couple of hours on, "In auditing has anything been suppressed?" and "In auditing has anything been invalidated?" when that's flat. A couple more hours of that and you'll probably see the needle straighten up. Then coach the auditor in to say, "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" and "How did you know the person thought that?" or "Why did you think so?" and get the rest of it up and you can straighten up a needle. So this is not a twenty-five-hour proposition or the next seventy-five hours or something like that.

Because listen: There's a point at which the pc's anxiety is rekindled on a no-auditing basis that dirties the needle up again. In other words, there's a point here where your efforts to clean up the needle dirty the needle up.

Now, you can always count on no-auditing to dirty up a needle. Always count on it to do so.

Have you ever noticed this fact? You're sitting there, getting ready to null a list. You're sitting there getting ready to null a list. Everything was very fine. When you finished up that list you just had a clean, flowing needle – everything was fine. But you stop at that point to make a note on your auditor's report to the effect that the tone arm is now at 3.5, and that this is this and that is that and the time is so-and-so, and then you glance up and you look at the needle, and it's going tickety-tock, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tick, tickety-tick, tick, tick.

Well, you could sit there then and get in your session mid ruds; and you can clean up the needle – don't think you can't. You can clean it up and then you turn back to your auditor's report, you see, and... [laughter] next time you look at it, it's going tickety-tock again.

That's anxiety. The button Anxiety is keying in there, and the pc is in a no-auditing bind, and so on. Actually, the way I've been handling that particular phenomenon lately, of the clean needle turns into a dirty needle just because there's – I'm taking a breath to say the first word, you know, that's too long, you know? And I'm saying – like this and the dirty needle turns on, see. Well, it's just the pc's anxiety that's doing that kind of thing. And I'll just sail into the first one, and then say it two or three times, and say the next one two or three times, and so forth.

Now, by crossing everything out as you go down through a list, you can also sometimes turn on a dirty needle. The pc gets anxious. Nothing is in. You just keep making those
Xs, you know, making those Xs, making those Xs, making those Xs, making those Xs. Well, sooner or later, you're going to decide that it has to be tested for Suppress. You test it for Suppress and you promptly have a dirty needle. Where did that dirty needle come from? Well, it comes from the fact that the pc probably did suppress something, but your asking for it keyed it in so it now registers and it wasn't active before, but it is now.

But the main thing is the pc is scared you're going into mid ruds. Scared you're going into mid ruds. So, because they're scared you're going into mid ruds they pull off, and you now have a dirty needle. So this tends to discipline you not to put in the mid ruds so you do the whole list with a heavy suppress on it.

Well now, those are the... those actions actually aren't related to 2-12. They're the actions of auditing. You see, they're the actions of the pc being controlled and handled by the auditor, don't you see? This is the pc's anxieties about auditing, the pc's confidence in the auditor, the pc is in-session or isn't in-session, and so forth.

The only thing I really get very alert for and really go to the mat and slow the whole session down to nothing is the pc, in putting in mid ruds, gives me a "critical." I get a dirty needle and when I pick it up, I find out it was the pc said that I had shuffled the paper loudly. I know I won't have any luck, now. I know I won't be going anywhere now, because that pc has got something I nearly found out. I don't care if it was in the last three days or the last two days or in the session, that pc has a withhold from me because that pc has given me a critical utterance. And critical utterances are always underlain by an overt/withhold.

And that's the only thing I go alert for. Why do I go alert for that? Because that one critical utterance or that one attitude on the part of the pc will multiply and multiply and multiply and all of a sudden I'm going to have a screaming ARC break.

That is the same situation that you run into an hour later, with the pc trying to blow the session. You see that? I'm not being sarcastic, but most auditors don't catch the missed withhold; don't catch that ARC break for an hour or an hour and a half. It's long after they've happened.

And you've got to become alert for that. These are the fundamentals of auditing I'm talking about, you see. You' got to become very alert for that.

You're putting in your mid ruds, and you say, "Well, in this session has anything been suggested?" See. And you get a tick, you say, "All right, what was that?"

And the pc said, "Well, yes, you actually were saying some word a little louder than the others, and I thought you were suggesting that that was it."

That's enough, man. My next rudiment is nearly found out. I don't – I don't play the motordrome game of riding the motorcycle on the vertical wall just for the cheers of the audience like some of you do, if you will pardon my French. Because that's the one thing you can't monkey with, is a missed withhold. See, that's a critical; that's a direct indicator! Great big black arrows immediately drop up in the sky and point directly to the pc's bank and they have engraved on them in gold letters which flame, you see: "You've nearly found out something about this pc."
Any indication of a missed withhold causes me to go after missed withholds. Pc a little critical; pc upset. I go on the basis: Doesn't matter what I do as an auditor, as long as I'm trying to audit the pc, I don't merit criticism. I'm not trying to punish the pc because the pc's criticizing me and I'm not doing this because I don't like criticism. I'm doing this because the session is going to blow up if I don't. That is your first symptom of a session blowing up. Pc's feeling a little critical.

Now let's move over into 2-12. You do a couple of things wrong and you're going to be in a mess. And one of those things is you find a slamming item and it's slamming like crazy, and you don't know what a rock slam looks like so you don't… I know that sounds incredible, but there are two people here who didn't know what a rock slam looked like.

Now, that sounds incredible, but it's true. And don't you ever make that mistake in a co-audit or teaching a bunch of HPAs, HCAs or something like that, that you know that they know what a rock slam looks like. Because you say, nobody could miss a rock slam. Well, let me tell you, people can miss a rock slam. They can miss 'em, and just learn by that.

So this item is rock slamming like mad, and for some reason or other the auditor doesn't want to embarrass the pc by pointing it out that he slams on "auditor" or something. I don't know for what reason – or he doesn't know what a rock slam is, or something like that – but he knows the thing was active so he represents it.

Now, listen, it isn't always catastrophic. You can get away with it often enough to make a fool out of yourself.

All right, I'll give you the exact example: You're standing in a room, a burglar comes in the door with a drawn gun, and the telephone rings. Now, you'd feel a little distracted, wouldn't you? And I think that if you picked up the telephone and found out it was unimportant, that you would have a tendency to swear as you slammed it down to take care of the other situation or something there – you'd be in an agitated state. You get the idea? Split attention.

The command value of Mr. Burglar with a gun in his hand is terrific, and somebody's saying, "Look away from this thing." All right, the command value of a rock slamming item is terrific, and the person's attention isn't on the item that is slamming, it's on the reverse item. It's on the hidden item. That's where their attention is mostly absorbed. They're slamming on "gooney birds," and the opposition terminal to "gooney birds" is "hunters." And you ask him "Who or what would a gooney bird represent to you," you've told them to take their attention off this hidden item "hunters." You don't even know what it is, see. And that's like the telephone ringing and they have to take their attention off the burglar, see. And it drives them around the bend. They practically go out the bottom.

And when you get a List One item and you don't oppose it; if you're really mad at some rock slammer; if he's really cost the organization thirty-five thousand Rand or something like this – I won't mention any areas – [laughter] and you really want to drive him potty, and just have him so he'll be out in the street waving guns in his hands ready to shoot somebody down or something like that, find "Scientology" rock slamming and then represent it. All you've got to do is put a represent list on "Scientology," a rock slamming item, and he'll go right around the bend. He practically goes out through the bottom.
See, there's a hidden item there, he's got his attention on this item, and you tell him to put his attention on Scientology and represent it and he can't do it. It's just nyahh! see. He doesn't know what he's got his attention on, he just knows there's something dangerous there. And you're telling him to take his attention off this dangerous thing and then to do a represent on something he's only got his attention from or at, don't you see. You've messed up his attention.

See, here's these two items smashed against each other. His attention is totally fixated on the interrelationship between these two items, this package, these two reliable items against each other, see. That's what his attention is on, and you take one of these and you start representing it, you're telling him to take his attention off the other item and take it... Ahuuuu-zzzzz-zzz. And he practically goes gibbering.

We've had two cases here, slamming on List One that have been represented, and boy, they both almost went out the bottom. And their antagonism on List One went up by the square. Zooooom! Don't you see. They couldn't take this.

Now, if somebody had sat down and opposed the rock slamming item – just like it says in 2-12; did it right, in other words – why, it just would have been as right as rain. Everything would have been fine and sweet and everything. But a case practically goes out the bottom.

Now, you got somebody who's slamming on three or four points of List One and you do nothing but represent lists on them – oh, brother! That's happened here a couple of times. Hardly anybody knew they were slamming on List One, you, see – this hadn't been isolated. Agh! And they didn't know whether they were going or coming. They just started out the bottom.

So it's a good way to get even with somebody. If you find an item slamming nicely, why, represent it.

Now, if you really want a case to fold up sooner or later, if you find an item slamming nicely and you oppose it, why, stop listing just at the moment when you can barely null it to nothing and not find an item. Because now the item you took it from, will not slam, all the other slam seems to be gone and you don't see anything there, and the case feels fine – feels much better – but you've got a sleeper now; you've got a hidden pair in present time. That's about the only big mistakes you can make. Of course, you realize I'm just taking up 2-12 mistakes with you here.

If you – after you null the thing out, if you continue to list the opposition items against the thing – it's not now slamming, see. You listed it out, everything disappeared, there's hardly even a dirty needle left, everything's gone now. It all looks fine, but you didn't come up with a reliable item. That's the only thing that's spooky about it all. It just – you didn't have an item after you opposed it, see. You start listing again on that opposition list and all of a sudden the nicest, biggest rock slam will turn on the original that you ever saw, and you'll get a rock slamming item, and all of a sudden you'll wind up with – you'll have a very nice big rock slamming item and you'll have a package.
In other words, you can quit just short of getting a package. That, probably, would be the most puzzling mistake that you could make in 2-12. That would puzzle you.

This also happens with a represent list. You've got some dirty needle or something and you're representing it like mad, and it represents into a slamming list and – nice, long list, and it nulls – everything is out, you have a little bit of a hard time keeping your mid ruds in, but you get it, you get it all nulled and you get clear on down to the bottom of it, and you're there – got no item. And there's nothing there now, and it's all gone and everything's gone. And you thought it was "shoe trees," or – but that was sort of the last one in. You don't know… "Well, it all must have… I know what it was. They were all bonus packages."

You see, you'll always get an odd number of items; one, three, five – I don't care what it is, it's always an odd number of items. You get an even number of items that exactly match up on a represent list – that's very suspicious, and probably has never happened, and probably never will happen.

You get two items on a represent list that go against each other, and the whole thing folds up. I think that would be almost too rare for you to include in your calculations. The basic thing is, the pc doesn't know about it. In other… if you got a bonus package you can practically count on the fact that there were _three_ items slamming and that one of them is not yet on the list.

In other words, if you do one of these washouts that you've been calling skunks; if you think you've been skunked – it rock slammed and it all disappeared and now you haven't got anything to show for it and you cant put anything on the line plot… Well, you can put something on the line plot but it doesn't now slam. You'll be amazed. All you've got to do is continue that list. You've nulled it all, don't you see, and maybe you couldn't have continued it before you nulled it, but the nulling of it helps you to continue it. Even though the pc has a little bit of a loss and so forth, he can continue it much more easily now that it's been nulled. And hell give you a stream of items and you'll come up, and there'll be one going bang, bang, bang, bang, nice R/S, everything's fine. Got a reliable item, you've got something to oppose.

But let's say you were opposing this item on, on, on, on, on, on, and it comes to the end of the list, and you can null the list, so on – the danger point in 2-12 is at that point where the list is nullable but the item isn't on it. And oddly enough, that point can exist – so powerful and good are mid ruds. See, your auditing can be good enough, actually, to null a list that isn't complete.

There's a point where you couldn't null it, don't you see – that's just before this point. But then you finally complete it up to a point. It's got enough charge off of it so that it can be nulled, and you have a little hard time keeping the mid ruds in and you get it on out, and then all of a sudden, everything goes flat. Everything goes flat. Everything disappears.

Now, this is contrary to an earlier lecture I gave you. I want to give you a point at this. Because I said if you exactly matched the things up, this would – pardon me, it may sound contrary to an earlier lecture I gave you. I said if you'd match the thing up exactly, it would go _pssww-pssww-pssww-pssww_, and you wouldn't have much left of the package.
But let me tell you something. That can be interpreted as: Just by listing the thing out and nulling it, it all disappears. And you ask the pc what confronted what, and the pc says, well, he guesses... and so forth, and that just isn't good enough. The pc's got to know. He's got to know for sure. "Waterbucks-tigers. Yeah, those two went together." Bang! You get the positiveness of the pc. It's very positive. Pc's never asking himself questions about this. "Man, that's it!" you know. "Oh yes, all my life I've just been terrified of water..." and so forth, and this sort of thing, "...and of course those things go together, because I used to have a bearing go down every once in a while in my car and it'd sort of make a snarling sound and it would upset me a great deal." On and on and on, see. He knows those two fit together. "Oh, yes. That 'waterbuck,' that goes just up against 'tiger,' nothing else," see. Well, if you don't get that kind of phenomenon you haven't vanished it down at the end.

Now, you just continue that list, whether it was an oppose list or a represent list, and you all of a sudden will see a rock slam. Where the hell did that come from? See, you'll see another rock slam turn on. And now your list will null down to an item and the rock slam will come back on what you were opposing or come back on what you were representing – it won't come back on what you were representing, but it'll come back on and make an RI. And if you're opposing, it will come back on the thing that you're opposing. That is the correct statement.

Now, here's another mistake that is made. People are abandoning lists which rock slam. They had rock slams on them, and so forth and they're just abandoning them. Why?

Well, you'll get disabused of this and you'll get confused about what the score is – and life in general – if you've taken a rock slamming item and represented it rather than oppose it. Now, if you've done that one, you will now get a rock slamming list – this is very baffling – which will go to nothing. Or it'll just dirty-needle forever, and you can't seem to complete it. And then you never go back and check the original item. The item you're taking the represent from is slamming like crazy. Has been all this time. The more you unburden it the more it slams.

In other words, you had the item in the first place. What the hell are you doing representing it? In other words, a rock slamming item does not find another item by representing. The only thing you're going to come up with on a represent list – you may get a bonus package or something – but the only thing you're going to come up with in actual fact is the item you started with. You've got the rock slamming item, why the hell are you doing 2-12, see. Why are you doing 2... ? You see, what are you trying to find? You've got it!

It's sort of like a bunch of firemen come up, you know, in their firetrucks, and here's this whole apartment building on fire, you know, and the guys run around asking everybody in the neighborhood and phoning city hall and so forth, trying to find out where the fire is, you know – paint's blistering on the truck.

So they start a Fire Prevention Week in the area and start putting up fire prevention posters and that sort of thing, and never take out a single hose or do anything with the fire.

The pc gets very upset when you do things like this, see. How can you find an item that you've already got? That's the question.
Now, here's a sneak that happens, which is not a criticism of the auditor. You've got an item, it's doing just a little bit of a buzz, and you list, and you go dirty needle, and you get messy, and you've got rock slams, and it's quite a list, and you go on, and it doesn't seem to complete or something or other's happening with it, and so forth. And you fail to test the item you got it from. That item has been rock slamming for some little time now. Because you represented it, it rock slams. So although actually it does contain the modifier of "When you get a dirty needle and can't finish the list, you do this," in actual fact, if you're a very clever auditor, you would always check what you're representing, because it might be the item, suppressed, and the representing of the item cleans it up and lets it slam.

You see, representing is very powerful auditing. When you represent something, you as good as prepcheck it and everything else. You could probably take a wrong goal and represent it and have it vanish. See, you get the idea? I mean, you could do a lot of funny tricks with this thing called represent. You do a lot of odd tricks with this thing.

Well, don't then be surprised that you start out with something that is giving a dirty needle, and you do 280 items, and you just don't seem to be getting anyplace, and you go on to 500 items and you just don't seem to be getting anyplace, and you go on to 750 items and you don't seem to be getting anyplace, and so forth. And all the time from about 50 items onward, you have had the item. It's the one you're representing.

Now, sooner or later the pc is going to get kind of bug-eyed as you go down that list; it's going to dirty needle; and it's going to be upsetting to the pc, and so forth, because now you've got his attention in a bind. See, you're asking him to represent a package. It's: the burglar has walked in the door and the telephone rings and it's his girlfriend telling him that she will be five minutes late because she didn't get a lipstick from the store and could you remember to get some ginger ale as... Burglar says he's going to shoot in the next five minutes, you see, if you don't immediately write him out a check for eight million quid or something. [laughter]

Fellow's liable to bark at the girl, under those circumstances, and the pc's liable to bark at the auditor. So you've strained, actually, the pc's attention, because the pc's attention is what causes that rock slam.

Now, the earliest lecture on attention units was given back in Elizabeth, New Jersey, in 1950, in very early June. All about attention units.

Let's say that a pc has a certain number of attention units available, total – you know, theoretical availability – and he's got 90 percent of these tied up in the bank. Therefore, he's got 10 percent of his attention units around in present time or available. Actually, it's not like that at all. It's something on the order of about one one-hundred-millionth of his attention in present time and the remainder in the bank.

But that was the earliest lecture on this particular subject. Of course, that's just an illustration. That's just an illustration, a graphic sort of a picture, of what happens to the pc. In other words, his attention is trapped, residually, in certain portions of the bank, and therefore he hasn't got much attention to spare elsewhere.
A nervous or anxious or frantic individual simply hasn't enough attention units to put on present time, or what's come up. And they're all trapped elsewhere and you're making him take his attention off various places and things are collapsing in on him in these other places in order to handle this, and he gets very frantic. It's simply a symptom of... or he goes into apathy. It's a symptom of not having enough attention in present time, see. And the less attention one has in present time, the more one is likely to go down Tone Scale. This exactly matches the old Tone Scale. The less attention in present time, the less... the lower the tone of the individual is going to be, and his concept of reality, and all this sort of thing.

Actually, you can add up all of Dianetics and early Scientology and so forth, just under the few words I'm just giving you here. Just giving you a picture. Of course, you know you've covered that ground.

But apply this now to the fact that we have found those things which have, without any doubt whatsoever, ensnared the greatest part of the pc's attention. And those are attention traps to end all attention traps. And when you've got a rock slam you have spotted one of these attention traps. And the rock slam is caused by the fury and franticness of his attention and opposed attentions. And that – zzz! That's what causes it.

Now, that amount of attention then is absorbed in the bank. Now, you stir that up, you put his attention on one of these items, and then you go off to find another pair. And you only find one of those, so – you haven't found a pair yet, see, you only find one – and then you go off and you find another item. Get the idea now. You couldn't find a pair that time either for some reason or other. And you finally – you list that out, you see, and you haven't opposed it, you see, you've had to go in with other lines, like "What would you rather not think about?" and "Who or what has been shot lately?" or something like this, you see. And you kept going in, and you'd find a rock slam each time and then you only find one of the items, you see.

How many of these single-sided items or half packages do you think you're going to find before the pc will get no R/S? See, that's the burning question. What can the pc tolerate? Oddly enough, the tolerance is sometimes very good and sometimes very bad. It isn't constant.

If the thing is directly in present time – and the second lecture is about the phantom slam – but strangely enough, if the pc has a thing right in present time that you haven't found the package with, but have ticked it, and it's right in present time, and particularly if the thing he expects to help him, and then you neglect this thing, it's a lead-pipe cinch that his attention has been all gathered up now. He won't have any attention left to put on anything else. And you just lay dead horses from there on. I'm going to give you more lecture about that.

But right now I'm talking about the auditor who finds an item, then doesn't find an opposition for it; finds another item, doesn't find an opposition for that; finds another item; almost finds another item; gets a list that's rock slamming, abandons that and then all of a sudden says, "I wonder why this pc doesn't rock slam anymore? I wonder why this pc..." – pc's getting better, and so forth, says he feels better, and so on. What's happened here? See.

Pinned his attention here, pinned his attention there. You know, these, this, that, uh, ub, ub. He's got no place to look now. You know, he's just sort of – there he is.
You say, "Why don't you rock slam, bud?" In other words, you can tie up a case so that it won't rock slam by just making too many bypasses. Now, this isn't really terribly serious.

Now, we now know what... you see, you can take the case's folder — that's why, my God, always save all the pieces of paper. And always put the date and the pc's name on it, and what you did on that piece of paper, for heaven's sakes. And this is why. In my auditing over the past couple of months I finally have left three things which have got to be completed. There are three, back along the track. There are an awful lot of packages, but I know now that those three packages are not complete.

Now, that isn't enough to catch up with it and stop everything over the number of items that have been found, the amount of attention that has been freed. But brother, I thank my stars that the records were complete. All I've got to do right now is write a few more things on the list and null them and I've got the item, do you understand? I didn't understand it earlier, I was studying this. But they're... I still had three of them.

Now, the number of these that you miss add up to the amount of stuck attention the pc has got on the track near present time. And you can add that up to a point where the pc won't go Clear. But if you've kept all the records, it can very easily be straightened out. That's what's important.

Actually, some auditor comes along and gets all the residual gain — bang! All the poor, first auditor had to do was list five more on the oppose list, you see, and he would have had the rock slamming item and it would have gone together as a package and the pc would have flown, see — 2-12 is a sneaker.

It produces better results done wrong than old techniques done right. So auditors become too easily satisfied with its gains. The pc is very happy about it. And my God, he's got the — he's got this thing, he just had to list five more and get the item, and really package it up, see, and the pc would have taken off like a Cape Canaveral — not a Cape Canaveral rocket — like a Russian rocket. And everything would have been gorgeous. See, that's all he had to do, but he didn't do it.

Now we know, now we know what a Class II Auditor is that knows 2-12 very well and is well trained and classified. We know what he is. He takes the folders and guides through the auditing of cases that have been done by Class I Auditors and straightens them out.

So this tells us at once what a Class III Auditor is, you see. He straightens out the incomplete lines and the failure to package of the Class II, you see.

Now we know what a Class IV Auditor is, see. And he takes the cases that have not been completely packaged and straightened out by Class IIIIs, you see, and he straightens those out.

And we finally find out what my class is. I straighten out the Class IVs. [laughter]

In actual fact, it is not dangerous to put this technique in clumsy hands — not at all dangerous to put it in clumsy hands, because it has residual gain. With this one proviso: pro-
And the next thing you insist on, that common, ordinary, good auditing gets done, you know. That's the next thing. That hasn't anything to do with 2-12, don't you see.

Now, the next thing after that is that 2-12 is done right and effectively, and that's about the order of importance. And if that order of importance is followed, why, anybody will be able to pick up some case and put it back together again. He can see – he's got – he looks in there and he sees these... they've got a list of five items, as opposing the rock slamming item, and there's thirty-eight strikes after each one of the five, you see, and right away he has some idea of what happened. All he's got to do is complete that list and he's got it squared up. Those are your orders of importance.

If a case can't do the basics of auditing, then the auditing the case must be permitted to do is the simplest auditing that can be done. In other words, you just omit the mid ruds, you just omit all of these odd balls, and you get 2-10. That's a heavily supervised co-audit sort of a process. You just omit everything that the auditor is goofing with and carry on from there.

But this is the way – this is the way 2-12 stacks up at the present time. It itself is not complicated. But somebody who is still learning to audit while doing 2-12 can find it very harassing and very complicated, particularly when they've missed rock slams. And particularly when… Well, they had all of List One slamming, so they represent a think item. "What would you rather not think about?" Pc goes halfway around the bend. They say, "There, you see, 2-12..." But they actually never can quite say that it doesn't work, because even if they did that, that badly, the pc still registers some gain.

So 2-12 is actually the first technique that falls into all these categories. And it's quite new. It opens up new doors to auditing. It opens up new doors to results.

Supposing an auditor almost did it right and got lots of lists, and he almost had items and so on – but he never checked anything out. You took the pc's folder, you studied it from the beginning, found exactly where it is, and the case – with four or five hours of auditing you find twenty-four items. You'd suddenly get a gain that'd make the pc just practically thetan exterior right there, don't you see? Residual gain would all take place in a very short period of time.

But the auditor that did it, if you ask him, would have been very satisfied with his own auditing. Saw the pc gain all the way.

The only thing that gives you trouble sometimes is you cannot quite make up your mind whether the item that you're going to oppose is actually a slamming item or not. And that's the only list you will ever lay an egg on, because it gives you a cyclic rock slam, dirty needle, clean, rock slam, dirty needle, clean, rock slam, dirty needle, clean, and will probably go on doing it for the next fifteen thousand items. That's the only bug there is where it really takes a little bit of judgment, because sometimes you say, "It isn't rock slamming anymore," and you should have opposed it. And sometimes you say, "Well, it was rock slamming so therefore I'm going to oppose it," and you shouldn't. So in that particular case you just learn –
one of these cyclic, dirty needle sort of lists that go on and on and on, on an opposition – you learn what one of those things look like, and after that you'll know what you're listing.

Okay. Thank you.
Okay. And this is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 11 December, AD 12. And the... this lecture concerns 2-12. The first lecture here was – this had to do with the basics of approaches to 2-12, some data on it. This lecture concerns a special manifestation and some other odds and ends on 2-12. This special manifestation is called a phantom rock slam. Sounds like something out of the Lone Ranger or something. But that's so you won't forget it.

Phantom slam. It's going to cause you more trouble than anything else. You're going to get somebody all grooved in, and they can go through all the notions of 2-12, and then they're going to run into a phantom slam. And now they're going to have trouble.

Now, I mentioned this phantom slam, many, many, many lectures ago, many, many weeks ago. And I said I was studying it. There's more to it. Now, I now have studied it. I know what a phantom slam is – given a great deal of lime to it and a lot of auditing on it and a lot of work with it.

Now, this is not a rare manifestation. To give you some sort of an idea, Staff Staff Auditor Number One in one of the Central Organizations, on the first three staff pcs, found each one of them with a phantom slam; didn't now what it was, and started burning the teletypes. Didn't know what this thing was. The teletypes got burned for another reason, and that was requesting permission to grab what was slamming in the rudiments and oppose it.

Now, this permission is about the same as asking permission to step off Empire State Building without a parachute. Now, this is first and the foremost – the first thing you must know about a phantom slam is just this: that you mustn't grab slams out of rudiments and mid ruds because you now know what the pc is slamming on. You just mustn't do that. You must get your rock slamming items off the record.

In other words, get those things either by straight 2-12 or old Security Checks or something of the sort – case data that is fairly consistent and fairly straight. Because peculiarly enough, the phantom slam will attach itself to anything and everything in the rudiments. And today the pc is slamming on "Joe," "Bill" and "Pete," and tomorrow is slamming on "mistletoe." Only the pc never slammed on "Joe," "Bill" and "Pete," and never slammed on "mistletoe." And you can wind yourself up with a peculiar phenomenon. The only touchy point in auditing of 2-12 is opposing something which isn't a rock slamming item. And when you do this, you may get a rock slam in your opposition list but it'll be a cyclic sort of a proposition. You will get a rock slam and it'll go out to a dirty needle and then it will go
clean, and then you will get a rock slam and a dirty needle and it'll go clean, and you get a rock slam and a dirty needle and go clean.

Sometimes the rock slam will even dwindle. And then you get a rock slam and a dirty needle and then it goes clean. And this I'm talking about is every two pages or every three pages worth of items you go through this cycle. And you just keep going through this cycle. And you go on and on and on through this cycle. And this cycle never ends. And you start after you've got three hundred items, you say, "Well, that's pretty good, I'd better try to null this and..." – not nullable. You can't get the ruds in, you can't do anything and so on. Pc perfectly willing to give you more items. And pc perfectly willing, you see, to put things down. You've got rock slams, everything is fine – apparently, you see. But you can't null the darn thing. And you get three items, four items null, and then bang-bang, and everything is in, and bang-bang, and the needle goes dirty and so forth and you add to the list and you try to null and you can't do it.

This is peculiar to the opposition list, by the way. You got this confounded cycle going. I'll tell you how to get a list like this, is let's carefully take an assessment of items the pc does not react to. Let's very carefully sort this out. One of the ways of doing it would be to say, "What objects are in this room?" and make a little list and then ignore all those that react on the needle and take one that doesn't. Pick one that you're sure doesn't react on the needle. Now insist the pc oppose it. And oddly enough, the pc very often will be very glib and oppose it and feel much better and you'll get this confounded cycling thing, and it may even rock slam. But you will just about go daffy with this list because it never becomes a nullable list. That phenomenon does exist.

You have to know about that phenomenon because very often it is necessary to take a List One that somebody said rock slammed last August, during a Sec Check, run in upper lower Bulawayo – that they rock slammed on "PABs".

Now, you wouldn't pay any attention to that until you'd laid three dead horses on represents – dead horses, no rock slams, no rock slams, no rock slams. You can't seem to turn on a rock slam during listing on this case.

Well, now you must assume that this case rock slammed at sometime or another on List One. One of the things that's going to be upsetting about 2-12 is people are going to go around – rock slammers are going to go around, they're going to say, "You see, the reason we use List One is just because Ron is fixated on this idea of security, see? And he's – of course, you can understand how he wants to protect Scientology and its organizations and Scientologists and so forth – but he's just got this bug, don't you see? And actually you don't need to do List One at all. You never have to have anything to do with that. It doesn't matter, Scientology benefits anyway and you don't pay any attention to that because that's just nonsense and we will only use the auxiliary lists."

And then you're going to have somebody laying dead horses and being very unhappy and the longer they audit the more miserable they're going to get and the case is not going to make any real progress, and they've just been let in for it, man.

Well, the phenomenon is this, and this is also very much – very pertinent with the phantom slam. That which is helping the person is the enemy of the person and so he never
will accept the help. He's got an enemy mixed up with the auditing session. There it is, right there in the session – it's right here, right now, in present time. It isn't some esoteric thing like an auditor gypped him out of some money back in lower Chicago, see? That had nothing to do with it. It's right here, it's right now. And that's what you have to know about the phantom slam – it's right here, it's right now. It isn't yesterday and it isn't the wife and it isn't this and it isn't that and it isn't a pr... PT problem he has out of session that he came into session with – it's right here! It's right in this session.

Now, List One is where? It's right here. It's right in this session. See, it's Scientology that is being used on the person, don't you see? It's the rules of various specific personnel that are being used on the pc, don't you see? They're being run on an E-Meter. They're in a session. Got that? And if those things are neglected, it just goes on – that slam is just... they're never located. Never, never, never, never located.

Now, the most crude manifestation of this is the phantom slam. And there it is, you see it, and now you don't see it. And you see it and now don't see it. So here's – let me go into this a little bit further. Somebody's going to – just to finish off this other thought – somebody's going to say, "Well, that's just security, and that's just so those damn Scientologists come out and us psychiatrists can really make something out of this, you see?" All of a sudden they start auditing themselves into a hole. It doesn't work, nothing works for them. It all goes by the boards! Plaghh! Understand?

It really is true that a person cannot have – I don't care if he analytically and intellectually can have the help – he can't have the help if he's rock slamming on it. See, if it's a mortal enemy of his, he just can't have it. Because his attention on the help is what he gets fed back into the bank from an enemy. And he just can't stand this. And if you ignore this, he'll just go on – dead horses, dead horses. He'll feel a little tiny bit better and he'll feel a little tiny bit better.

This is so much the case that sooner or later on just a dead-horsing case you just have to assume that at some time or another he rock slammed on List One; he does not now rock slam on List One; we cannot now find the rock slam on List One; it is submerged in some way, and we don't know how, so we're just going to take three or four or five or six key points of List One and we're going to tiger drill the things and get any one of them to tick, and then we're going to oppose it just for the hell of it. And then all of a sudden it'll turn on a rock slam and so forth.

Yeah, but it doesn't turn on a cyclic slam, it turns on a slam that goes on out and produces a reliable item, see, and bang! gives you a nullable list. All of a sudden these two things go together; the case starts to fly at once. You understand that phenomena?

All right. Now, the most flagrant and the most baffling case of this, is he phantom slam. Now, you see the case I was just talking about, it doesn't slam at all. Now, there's quite the reverse. There's the case that just slams slams and slams. The auditor sneezes and the case slams.

I can tell you an awful lot about this phantom slam. It is really goofy. It makes lists look like they're slamming when they aren't. And eventually, the auditor won't be able to tell whether he's got a phantom slam or a real slam. He's just done a list, but every time the pc had
the tiniest little withhold in he session – moved his foot and didn't tell the auditor – he's got a rock slam. At that moment the auditor is saying, "Pigs." So he marks down on the list, "R/S, pigs. R/S." See? And then the withhold continues to have force till the pc changes his mind or something, for the next few items, so he's got R/S, R/S, R/S. This is nice. You know, R/S, and then it's gone.

Now he goes over the list again, and although it is not always true, that – it's seldom true that something that R/Sed while being written down, R/Ses during nulling. As a matter of fact, it doesn't mean a thing if something that R/Sed when it was written down doesn't R/S when you're nulling. Just forget it. Don't even expect it to. Your test is whether or not you've got it... one R/Sing item while you're nulling. That's the one thing you've got to have, see?.

But in this particular case you just never get... you got these R/Ses and as you're nulling, the ones that had R/S all marked with R/S, they no longer R/S. But this one – this one, "willow wand" which didn't R/S while it was being listed, R/Ses. Only you now say, "willow wand" and it doesn't R/S. Man, this is stuff for the nut house. You know? And you just get kind of baffled after a while. You say, "What the hell is going on here?"

And if you keep on auditing this pc you will eventually realize that the R/S has nothing to do with what you're doing with R2-12. The R/S turns on incidentally. And it's likely to turn on more powerfully on a charged list. If the list is a heavily charged list, natively, that has its own R/S on, now you'll get far more R/Ses because of the phantom slam, see? See, you're busy listing something that does have some rock slams on it. Well, the presence of the phantom slam makes practically everything on the list rock slam. There's real enthusiasm.

And then you get right on down to the end of it and you say, "Well, there's my item, pigs." You know? "There's my item, pigs." And you get right on down there, bang!, pigs. "It rock slammed the first time I went by it." [with a pleading voice:] 'On pigs has anything been suppressed? On pigs has anything been invalidated?" Man, they're the deadest pigs you ever had anything to do with. You were betting your bottom dollar on "pigs" because you saw it rock slam the first time through and you come back and it never rock slams again. You just chased an R/S all over the place. It chases all over the list, it chases over Tiger Drills. It chases here and it chases there. And that's the phantom rock slam. And it can really louse up 2-12.

Now, you see this is not very rare. This is not very rare. If I tell you the first three cases run by Staff Auditor – Staff Staff Auditor Number One in a Central Organization on staff were all phantom rock slam cases. So, by George, we had better know a great deal about this.

So I have practically audited me eyeballs out trying to find out everything I could find out about this confounded manifestation. And the test is this: Does the pc R/S in rudiments or mid ruds? Particularly in this new form of Goal Finder's Model Session, where you're putting in "Since mid ruds," "Since big mid ruds" to start the session with – "Since the last time I audited you..." in other words, put your big mid ruds in. And you'll find out that needle will be awful smooth an awful lot of the time.

Particularly – I don't care whether they're put in that way for a listing session, but for a nulling session they must have been put in that way. "Since the last time I audited you..." or
"Since the last time you were audited..." (if it's a new pc), "...has anything been... " you see? And then you just move in your big mid ruds right straight across the boards.

All right, that type of operation will get more rudiments in than you can shake a stick at. It's actually more powerful rudimenting than old Model Session. This is really, really gunned up. And if such rudiments are put in at the end of the session, you're putting in more end ruds than you've ever put in before, too. Particularly if you're careful with the room and havingness. But that's beside the point. Because, that's details that are coming up and it's simply a smooth-out of Model Session. You see these various changes of one kind or another. But they have bearing, and I mention that just in passing here only for this reason: If you're using any type of mid rud which gets from the last session, or covers any type or period of livingness at the beginning of session or during the session or something like this, and you see R/Ses turn on, an R/S turn on, or if you're using old-type Model Session, you saw an R/S turn on – watch it, man, because you're auditing a phantom slam.

Now, sometimes the pc graduates upstairs to having one. And you feel you're perfectly safe and everything is fine and so forth. Actually your pc was below rock slamming. And you unburden the case and the case is making good advances and one day you sit down and find yourself facing a phantom slam. In other words, the pc can move upstairs into one.

Now, a slam on a case will go through a cycle. As you unburden a case it can come into rock slamming. See, it didn't rock slam on a certain subject or area before but it moves into rock slamming, then the rock slam becomes very frantic and very intense – this is plotted against quantities of hours of auditing, don't you see, numbers of sessions. I'd say... let's say over a period of a couple of weeks of auditing you're liable to see one of these things which was a very tame R/S turn into a very frantic one. And then start to cool. Now we're talking about a phantom slam, you see? And then it gets cooler and cooler, and finally is almost a lazy rock slam. It's hardly a rock slam at all. You keep unburdening it.

And then one day you hit the actual item right on the button, and all the characteristics of the slam come back for that item. Crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash. Because you hit it right straight on the button. So, it can appear to go away. It can appear to get more frequent. It can appear to get less frequent. It can all of a sudden develop on a pc who is moving up scale by reason of finding packages. It can tend to disappear because you're finding packages.

In other words, the characteristics of this thing can change, and there's no particular way that you can spot and say, "That is the pc's phantom slam." See? That – it will be more or less the same width but different speeds. And it can simply materialize out of the blue. You know, he never had a phantom slam before in his life and you've found three consecutive sets of packages on him and one day you sit down and you say, "Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?"... Guess I left him stuck in the last item.

All right, and it... finally gets the suppressions off and it goes off, you know. "All right, since the last time I audited you, has anything been invalidated?" – Crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash-crash. And he gives you an answer, and that's all.

Here's the – here's a horrible mistake. "Oh." he says.
"Since the last time I audited you has anything been invalidated?"

He says, "I invalidated what Joe said about his pc." And the slam turns on.

And you say, "Joe" and you'll get the slam back because you haven't got all of the rudiments in. So you say, "Joe. Joe." And because you've changed it and he objects to it, his withhold turns the slam back on, and you say, "Joe. Joe. Hey, what do you know! I've got a slamming item, here, 'Joe'! Ho-ho-ho-ho." God help you! You have no slamming item named Joe.

Now look, I've kept records of these things. I've taken goals lists and have spotted every type of goal the pc slammed on and they all bear a relationship. It's all understandable, it can be measured up. You can figure it out within two or three dynamics. I mean, you can get close, see? It's either the 2nd dynamic or the 3rd dynamic or mankind or God.

You can drive yourself halfway around the bend trying to figure one of these things out. I'm not kidding you, man. I really had the old wits tuned up to a high whine on this one – wheels skidding all the way, too. Now, I've seen these things turn on. They are just not related to one case here. Inexplicable. How the devil? How come? How are we missing on this case? How's this going? Well, it's just this phantom slam. Makes everything look like it rock slams if the pc happens to have a withhold and you're saying the item at the same time, then you get a w... you see? But the more heavily charged the item is, the more likely you're to get a rock slam on the item. So that item is charged today. "Joe" is charged today. So all today we've got a rock slam on "Joe." Soon as we clean up "Joe" we haven't got a rock slam on "Joe," we now have a rock slam on "peanuts." Not even the same dynamic area.

And you can hunt one of these things down and my whole message to you is – don't! What is a phantom slam? A phantom slam is a rock slam that turns on in the rudiments. Any rock slam that turns on in the rudiments, any pc who consistently has rock slams turn on in the rudiments or running general O/W, that's a marvelous one to get phantom slams in. Oh, you can just drive yourself round the bend, you see. "What have you done?"

"Well, I've uh... been mean to Joe today." Rock slam.

"Joe. Joe. Joe. Ha-ha! Joe. Hey, what do you know!" "What have you withheld?" You see, you eventually get back to that, you know.

"Uh... well, I didn't tell Joe something or other and so on."

And you say, "Joe. J – Where the hell? It's gone. What happened?"

As long as he had a slight withhold from Joe, "Joe" rock slammed. Oh, how cruel! But it's during the rudiments, one that turns on during the rudiments. Now, you're safe as long as you never get rock slams when running general O/W and during the rudiments. You're perfectly safe. But you get any occasional – even an occasional – rock slam while doing rudiments, you've got a case that'll phantom slam. And that case will make a liar and an idiot out of you in listing. You'll be listing away...

Don't think you can't make any progress at all, because you will. Every now and then you accidentally find a real rock slam. The rest of the time it's just the fluke of whether or not the pc has a tiny withhold from you or the remainder of the dynamics. And that creates a rock
slam. Pc feels a little bit chilly at the time you're going down the last part of the last five items. Oh, man, you've had it. Because you go... every one of them's in. They're all slamming beautifully. And then you say -- you decide to put in the session mid rudiments, you see. This is after you've already said, "Well, four items are slamming on the list. This was marvelous, you know! Oh, we had a wonderful session, you know." And the pc looks like hell, but, "You know, I had a wonderful session," and so forth. And you're putting in the end rudiments, you know, I mean, you're putting in mid rudiments for the end of the session, you know. Pc says, "I was cold." Slam. Slam. Slam. Slam. "I was quite cold earlier in the session."

And you go back and you say, "Tiger. Tiger. Waterbuck. Fireman." There isn't a slam in the lot. Disheartening! Every so often you'll be patching up somebody's line plot that's been done in a co-audit and you'll be taking this line plot and you'll find out that there are twenty-four listed items that have been found over a period of eight and a half years of auditing or something. And you'll find out that only one of them slams. Twenty-three don't. And you say, "Well, the charge all dissipated." No. The poor auditor was bucking a phantom slam the whole way -- was making a liar out of him. So you see how important it is to know about this particular thing. It is important.

Now, this would all be pretty desperate if I hadn't figured out the solution to the thing and got the thing taped. But I wouldn't tell you of the ghastliness of the whole thing unless I had some resolution to the thing. And the resolution is very, very simple. You get the rest of what a phantom slam is: A phantom slam is turned on by something in immediate, instant present time of the session by something immediately in, or in the vicinity of the session. You needn't memorize all that, just remember, I'm just trying to tell you, it's right here! See? It isn't the fact that they just had an argument with the D of P, see. The D of P is down the hall. How the hell can they rock slam... ? See? The D of P isn't in the room. No, it's got to be right here, man.

And the way you smoke one of these things out... Now I've altered your List One so it will contain practically anything, but if you don't find a sl... if you've got a phantom slam, and the pc doesn't slam in anything you find in List One, do something. And this is what you do: You get, with the pc's help, very possible element of which a session consisted. You would make a special list. And on that list you would make damn sure that you included every part of the pc such as "me", "Joe", "you", "yourself," "my mind," "George P. Aloysius Doakes" -- full name, see. You lay all this down here, see, and you get a list of this thing. You've got the meter. You notice on the back of a meter you've got "HCO," so for God's sakes, get HCO down on it. Don't you -- you see what I mean? You get "badges", "symbols," tables," "chairs," you know, auditor," "men" -- with the pc's help, you know. The auditor can list as many of these things as he wants to. This is one of these peculiar lists. Then he has to get the pc to complete it.

We get everything in this session and you're going to find the phantom slam. That's everything in this session that is right here, right now. And you'll find the phantom slam.

Oh, yes, he has overts on what it will be. If it turns out to be the E-Meter -- yes. Now, for the first time you begin to get enough realization. You see, because he slams on it, he can't recognize it, he can't perceive it, he doesn't even know it's there. There's -- there's been -- al-
ways been a hole in the session called an E-Meter. See? And he won't give you any of the... he won't give you any, any help on this, really. You have to say, you know, "Is it this, and how about putting... putting 'a table cloth.'" See? "How about that?" "Wood," "roofs," "rooms," "air" – got the idea? That's the phantom slam.

Now, my bet is that the greatest number of these will turn out to be "me," "myself" – first dynamic. My bet is that you'll have a majority of first dynamic things. Could be, for instance, "me," but translated over into "my mind," don't you see, or something. It's something right in the vicinity of the first dynamic, it's that close to home. Pc fighting himself, that kind of thing, see. I think your greatest majority of them will be that.

But this one – now, you're saved by the bell with this, because you can fumble through and you'll find out the phantom slam will get more... and you do find some items. Your items... you've got to be awful careful in auditing a case like this, but you do find some packages. You do make some progress with the case. See, you gra... really can't help it with 2-12. You push it ahead one way or the other.

Case isn't going to make as much progress because he's got a PTP that's right present in the session all the time, but you couldn't find it. Don't blow your brains out. Because just the process – don't worry the pc about it either – just the process of going on and finding some packages and finding some packages will show you that this slam is changing in characteristic, as you find it in the rudiments. And it changes and it gets more and more to PT and it gets more and more sudden and it gets more and more constant and you theoretically could find packages till one day the pc blurted it out. Pc says, "It's 'neckties.'" There it is. Slams.

Now, the only test of whether or not you've gotten the phantom slam – this is the only test – is it doesn't reoccur. That's the only test. So you really don't know for several sessions whether or not you've got the phantom slam. But you'll see one of these things, and the only thing I could hope won't happen to you is, halfway through auditing somebody, he makes sufficient improvement one way or the other for the thing to turn on, then you don't recognize that a phantom slam has occurred and now you just find all kinds of rock slams and you find all kinds of slamming items, but nothing ever stays in. Except now and then, one slams consistently. And you say, "Isn't that nice!"

But when you oppose it, it's still there. There's no way you can sort of wash this one out. Because everything you're finding is a phantom slam. See, you're actually not finding its opposition at all. Hideous to contemplate, isn't it? The only thing that could be bad luck about this is you didn't notice that you were getting a phantom slam in the rudiments. That's the point that you could miss.

It's liable to start on a pc that it has not been happening on before. So that is very, very pertinent, and that's the only place you should really look for one. And don't plunge. Please don't plunge. Don't go diving overboard and grabbing these things which come up in the rudiments so that we can use them and oppose them. Uh-uh. Hideous to contemplate that some poor auditor, some poor auditor up in upper Podunk, he doesn't know anything about this and he's doing marvelous 2-12, and he's just getting packages and packages and packages and packages and packages and packages. He just gets packages and packages. And you look at his folders one day and he's got ten items compose a list. And he's just taking what slammed.
In other words, every time he had a withhold from the auditor, the auditor had a (quote) "reliable item" (unquote). Dzzz! And every time he had a withhold on anything that was opposing it he had another reliable item, didn't he? So that gives him a package. [laughs]

Yeah, this is a real goofball proposition here. A real goofball thing to have. But where you've got one of these things right in the session – right here, right now and so forth – it would be a very good thing to try to round it up. Without driving the pc matty and – into a nattery heap. Just try to rind... wind up the case that way, because, listen, that's so close to present time and it's so close to the environment of the session that the pc has such a screaming PTP about it that he's always being audited in the presence of a PTP and so therefore he's making no real gain at all. That is also the secret of List One. Because List One items are so close in to the session, the pc is always being audited over the top of a PTP. And we know darn well that nobody makes any progress – PTP.

The way to test that datum, by the way is – nobody will make any progress in the presence of a PTP – on a research basis, wait till somebody had a real, good, honest, authentic present time problem. Then don't let him tell you about the problem. Don't really go into this problem at all. And then insist on running a Touch Assist on him. Or run an old Communication to the Parts of the Body Process. Honest, you just won't make any progress at all, see. He won't be able to ans... he'll answer the auditing commands and he'll grind, and he'll grind and he'll grind and he'll grind and he'll grind, and it'll go on and on and on and it's all the same thing and maybe he'll even get a little benefit out of it, something will stop hurting for a while.

And then take the present time problem that he's come in with and run Problems of Comparable Magnitude or some old process of some kind or another. Dispense with this problem, get it cleaned up real good and go back and audit the same process you were auditing before and you'll see all of a sudden he'll make very nice gains. This is one of the silliest phenomena associated with auditing – that pcs don't make gains in the presence of present time problems.

Now, I've seen, oh, scores, scores and scores and scores of graphs on this. I... the data on this is very sound. And these graphs all demonstrate that where the auditor didn't handle the pc's present time problem, you didn't get any gain in the graph. And then this kind of an action was taken, you see, that the auditor was then made to handle the pc's present time problem, got hold of that problem – it'd be some nominal problem with the wife or something like that – get rid of that thing and then you might get a graph change. You didn't necessarily get a graph change, because the present time problem might have been more fundamental than the one you handled, don't you see? But where you handled the present time problem of the pc and the pc's told you that it had been handled and that sort of thing, you'd thereafter get a graph change.

So, I had to isolate what was keeping cases from advancing. This was back in 1955, 56. And I finally worked it down to the present time problem. And therefore for over the years have studied present time problems pretty closely and then was eventually able to smoke out the whole of the GPM, just on that data that comes up from that zone of research, and the anatomy of the problem.
Now, the closer to present time and the closer to auditing the present time problem is, the less gain can be expected from auditing. It's a direct proportion. And that's why List One is a killer. Now, List One has been made now to include all the dynamics. Now, it's -- it's rather stretching one, but if we realize that matter, energy, space and time are all part of the auditing room and are all part of the session and that the word "auditing room" is also part of the sixth dynamic, realize that there are a couple of thetans present in an auditing session. (Some pcs think there are more, but...) And when you realize that some pcs are totally sold on the omnipresence of God -- he's everywhere, you know -- also, you see, if he's real mad at mankind he can have an oblique ax out for Scientology. See, it's liable to help mankind and he hates mankind and you're a member of mankind and he's sitting in a mankind body, don't you see? So, that becomes part of the session. You're both living things, and in some sessions, even the second dynamic has been known to raise its head.

Now, this situation, then, makes part of List One the dynamics. But that ordinarily should take care of the phantom rock slam. Ordinarily, just an assessment of List One and a careful attention to "did it turn on a rock slam?" -- that ordinarily would take care of your phantom rock slam. You'd get it -- do List One, you get the phantom slam with your present amended list and you'd sail right from there. Everything would be fine.

You might not have even noticed you had a phantom rock slam, you'd have it off so soon. Well, that's -- that's all well, but after you've done this and after you've cleaned up all the slamming items on List One, you then have a phantom rock slam -- what are you going to do? You see, you have to have the total security of an answer. Well, you certainly better go over it with the pc and take up every single bit that the session consists of. And just get a long list of them, we don't care how much of List One he repeats, we don't care about any of these things. Because it might be something a little bit off base. He might call himself "Joey" and it might be "Joey" that he rock slams against, but not "Mr. Jones." See? "Mr. Jones" -- pc's name, you see -- "you" -- all that sort of thing. No, it's "Joey."

Quite weirdly enough, this is the character he most despises in the whole world -- Joey -- himself. But "me," pointing at him... By the way, this is an interesting thing. The way you assess those things is, you really shouldn't point at things in sessions on lists and that sort of thing, but you can point at the pc when you say "me." You can point at the pc and say, "Me." And point at yourself and say, "Me." And you can get this across.

Now, there, aside from not being able to audit, is the greatest trip rope that you will find in R2-12. That one can really throw you because it could throw a veteran, if you didn't know about it. I mean, a fellow could know all about R2-12, making marvelous success with R2-12, tearing right down the track with R2-12, getting packages on pcs, straightening out everything, everything is going gorgeously, and all of a sudden he finds himself across the auditing table from a phantom rock slam. Doesn't recognize it for what it is, all of a sudden picks off, out of thin air, 'Ha! Joe! Ha-ha! Guy rock slams on 'Joe,' I guess we'd better oppose 'Joe.'" Oh, this list is going no place.

Odd part of it is, he could oppose Joe and he could oppose Pete and he could oppose the fellow's wife and he could oppose this and he could oppose that and he could oppose
something else and about… He could do forty or fifty lists, actually, trying to trace this slam and oppose it. He would lay an egg on that preclear, that's for sure.

If you can't find it and if you can't turn it off, well, just to the best of your ability… You see, I've given you now three solutions to it. Your first solution is your expanded List One, that normally should catch it. If you notice after you've done List One and you think List One is pretty clean, that you still have a rock slam turning up in the fellow's rudiments, you know you've got a phantom slam, you know that guy's got a PTP right in that session. Right here. It's a PTP with the E-Meter, the auditor, with wearing clothes, with having to breathe air. It's a PTP with something.

Then your next action is just sort it out – sort it out. Get a new sort of a List One. But actually, it's the "session list." And it's just everything that this session might possibly consist of. And while you're listing this thing, keep your eye like mad on that meter. Because he might think of something that turns on a rock slam when he's concentrating on this session, you might be able to steer him into telling you exactly what it is. And it's finally, "your hair." Got the idea? See, you could steer him into it if you saw the slam turn on. So it's listing against the meter, as you always do, but very pertinently.

All right, that's your second remedy. And your third remedy for this if all else fails, is just go on finding items to the best of your belief, and don't buy items that just go flash-flash and then disappear. Go on and find some item that tends to stay in. Because this above all else will tend to make you do incomplete lists.

You'll say, "Well, it flashed, you know, I've got these last four items at the end of the list and they all rock slammed and then the rock slam turned off. So naturally, they packaged." Naturally. And you don't put those extra twenty items on the list that gets the real item, see? It leads you to incomplete lists and so forth. But do the best you can. Get your packages and so on, and all of a sudden you – that's climbing uphill, very hard – but you'll notice that this slam will get more frequent, turns on easier, gets less frantic at the same time, and then one day the pc, you're doing some kind of a list and the pc says, "Heads! A head. A head!" See? "Yeah! Yeah! It's this head!" See, it slams like mad and you've got the phantom slam. Got the idea?

That would take care of it all. But I would make a special effort to do something about this as early as you noticed it. Now, I'm sure that some of you right now are auditing pcs who have phantom slams. And that you are just a little bit puzzled as to what happens to this occasionally and how come you got down to the end of the list and then you had to say, "Well, actually, there were two packages on the same list and they both blew up, and there was no item, really, which came out of it because everything packaged and they were all bonus packages."

That's for the birds, you know. That's just for the birds. You should go back and take any list that… Well, actually, if you have a phantom slam, is you go ahead and find out what the devil it's slamming on – whether from this new issue of List One, or the second method of making up a list of the session – and find it, get it out of the road, and then go back, and then go back and pick up all those lists that resulted in no item, really, that all sort of went out suddenly and mysteriously, that… it was nullable, but it all disappeared and you didn't really have
anything, and you... the last one in, you guessed. You know, that kind of thing. Complete those lists. Null – you don't have to null the whole list, you just null the stuff that you've added to it. You're going to find yourself some nice RIs. Maybe at the expense of only listing a few hundred items on a half a dozen lists, maybe you'll find yourself about six reliable items. Slang! Slang! Wouldn't that be nice! Bonus package.

That'd be a good way to show up some HPA someplace, by the way. Take this folder, take the folder he's been working on on this pc for the last 195 hours, you see, and then you only audit the pc for something like three and a half hours or something like this and you find twelve new items, you see, or something like this, and you say, "You see, it's very easy. What you do in 195, I do in... " Dirty. Dirty trick.

But now, 2-12 should result in a positive result. You should have something to show for it. Don't think that everything goes up in smoke. It doesn't. You should have something to show for it.

Now, there's one little other phenomenon I want to talk about, which is really not part of phantom slams, but something I ought to mention is indeterminate things. Opposing indeterminate things. Now, you'll find out that you can represent indeterminate things. Definition: No mass. Massless. It's an idea or a condition. And now, you can represent these. Oh, by all means, represent them, you see, and you're going to get rock slamming items and you're going to get nice, massy things, you know, and they've got mass, meaning and fixidity. And everything is getting along fine and you're getting these things and then one fine day... You know, that's from this indeterminate – I mean, it's just a doingness, it's a significance. Let me call it a significance. That communicates to you better. We already got a word for it: Significance.

You represented significances and that was fine. But when you start to oppose significances, you're going to get in trouble.

Now, it isn't that you don't oppose significances – you do. If you find a rock slamming significance, why, you oppose it. We don't care what we oppose. The only thing we have to know about – if it rock slams, oppose it, see. That's all we have to know. But this peculiar thing, this significance that is rock slamming will occasionally throw you.

Now, you do the Zero A list. You assess the Zero A list, and you get – you get something about "attack." You know, and you've assessed out "attack" and you're going to do a represent. You're looking for something to do a represent list on, to find something to get a first list, see. And you hit "attack" and it says "attack" and it rock slams. And you say "attack" and it rock slams. You say "attack" and it rock slams. Well, now, the Zero A lists, of course, are made for representations to get first lists out of, aren't they? But even that is junior to the law: If it rock slams, oppose it. If it's a reliable item, oppose it. Don't ever represent it. Oppose it.

But this significance produces an oddity, because you're actually opposing nothing. See, you're opposing an idea. And you find yourself sometime opposing "attack." "Who or what would oppose 'attack'?" Oh, wait a minute, that's a doingness. There's no mass at the other end of this thing. Well, you can actually come up with an item. But you have to oppose it right back to get a package. Because "attack" versus "a defender" is not a package. You
understand? It's got no mass. So you don't have "attack" versus "defender" equals a package. You have to swing back on the trolley and oppose what you've just found.

Now, the easiest thing in the world is to oppose a significance and wind up with a vzzz, where the significance doesn't read, and you didn't find any item opposing it. That is the easiest flub to make anybody ever made. You just list a hundred more opposition items to it, and you're going to come up with a great, big juicy reliable item that you missed the first time.

In other words, you could null that list down to nothing, and it apparently took the charge out of "attack" but you didn't come up with an item to oppose "attack." Now, you've got to swing back and get the item that opposed "attack" by opposing what opposes "attack." Do you see that? Otherwise you're just going to have a – you're going to have a significance opposing an identity. And that isn't a package. A package is... are opposed identities.

Now you, of course, can have an idea opposing an idea and call it a package because they both rock slammed. Now, that's four items, perfectly all right with me. But actually it isn't very much of the GPM. It's darn little. But you get "a bricklayer" opposing "working hard" and try to call that a package. It's not a package.

Now, you can get the bricklayer by opposing "working hard," but you've now got to oppose the "bricklayer" to find out what the package consisted of. Got to get the zig-zag of this. This is old, original 3D Criss Cross. But this particularly applies to the significances. Significances very easily go blank, so that it doesn't rock slam, you don't find an item to rock slam against it and you say it evaporated. Couldn't evaporate. You found an item with mass opposing a doingness and of course that was no package, and it didn't evaporate anyhow; it's just submerged.

All you've got to do is keep on opposing it. Just get your list. Complete your list. And you're going to find a nice, big slamming item, and it's going to stay there this time. And boy, when you find that item, man, it'll really stay there, it won't evaporate, you couldn't hit it in the head with a sledgehammer and do anything to it. It just goes on slamming. See?

Now, to do anything with that and get your package you've got to come around backwards, and you've got to find out whether or not, using your same opposition rules, whether that produced pain or sen. Now, if it produced pain or sen, why, you oppose it accordingly and you're going to come over here and you're going to get the nicest package you ever saw. When you get those two packages, they're going to sit there right together and the pc knows all about it and then they might have a chance of blowing.

Now, you see how items could get submerged in 2-12 and appear not to have anything there and – and so forth? And the only rule you have to follow is, if the list is nullable, you can find an item on it that will be a good, strong, beefy item – if a list is nullable. It has to be a rock slamming list in order to find an item on it, of course, and it has to be nullable. It need only have one rock slam on it. We've just had some lists start to rock slam after a thousand items. Isn't that horrible? It's not giving this cyclic manifestation though, that I've discussed and you have no reason to suspect the source is wrong and it did rock slam. Now, that list won't go down to nothing if it was nullable. It won't go to nothing. It will go to an item. If it
looks like it's going to nothing and there's just four dirty needles left in – four dirty reads, you know – man, that list isn't complete. Just because you could null it is no reason it's complete.

Now, there's another goofball one about invalidating the list. Invalidating items. You're too prone to use invalidated items to dig up this and to dig up that and to dig up something else. Why don't you just forget it? The pc's invalidating the items he's giving you and that sort of thing – yes, that's a perfectly valid test. But now, why, some students have begun to use that for other reasons. And we have already found two pcs who already knew the rule, who didn't want to complete the list who simply invalidated two or three items and then got out of it. But when the list was completed, produced an item.

Ah, my faith in pcs is deteriorating here.

The list we're talking about – that is the freak list, that'll give you trouble – is the list you can't null. So your basic rule, you see, is, "Is the list nullable?" If the list is nullable, it'll have an item on it. If it hasn't got an item on it by the time you've finished nulling it, then complete the list.

How much should you pressure the pc into listing when he doesn't want to? This all comes under basic auditing. What are you doing as an auditor sitting there with the pc out of your control? The usual phenomenon is something like this: Pc says, "I haven't got any more. But I tell you the list is complete. I-I've said it's complete. I've said it's complete four times, and now you want to go on and on and on and on and on. I've said the list is complete."

And you say, "Well, all right. Well, all right. Okay," you say. Surrender, you know. "Okay. On this list, has anything been suppressed?"

And he says, "So-and-so and so-and-so, another two items I didn't tell you and so forth and oh, yes! There's 'iceberg,' 'reindeer,' 'Santa Claus,'" so forth.

And the other day we had a very disgraceful scene. A very disgraceful scene. The pc kept on listing and the auditor couldn't stop him to get in the midruds to finish him, you know? [laughter] It's just basics of auditing.

Oddly enough, after a list is completely nulled, completely finished and completely dead, a pc very often will be able to complete it. And very often the pc is not really able to give you more items until you've finished nulling the list. Well, that's one for you to know, isn't it? The pc says there are no more items, he actually can't think of any more items – null the lot, tiger drill the last two and all of a sudden the pc's got twenty more items. You haven't got an item yet. So just go on listing, listing, listing, listing, listing, and list your needle out clean and just take that new section and just – just as though it's a brand-new list. Null it down, this time you've got an item. Sometimes you haven't. Sometimes it happens again. If you can null a list, there's an item on it.

Main trouble you're going to get into – the main trouble you're going to get into, however, comes under the heading of the basics of auditing, not under the basics of 2-12. You'll think there are endless rules to 2-12, you'll think there are endless things to know about 2-12. In actual fact there aren't. These rules are pretty hard and fast about 2-12. The basics of auditing cover most of the difficulty that a person will have. He knows 2-12 pretty well, basics of auditing is what he's probably light on. The danger of 2-12 is that an auditor can get a result
on 2-12 that he is satisfied with and that the pc is satisfied with and the auditor has not yet completed his 2-12, has not yet got proper items on 2-12 and has not done it right at all. And the residual gain there is about a thousand percent worth. That's the main danger.

People... you're going to find – someday you go down to Oklahoma here, twenty, thirty years from now, and there'll be somebody down there in Oklahoma, and they'll be busy auditing on the original 2-12 and that sort of thing, and in all those years they have never found an item on a pc, never found a reliable item except by accident and their pcs are all happy and they're all happy and they think 2-12 is wonderful. That's the main danger with 2-12.

All right. You know, actually, we're very, very happy with the way you're doing. You get a lot of – you get a lot of knocking about, you know, and you get a lot of snarling, but in actual fact, why, we're very, very proud of the way you're doing. I'm very proud of the way the Instructors are handling this. We've gotten this thing off the launching pad at a – at a fantastic rate. We've got people in here very new to the course who are doing very, very nicely. They're doing fine.

Somebody came from another organization, from an organization, one of these – other day – to ask about the trouble we were having with 2-12. And they were getting ready to get it trained and they were getting ready to get out checksheets and they were getting ready to get auditors to study it so that someday somebody could do it. And they were quite surprised that we weren't having any trouble getting 2-12 into action. They were quite amazed, as a matter of fact, rather insulted. We should have been having more trouble than we've been having.

So, I think you're doing fine with it and you're looking much better. The number of items found are fantastic. And you've got a whole bunch of residual gains coming up now, and the gains are right there, because you go back and look at those unfinished lists where you didn't find the item – finish the list and find the item, and all of a sudden the pc will take off.

Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.
R2-12 DATA:
NEEDLE BEHAVIOR

A lecture given on 13 December 1962

Well, another evening. What – what's the date?

Audience: Thirteenth.

Thirteen Dec., AD 12. Have you been lucky today?

Audience: Yes. Yeah.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

This is a lecture on 2-12, needle behavior.

Nomenclature: a clean needle. What is meant by a "clean needle"? What is meant by
"cleaning a needle"?

Well, not what you think. We want a free, flowing needle. We want a needle which,
when it comes up the line, doesn't go tick-tock. Not when we say anything! Now, let me get
this point across, here. I'll be calm. The auditor is saying nothing. Do you understand? The pc
is sitting there. The auditor is not doing a thing. You got that? He's not even reading the meter
probably. And under those circumstances there is no faintest trace of irregular or reacting mo-
tion on the needle.

I knew I could get this one across. I just saw a couple of cognitions. Now, you've been
thinking that cleaning a needle had to do with when you said something it went bop, and then
when you said something again it didn't go bop. And that's not cleaning a needle. I make my
point?

Audience: Yes.

That is just taking a read off the needle. You can clean a read off the needle, but that
doesn't give you a clean needle.

If you will watch a needle on a preclear, at some time or another in the source... in the
progress of processing – at some time or another in processing, probably during listing – you
will have finished a list and will not yet have Qed-and-Aed, see? And at that moment you will
see a needle undergoing a slow, pleasant rise and, less usually, a slow fall. It would be flow-
ing. That's all it will be doing – a flow. You can see that needle flow.

This is particularly true of a Mark V. I... a Mark IV doesn't even begin to express it
like a Mark V. But a Mark IV will also express it. And there's that needle, and it's just... you
can't even begin to approximate it with your finger on the tone arm because that is too irregular a rise. You understand?

It is a total uniform speed. There is not the faintest tick in it! There is not the famous – faintest speedup! There is nothing. It is just like molasses pouring out of the barrel. And there it is. And that's a clean needle! And that's how I want you to get your needles before you start nulling, and you won't have any more trouble.

And I'll bet you right now there's several amongst you who don't think it's possible.

Well, I can tell you that it isn't possible to null with a needle any other way. If you put your big mid ruds in, your needle will look like that unless you clean a clean or miss a read. Absolutely faultless mid rudiments will give you that needle. And if it doesn't give you that needle, you've missed one or cleaned a clean! You've goofed!

There isn't a pc that you've been auditing lately that I couldn't have a clean needle on in the course of fifteen or twenty minutes, no matter what they've been up to, with just the weapons you're using – big mid ruds. Just that, nothing else.

Look, please. You're in over your heads on 2-12, trying to figure out what you do on 2-12. And your trouble isn't with 2-12, see. 2-12 actually is very simple.

There's various things about 2-12: You always oppose a rock slamming item. Opposing is senior to representing. If you don't get an item which is unmistakably it, you extend the list. I mean, these things – these things are easy. These things are easy.

The trouble auditors have trouble with is the fundamentals of auditing, the fundamentals of auditing. And let me tell you, you start goofing up with your TRs, you start goofing up with your meter, and you now have a process that somebody looks down your throat and knows you have been.

If there's anything wrong with 2-12, it is so positive in its gain that anybody can tell you've been goofing. In other words, 2-12 starts showing up any fault you have with your TRs, your Model Session and a meter.

Before, these could be submerged into the upsets and vagaries of the pc. You'd say, "Well, he's having a hard time, but he'll come through it."

There's only one period during 2-12 when a needle looks some other way or when a session looks awry. And that's when you're about a third or halfway through a list, you're getting up toward the end. It's hot. The pc doesn't want to confront that next string of rock slamming items. He starts throwing little brakes on, little protests and that sort of thing, and you clean it up and it goes dirty and you clean it up and he goes dirty. Or when you are – as you inevitably will – try to null an incomplete list, a list which is almost nul- lable. It hasn't got the item on it, but it's got enough charge off of it so it looks like it can be nulled if you keep your mid ruds in. When you get yourself into that situation, yeah, your needle will look rough, but you smooth it out. And then it looks rough, and then you smooth it out, and it looks rough, and you smooth it out. You should make up your mind sooner or later that that list is incomplete.
But the point is, yeah, there are periods during 2-12 when somebody is snarling, see, and when the needle is this way. Because after all, the pc is undoubtedly going to get misemotional. Undoubtedly the pc is going to develop some somatics and say no. Undoubtedly some great big crashing rock slam is just over the horizon.

The pc sits there and he says, "Well, that's – that's complete. That was the last – the last item I put on was it. Yeah. 'Fuddy-duddies.' That's the last one. That's a – that's it. I know it's on the list now." Sell, sell, sell, sell.

You look at the needle – looks all right, nothing wrong with it. Make a few tests one way or the other – looks all fine. You go back and try to null the thing and now it's dirty and it's this and it's that and it's the other thing, and you're in trouble all the way. You decide to extend the list and find out three more items later he had a dial-wide rock slam. That was what he was trying to get complete before he reached.

Oh yes, there are periods during 2-12 when the meter looks awfully, awfully gummy and messy. But when you've got the list complete, and when you put in those mid rudiments to test that list for completeness – which test, by the way, is only a conditional test now. You've got to make a full test the way I gave you in the first place to really find out. "Is it complete? Are there any more items? Have you thought of anything else that should have gone on the list? Could there possibly be anything else on the list?" – Any of those questions produces a reaction, the list is incomplete.

Just stating the question itself, which I gave you to try to help you out was – made it too easy for you, because it doesn't deliver the goods.

We're talking about, now, a clean needle – a clean needle. And a clean needle looks like molasses being poured out of a bucket by a statue. There's just no slightest vestige of anything on it. So there's another E-Meter characteristic. There's another meter characteristic that has not been stressed, because one has talked about it, and it has apparently been so obvious, but there's a lack of communication here. And I realized last night that there was a lack of communication.

I'm not blaming you for this lack of communication. I mean, I'm not blaming you for not having – its not having gotten across uniformly and universally. Not blaming you much. Of course, you don't know what the hell's the matter with you. But it's all right. I'm being calm about the whole thing – within reason.

There's this thing called a clean needle. And the definition of a clean needle is something which flows at a uniform rate of speed at a period when the auditor is doing and saying nothing. That's a clean needle. And dat's da way they ought to look.

Now, you should realize that there's a reverse to this. It's something called a needle pattern. Well, a needle pattern isn't exactly a good statement of affairs. Pc comes in and he's always going tick before he goes tock. And the needle's going up and it goes tick and then it goes tock. And then it goes pit-pit. And then it goes tick and it goes tock, and then it goes pit-pit and so forth. And he always does this. Well, that's what's meant by a needle pattern. It is a chronic and constant needle behavior on a particular pc, when the auditor is saying and doing
nothing. We have to add that. It's not a needle response, it's a needle appearance when the auditor is saying and doing nothing.

Now, a needle with reaction on it is a dirty needle. And that's why we don't need to re-qualify the definition "needle pattern." A stage four needle is just a big needle pattern, and people will have these chronic patterns. But that's not really what we're talking about. We're talking about a dirty needle.

What is a dirty needle? You think it's a needle that's going bzz, bzz, bzz. It's a needle which doesn't look like molasses being poured out of a bucket by a statue – any tick, any roughness, any slight speedups as it goes. It's strictly a Cadillac with an automatic shift moving off on a perfectly billiard-table-flat highway, driven by an old lady.

A dirty needle is any needle which departs from the appearance of a clean needle.

Now, a dirty needle has nothing to do with the auditor. The auditor is not doing anything. All these needle patterns and responses and behaviors and everything else I'm talking about is with the auditor sitting there totally Japanese, withholding his foul breath from the pc's face, you understand? Auditor doing absolutely nothing. It's beside the point.

Now, add this into your auditing. Take that meter – pc is on it – take that meter, and just hold your breath for a count of five and watch that meter. You haven't put any question to the pc. All cycles of auditing are complete. All cycles of auditing are complete. And just watch that needle. And if that needle is doing anything but flowing at a perfect uniform rate – or could be still, but the probabilities of that are very, very faint – if it's doing anything that has any irregularity in it of any kind whatsoever, that is a dirty needle and your middle rudiments are out! You got it?

And you want to develop this practice of just sitting there for a count of five and watching the pc's needle. It tells you a libraryful. And that is the state of the needle. You observe the state of the needle. And the state of the needle is not where the tone arm is. It is not how sticky the needle is. It is not how unsticky it is. It is whether or not it has any ticks or tocks on it.

And if it's got any ticks or tocks and halts and zzppps, and anything else... And you understand, those are to a microscopic degree! You understand... this is a very extreme statement I'm giving you. Anything beyond perfect, unchanging, uniform action is observable – that is a dirty needle. And that means your mid ruds are out!

Now, if you've audited 1,865 hours on a pc with the rudiments out the whole way, it'll probably take you 25 minutes to put the rudiments in. You understand? It not only can be done, it is what I expect you to do. And if it isn't done, it's what I would consider a goof!

Now, that assigns some very difficult problems to you at various times in auditing. You get this raw-meat pc or somebody who has been audited by, oh, Frank Sullivan. And you
get this character, and whaaaaa! Man, that... you can't even tell which way the needle is going, because it's going both up and down at the same time! It is a mess. Goes bzzzt and tick, tick, zzzp! tock, tick-tock, pawk, as you sit there and watch it, see. Daah. That's going to maybe be a little bit rough now and then, until you get your first reliable item.

On such a needle of extreme filthiness – on such a needle – you actually can't expect too much till you get your first RI. You get a grooved-in list going, and you will see that needle go bzzrp-zzp – clean. Just, the list is going. And you've got the list about three-quarters complete, and you'll start to see this needle come clean. Marvelous!

I must remark on that, because that is the easiest way to clean a needle. That is the easiest way. But it offers this slight difficulty: You have to assess – you have to assess before you can list it. And of course the needle is so filthy that the assessment... assessment is almost impossible. See, so it's that period when you're doing that first assessment on this case that is rough, rough, rough, see – that is probably your most critical time in auditing. And that period, on any pc you will do, lasts only the length of time it takes you to get an accurate first assessment. It shouldn't last any longer than that.

In other words, in the total time of auditing the pc, the tendency of the needle to be or become filthy should not last longer than the hour or so necessary for you to find the takeoff point. You know, not per session, not every assessment. Going to have this pc for fifty hours, it's one of those fifty hours, and it's the first hour. And you hit it right on the button, and you don't miss with that assessment – that assessment is dead center – and as you go down listing that list, you'll all of a sudden notice that needle, and you'll all of a sudden notice that needle, and it's... be cleaning up. And by the time you've got the item you're going to find eventually on the list, ifs a rock slamming item. And you've got that item on the list, and so forth, that needle – when you go back through for the nulling ifs just nothing.

You say, what happened to the dirty needle?

Now, sometimes you'll be unlucky and you'll hit a dead horse, and then you'll hit another dead horse, and you'll hit another dead horse – something like that. Well, every one of those first assessments is ghastly. Because the dead horse is doing minimal to change the needle from filthy to clean, see. It's doing a little, but hardly anything about it.

When you find your first hot item on this pc – just in the process of listing, even before you null it out – you're all of a sudden going to see the needle go hhhha; all the tension come out of there.

That doesn't mean the next time you go up the line that it's not going to charge up. But after that you find it's very easy to get the needle clean by putting your middle rudiments in.

And before that time, that's the only case that I would think – I wouldn't make any brag of getting it in, in fifteen minutes, see. During the first hour, I would make no brag about it at all. Nor would I spend any time on it.

I'd decide, if anybody's needle was that dirty, and he'd been around auditors that long, he probably rock slammed on List One. I'd be much more likely just to read off List One, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, looking for the – looking for the slam. And then it slams, and I might or might not even finish the list. I'd just find the slam, and I'd say it a few more times
and I'd pull a suppress or two, and I'd make it slam, and I'd say, "That's good enough for de old redhead. We going right in, right here and right now, and we gonna oppose the living daylights out of this." And I'd have my item, see.

I wouldn't waste any time on this. You start doing picky... And by the way, those two facts go together. The odds are very much in favor of this pc rock slamming on List One if that needle is that filthy and that hard to clean up. So you're kind of saved by the bell on that one, aren't you?

All right. Now, we go into this situation of what is a clean needle, and let me say this: There is nothing which will substitute for pure observation. Needle characteristics have a tendency to become misinterpreted. One of those needle characteristics is this: a rock slam. And you want to ask how in the name of God can anybody misinterpret a rock slam, but it has happened! People have looked at a rock slam and said that isn't a rock slam.

Well, a rock slam is simply a slashing agitation of the needle, that's all. A dirty read is a buzzing agitation of the needle. A rock slam's always got a slash in it. And the dirty needle's always got a l-zz-zzp in it. But there's no slightest substitute for observation of one.

Now, there's a rocket read. Well, I can describe a rocket read very well. Figured it out. It takes off – it always which goes to the right – it takes off with a very fast spurt and does a rapid decay, like a bullet fired into water. It's very fast. It goes psswww! It looks like it's got all of its motive power from its first instant of impulse, with no additional motive power being imparted to it by anything. It's kicked off and it has no further kick, so it just rapidly dies out. How wide is it? That's a silly question. I've seen them from a sixty-fourth of an inch to a dial. See, they're any width.

Now, a rock slam can have its first slash mistaken for a rocket read – if the auditor has never seen a rocket read. Because that first slash looks like a very rapid, hectic motion, and they say that must be a rocket read. But actually, it doesn't take off with a spurt. It's of uniform speed, and it has power put to it the whole distance of its slash. In other words, there's a motor driving that one. It doesn't kick off and do a rapid decay. It's uniform speed. And it stops suddenly. It doesn't decay; it just goes bah – stops suddenly.

That first slash is more commonly to the left, not to the right. And you'll hear people talking about inverse rocket reads. Well, they're seeing the first stroke of a rock slam. There is no reverse rocket read. If you tiger drilled it up a little bit, you would see the second, third and fourth stroke occur immediately after that first stroke.

I was quite interested. They didn't know whether somebody was a rock slammer or not, because all they could get was the first slash going to the left. That's good enough, man. That's a rock slam. It's not a rocket read.

Now, we're into types of needle characteristics not covered in the _E-Meter Essentials_. And these characteristics of the meter have all emerged in the past year. Not the rock slam. We have known it for years and years and years. But the importance of the rock slam – oh, we've known something about that. But that a rock slam could be as small as it can get and be a rock slam – well, I'm afraid we didn't know that. It can be awfully tiny. See, you can forget
your "inches of measurement tells us how... whether it's a rock slam or not." A rock slam is definitely itself. I've been studying them lately, and they're definitely themselves.

The other day I saw one that was a – something on the order of about a sixteenth of an inch was its first stroke. And then it went into a dirty needle – dirty read. Sixteenth-of-an-inch rock slam stroke, and then the remainder of about a fifth of an inch, or something like that was a dirty read. I saw the two crossed right there in the same read. I was quite interested in – when I drilled these things up and did a little something or other to them – to find out that it held good, that that was what that was.

Gives us terribly interesting point: Should we have opposed that item then or represented it?

Well, we're representing it and it's delivering rock slams, but I don't know but what that shouldn't have been opposed. Time would tell.

So there is a point there, which you will strike almost never, where your adjudication can become confused about it. Was it a dirty read or was it a rock slam? And the only thing that's confusing about it is that a dirty read is quite different than a rock slam. It looks like an electric buzzer going and it doesn't look like anything slashing. And a rock slam always slashes. It's the difference between tickling somebody on the sole of his foot with a feather and chopping his head off with a saber. I mean, the two things are quite different.

And there's this business of – this business of the rocket read that should never be confused with even a one-stroke rock slam because of its fast decay. Now, this – we add to these data, here, the data of a clean needle. And that takes – that takes something – is something new that has been defined. It was one of these "everybody knew" things up until this time – and it's not one of these. I mean, nobody evidently understood this thing, because otherwise some people keep saying, "Clean up that needle." The Instructors around here have been saying, "Clean up the needle, clean up the needle." And the auditor, in many cases I am sure, has been saying, "Well, yeah, anything been suppressed? Yeah, there was a suppress on that." And pull the suppress and get the needle... gets a few things from the pc, and say, "Well, I've cleaned off several reads. So therefore it must now be a clean needle."

He didn't realize that the shirt on the line was not being worn or used at the time it was clean. See? I mean, there it was. It was either plastered with mud or it was snowy-daze, tidewater white, see? See, it was – it was the needle when nobody was doing anything that we were talking about. Nobody's doing a thing. Just sitting there looking at the needle. And that's what determines whether it is clean or not.

No, all those little ticks and tocks and so forth come under the heading of your big mid ruds, plus – which also includes missed withhold – plus perhaps a very, very heavy shake-down of... Well, a case might be so anxious, the case might be so this and might be so that, you couldn't get these things in, but nevertheless those are the buttons which make it dirty – they're the buttons contained in the big mid ruds. That's why they are those buttons.

Now, there are a couple – three other buttons that have influence on this. But actually, if you clean up the main buttons you get the others too. There's the matter of shifted attention. This is not a button that you would use. I'm giving you an example. You could have 135 but-
tons and all that big mid ruds, don't you see? And it'd all be very complex. But the truth of the matter is there are none necessary. This is one of them. This is a very – a very nice one. This is a very nice one. This'll lead you astray any day of the week. "In this session, has your attention been shifted?" See?

Well, that – that's almost valid. It's almost good enough to be part of the big mid ruds, because you've get somebody whose attention was yanked off his list or yanked off the auditor, or the auditor did something unexpected; you get all the points of surprise out of a session, see.

Surprise is simply shift of attention. I've known that for a long time. And you can clean a couple of little ticks, and a couple of little reads off the thing, and that sort of thing. But in actual fact, it isn't good enough, over a broad usage, to be employed as a big mid rud. It isn't good enough. There are a lot of others this way.

Now, every pc has a favorite button. They have a favorite. You learn this faster prep-checking than otherwise. You do an eighteen-button Prepcheck and you'll find out that every pc you – every pc you do an eighteen-button Prepcheck on has a different favorite out of those eighteen buttons, see. This guy runs hotter than a pistol on Decided. And that bird runs hotter than the devil on Suggested. And they tend to have favorites.

Now, you're getting up toward doing a Prehav assessment just to get your mid ruds in, when you expand beyond a very small number of rudiments. You go beyond eight or nine buttons to get in mid ruds in a session and you are being ridiculous. Because if you're going to go any further than that to get Big Tiger or big mid ruds, you see, why don't you do Prehav assessment?

Why don't you get the Prehav Scale out, and do a full roll-your-own – and that'll deliver the case right into your lap. Actually the needle will straighten right out, because you've got the exact button now that is causing the needle to be anything. Only the difference is, is you're – you're no longer doing 2-12. You're doing Routine 2. That was the earliest ancestor of 2-12, see.

Oh yeah, you can do Routine 2. You do a Prehav assessment and run this thing repetitively on the pc, in a fi... or, in a five-way bracket. Marvelous! A lot of cases gone right straight up the graph and everything. It's a nice – it's a nice process. It's pointless. But it's a nice process.

You can change somebody's graph all over the place. If you just wanted to be an HGC D of P and be able to shake paper in front of the pc's face… The pc'll be very excited about it, too. And you just want to shake paper in front of his face and, "You want to know what gains you've got? Well, good, good. See, you went from the bottom to the top, see?" Pc feels good and everything is fine. Probably be back at the bottom again next week, but that's all right.

Point I'm making is you really didn't do very much in the way of shifting mass or anything else for the pc that had any lastingness. It was lack of lastingness that sealed the fate of Routine 2. It didn't last. You have to actually find items. You have to find items, and those have to have some mass to them for a case to get any kind of a shift.
In the first place, this case has got item one bucked into item two. And the reason item one is held in suspense in time is because it is exactly balanced against item two, which is held in suspense in time. And actually, even do Routine 2-12 badly, you have still upset that balance. You're not going to murder anybody with this, and the case could get an enormously better gain, but sooner or later that balance is going to – going to shift. It'll stay out, in other words.

It's like – it's like the fellow's leaning on the wall. And he could lean on the wall, and the wall lean on him, you see, for quite a while. But you take the fellow away from the wall or the wall away from the fellow and you haven't got the status quo anymore. This situation is no longer this kind of a status quo.

Well, in view of the fact that it isn't quite the fellow leaning against the wall, but a wall leaning against a wall, you take either wall away, the other wall will fall down. That's more the architectural pattern of the two dumbbells of a package.

So you can unsettle that status quo, and you can unsettle it in a variety of ways and it's never the same again. It doesn't recharge. But if you wanted to get the full benefit and never have anything hanging in your way at all, you'd, of course, neatly pick up the package. And the benefit there is ten, fifty times more than just softening up one side of it.

You soften up one side of the package and the other one tends to be unbalanced and not be as effective and hang around and aberrating the pc, but it's still there. And you leave too many of those things, and the pc starts getting confused. He doesn't know what he's leaning against now. And he doesn't feel he's had much of a gain. And if you want to know – if the pc wants to know he's got a gain, you actually got to find both of them.

You'll run into 2-12 some guy that you list the whole thing out, you think, and then you don't find an item. And then you – you found an item, and then you oppose it, and list the whole thing out, but don't find an item. You don't find anything to lean against the first item. And you'll find the case – the case tends to feel funny. Well, the case will say, "Oh, yeah! Lots of gains, lots of gains." And two days later he'll say, "What gain?" See, he's not in the know that he's had much of a gain.

He might have gained, you see. The two noses that he ordinarily wears – one of them might have disappeared, you see. There might have been quite a change in the guy, but he won't know it. In other words, this doesn't affect the knowingness to the degree that finding both sides of the package does. Now, you've got to go ahead and find both sides of the package in order to do that.

If you kept on doing that, finding just one side, and finding one side, and never finding the other one, and one side… You go up the line about six – this – six unfound, bypassed items in 2-12-you think you've found them but you haven't; you know, they didn't – nothing rock slammed on the other side, you see – you'll find your pc starting to be nattery, starting to look kind of seedy.

You go back, then, and complete those lists and find the rock slamming item in each case, and this pc takes off, and you wonder how the hell you ever considered that you'd ever seen a pc gain before. Because the gain, now, that he – that he gets out of just extending that
list a bit and finding that real item there is phenomenal. He now knows he's gained, and the gain is terrific.

In other words, you could make a little old gain that compares to processing of years past. Everybody's satisfied with this gain; they're happy with this gain and so forth, but it's not a skyrocket gain. There'll be a lot of people around as time goes on – they'll be – they'll be further out on the fringes of Scientology, you see. You'll hear this receding as a statement: "Well-well, 2-12 is all right. It's as good as... Oh, it's probably better than a lot of processes we've had in the past." You'll hear that kind of a statement, see.

Actually, that statement will get more and more further out away from where people know how to do it, you see. Because if you do it right, and you get both sides of each package, and so forth, there isn't any doubt left in your mind whatsoever about the power of 2-12 compared to old processes, you see. It's tremendous.

But you know, when you are looking at somebody making that remark, you're looking at somebody who never completes a list. He just – he just confessed. He just signed, sealed and delivered a confession that he stops lists when the pc tells him to, and that he never finds the final item, and that he's perfectly willing to say, "Well, they both dirty-needled, so it must have been a package."

"I told the pc it was a package – didn't have much to say. I told him, though. I was very satisfied with the intensive myself, but he was having wife trouble at the time at home, I suppose, and therefore he didn't think he got much gains out of it. But I could tell that he got gain."

Any remark made like 2-12... you know, about 2-12 like that – that's simply saying auditor didn't complete the list, or always made a habit of representing that which rock slammed. It – oh, no-no-no, I beg your pardon. I beg your pardon. That's another breed of cat.

If an auditor goes on representing what rock slams, he'll have this idea of 2-12 – get a little better reality here: "Oh, that process. I don't see what you people see in it, you know? I don't know what you see. I was running it on a pc. I was running it on a pc, and as a matter of fact, she didn't look too bad. She just had sciatica. And when I finally finished up, she looked about ninety and had lumbosis. So I don't see what you see in that process."

Well, that's the direct result of doing one of two things: of representing rock slamming items – thing rock slams like crazy so you represent it (you do that very often, and particularly on List One items, and your pc just about goes around the bend) or you didn't finish the cycle of action. You see, before you got an item on action A, you got tired and started in on action B. And before you got an item on action B, why, you started action C, hoping somehow or another it would all come out all right. Now somebody'll have to come along sooner or later and complete action A. And it will all come out all right, long as action A is completed.

That's failure to complete a cycle of action, will produce an adverse result, particularly if the pc is very interested in the cycle of action and you didn't even vaguely complete it. That's the best. If you really want to cave somebody in with 2-12, that's my strongest recommendation. They're going there, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa,
and you – you're sitting there, and you're watching the needle, and you don't know what a rock slam is. That'd be a good one. You think it's pc body motion or something and say, "Well, it's a dead horse."

The pc's saying, "Waterbuck, tiger…"

And you say, "Wait a minute, wait a minute. This whole thing's a dead horse. We're going to do a reassessment on some other list."

Pc – he's just left in a sort of a stunned state from there on. Actually, he will remain in that state until somebody comes back and says, "Well, who or what would oppose an ink pot?" whatever it was, see. And at that moment he'll take right off again. "Oh. You want them? Waterbuck, tiger…" clang, clang, clang, clang, clang.

Now, this idea of requiring a clean needle before you null – I've got to get it across to you. Because the beauty of a Mark V is that it expresses a clean needle much better than a Mark IV. And when you've really got the thing cleaned up, you can see a needle characteristic. That is to say, it's a type of needle on the Mark V. It is visibly a type of needle. And you'll get spoiled by a Mark V.

You'll see this thing, and it's just like turning on the light and turning it off, you know. And you'll see this needle, and it's just beautiful. It's just flowing. It's lovely. There isn't a ripple in the thing of any kind whatsoever. And this meter expresses that gorgeously.

And, boy, you know those rudiments are in. It'll spoil you the next time you'll take a look at the needle on the pc and you'll – it hasn't got that characteristic. And although the needle isn't reacting in any way, you'll start chewing on the pc trying to put it that way. You'll be absolutely right. There will be something – something that the pc has there that is making it some other way.

In other words, the Mark V, oddly enough, expresses a rudiments-in pc. It is a way it looks. And that description is just the ne plus exclamation point ultra of the definition of a clean needle. It really looks – it looks quite different. You'll see that needle – you'll see that needle one day on a Mark V and say, "What do you know." Actually, the pc is sitting there without a thought in his skull. He's just perfectly happy for you to go on, and not go on. It's quite interesting that the Mark V expresses a clean needle.

Now, if there's just the slightest suppress or just the slightest withhold or the slightest anything on the case – it isn't in a needle pattern; it doesn't go so far as to make a tickety-tock and a slickity-slock on the thing – it just doesn't look clean. It is still flowing, but it doesn't look clean.

It is a very interesting thing. I'm calling your attention to that on a Mark V because sooner or later you will – if I call your attention to it, you'll watch for it. And you'll suddenly say, "Hey, what do you know! This thing does. It tells you one more thing. One more thing than the Mark IV tells you. It tells you how clean the rudiments are, just by the fact that the needle is moving, and there it is." You want to look for that one.

Now, you can harass a pc in trying to clean up a needle until it looks like a game of battledore and shuttlecock. "Well," you say… You see a little tick on it, you see. And it's go-
ing tick and a tock, and so on. "Well, what are you thinking about?" This is one of those broad, wide-open-door questions that doesn't focus the pc's attention in any direction. He doesn't know what he's thinking about. If he knew what he was thinking about, it wouldn't tick.

"What are you thinking about?" you say. "Yes, well you must be thinking about something." And he'll try to – he'll think madly to find out what he is thinking about, you know? And he gets completely lost. He doesn't know whether he's coming or going.

So you'll see the needle now, instead of going tick and tock, is going tick-u-tock, tick-u-tock. And you'll say, "Well, I don't know; I really can't get on with this list, and I've just made up my mind that we will just sit right here until you tell me what you are thinking about."

And hell say, "Oh, my God, what am I thinking about? I must be thinking about something. Must be pretty powerful if he notices it on the needle, this particular way." By this – this needle now is going tick-hic, tick-hic, tick-hic.

And eventually, break down and ask him just the mid rudiment questions, one right after the other, and hell find out what he was thinking about. It's much better to put in the mid ruds than it is to give them supergeneralized questions.

Now, there's one exception to this. When you're going down a list, you're nulling away down a list, and all of a sudden the rudiments go buzzer! out from under – you know, more the heavily charged the list is, you know, the more a pc's think reacts on the meter. See, the pc's think associated with a charged list reacts more heavily than a pc's think on a no-charged list. And as a matter of fact, on a no-charged anything a pc's think wouldn't register at all. So on a heavily charged list – you're going down this list, and it's going to have a dial-wide rock slam when you finally find the item and you hope it's complete, you're not sure, you're going on down the line – you'll notice the needle is getting less and less flowing.

Nothing has happened to the needle yet. It's not doing anything peculiar. It just is less flowing. You see what I mean? It's just less. It hasn't done anything yet, but it's less right than it was. All of a sudden it goes all wrong, and starts hiccupping. Well, you can't do anything at this point.

Now, if you put in the mid ruds every time you did that, you would rapidly get into a great deal of trouble with the pc, because the pc just starts screaming. It's no-auditing, don't you see. Well now, the pc can't see that that needle's so dirty you can't null with it. Pc is unaware of this fact. So a very good stunt is not throw at the pc, and not push rapidly at the pc – never push anything rapidly at a pc – but just twist your paper around, and ask the pc which of these he has had any thoughts on. And let him go down the list.

Now, show him as much of the list as the needle has been getting worse on. And he'll say, "Oh, well, no, I didn't" – usual response – "No, I didn't have any thoughts. I didn't have any thoughts on that one or that one… Oh, wait a minute. 'Gladiator.' I thought wasn't that a hell of a silly thing to have on this list – 'Who or – who would cook well?' see? 'Who or what would cook well? 'Gladiator.' I thought that was a silly thing on the list. I don't know what's the matter with me, putting that on the list. That couldn't have been it. So that's all."
And you start to lean back – "Oh, yes! Oh, yes! Heh! Yes, this – this other item – this other item – I thought, by golly, you know, that – that's it. That's it, you see. 'Cook.' I said that-that-that that is it. And then I thought, 'Oh, no, that couldn't be it.' Yeah, and that's all I've done… Except this last one that you just asked me on. This – this last one down here. This last one down here – uh – I didn't understand what you said."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much," pull the thing back, and just continue nulling from where you were. You'll find out that is a very interesting little trick.

Now, a pc develops another allergy to that, by the way. The pc knows you're going to do that when he – you... he sees an in, an in, an in, an in. He knows that paper's going to turn around and come his way. [laughter] But actually that does far less harm than knowing he's going to spend the next half-hour battling with the auditor about mid ruds. It's all in the speed of auditing.

The rudiment that goes out on checking – and particularly goals checking – the rudiment that goes out is this "Anxious about." And that's really why it's in there. You're going to see a rebalancing of these rudiments very shortly into a very proper, better order. But it doesn't change your small rudiments, and it doesn't change your Small Tiger Drill. Those things are... compare one with the other.

But getting a needle clean – getting a needle clean is an operation which takes all needle pattern, all jerks and all ticks off, when the auditor is doing nothing, see. The – it has these things without the auditor doing anything, and it doesn't have these things with the auditor doing nothing. And then you see these character – this characteristic of a clean needle. And that's what a needle ought to look like before you start nulling anything.

That's what gives you in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in. And you say the list is incomplete. No, the list isn't complete. [incomplete] You're trying to null with a dirty needle, see? Maybe the list is incomplete, too, but even if you had a complete list, if your rudiments are out and your needle is dirty you say, "waterbuck," and it's – just the auditor speaking makes the needle tick. See?

The pc, in essence, has a withhold from the auditor, and thus is peculiarly vulnerable to the auditor's actions. He's just – even though he's just invalidated something, you see, the auditor doesn't know that he has. It isn't enough to make the pc critical of the auditor, but it is enough to make the pc think extra thoughts all the time. See, it individuates the pc. So he's not so well under auditor's control. And you've got an individuated pc, and the pc thinks there, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, think-think-think-think-think-think-think-think. Every one of these things will have to be picked up.

And the more they're out, the more the pc individuates, the more the pc thinks. So it just is a dwindling spiral. Now, you start to do a list that is complete with a pc with a missed withhold, the pc is individuated, the pc's going to think some crashing thought every five – every five items you say, and so of course these things are now going to react and stay in, and so on.

Now, the Mark V will be cursed by pcs who believe that the thing at 128 is unfair. In actual fact, the Mark V is not one bit more sensitive than a Mark IV. In spite of the guts of the...
thing. The guts are much more complicated in a Mark V than a Mark IV. But in spite of this, it actually doesn't register any more than a Mark IV does – if you've got fly's eyes. All it does is take what the Mark IV is registering and amplifies it.

And whereas it's almost undetectably tiny on a Mark IV – you don't know whether it twitched or not, on a Mark – you see it did register on the Mark IV – on the Mark V, when you turn it up to 128, why, that confounded tick was one to two divisions wide. See, that's what it does. All it does is amplify the read. The Mark IV always read it, providing you had fly's eyes. See, this is nothing more sensiti... one meter is not more sensitive than the other. But the tiny manifestations that would be microscopically small on a Mark IV are visible on a Mark V, and that's all. The Mark V is a more visible meter, not a more sensitive meter.

That's very important to an auditor. By the time you put a magnifying glass up on top of a Mark V, man, have you got it made. You can read anything.

Now, at that level, you pick up all the analytical thoughts of the pc. You pick them all up. And the pc who has been audited on a Mark IV and has been getting away with blue murder because the auditor didn't have fly's eyes, gets into a Mark V and he feels like he's going into a buzz saw, and he's liable to start cussing the Mark V. "Yeah," he thinks, "well, I hope that doesn't read." And the auditor says, "What was that?"

But let me tell you, if you never clean a clean, and you pick up every read and you clean those – in other words, you always clean up the needle, and don't erroneously clean it up – a pc's protest against mid ruds starts going out on the subject of the Mark V. It starts getting less, because the pc, of course, has less missed withholds from the auditor. And eventually they die out and stop yapping about it.

But at first, when you shift a pc over from being audited on a Mark IV to a Mark V, you can expect a little bit of trouble, because the pc's days of liberty are at end. The day when he could think all those nasty thoughts about the auditor and get away with it are over, because the auditor can see them.

But the Mark V does give you this flowing manifestation. The Mark IV does, too. But the Mark V, it becomes very, very visible. And you know that thing. "Boy," you say, "that's the cleanest set of rudiments I've seen in many a day." There's only one other way to get the same manifestation, and that's just ARC break the living daylights out of a pc! And you'll get the same manifestation. It has to be a very severe thing. You say, "You know that withhold that I – that you told me last week about Betsy Jo Ann – well, I – today I was on the phone to her parents, and they said..." see, something like this, you know. Multiply that by five or ten more, and you will get a very nice, flowing needle. I don't recommend that you do that. I recommend instead that you audit the pc.

Thank you very much.
REPAIR OF R2-12

A lecture given on 13 December 1962

Okay, this is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number two, 13 December AD 12.

Well, there's nothing much to talk to you about now, you know everything. And I noticed at the end of the last lecture you looked a little bit disheartened.

And there is a direct law concerning your disheartenment. There's a law that embraces this. It's the more you goof the more disheartened you will get! That's a law. We're now not dealing with a – an area of "we hope the process can be tailor-made for the pc," "we hope the process works on the pc." We're not dealing with that type of material right at the present moment. We're dealing with open and shut material.

And it's always very dismaying for an auditor to fool around with something like that, because there's only one person that shows up, and that's the auditor.

Now, for a little while, an auditor who's being shown up has a tendency to try to kick back against the material. He's – not producing a result, he thinks, or he's goofed up, so he doesn't know that the material will produce a result. So on a technique such as 2-12, it is necessary that somebody be shoved hard through to a win. Actually, it requires a subjective and an objective win on the part of the auditor.

If he wins on a pc, and he gets a win on it himself he consistently gets some more wins, showing that it wasn't a fluke, now, he knows very definitely that it is the matter of his auditing, and it is not the technique.

Now, this is a hard thing to confront. It's something like somebody saying to you suddenly, "Be responsible!" And heh-heh-heh-heh! That's kind of a nerve-wracking situation. You could always lay it off on something else.

Now, R2-12 has the characteristic however, of producing results if it is done right. Now, oddly enough, it'll produce results when it's not done absolutely right. And therefore is fairly hard material. You will at first regard it as very critical material, and you will hear – have people around in organizations and so forth, telling everybody that it is very, very difficult, and that they have to study very, very hard, and they have to this and they have to that. And after they've passed 115 checksheets, and run around the block on their hands and so forth, then they will be permitted to sit in and watch a session in which an item is being found, you see. You'll get this kind of stuff.

Actually that is not the approach which I advocate at all. The approach I advocate is: take the guy by the scruff of the neck, throw him into the session, say, "Produce a result."
Make sure he's getting audited on it at the same time. So he gets a subjective and objective reality. Then his interest is piqued. He sees something is happening around here. And then he wants to know why it's happening around here, and therefore he studies it not just as a grind or a rote, but he studies it as something that will do something.

And that's a lot different than the attitude of, "Well, if I study this very hard I will get a Class IV," see, or, "If I study this very hard I'll get a Class II," or something like that. No, it's "If I... there is something here. And if I study this, why, I will be successful with pcs."

Therefore the pc... the auditor wants to know all about it. He will – "How does this thing work?" You know, and obviously it just has an unlimited number of variables. It's just obviously, when you first look at it, you'll say, "Oh, my! Heh-heh-heh! Oh-oh-oh! This thing must have hundreds of laws, you know, and there's all kinds of special cases, and special conditions, and there's all kinds of this and there's all kinds of that and how devastating, you know!" And nevertheless, he still stays fairly willing. And just like I did on you in the last lecture, I throw something brand-new in your lap and say, "Get a clean needle before you start nulling."

That's pretty grim! And it'll be grim right up to the moment when in your next session you get a clean needle. Then you take a look at the thing, and you say, "Hey, what do you know! Wha-ha-ha-ha! Here's one of the damn things!" And you say to the pc, "Look! Look! I cleaned your needle!" [laughter] Goes tick, tock, thud! [laughter]

But the process, the routine, R2-12, is specially designed in training, and its training is based on that. Walk before you read a book about walking. And then you want to know how to walk, read a book. In other words, get the auditing done. Get auditing done.

Now this only has one liability. You've got to have somebody around who has to know how to untangle a case. And that's the subject of this lecture. If you're going to let all these people sit there in a co-audit and audit, why they've got to have somebody there who's backing it up. And who can untangle all these wild goofs that are being made. Because these goofs are going to be made, man. And this, of course, is all part of it.

This person is sitting there, and it's kind of a rock slamy kind of auditor anyhow, and he's sitting there and he says, "Now look! Ha-ha! Heh-heh! Look, look! I – I opposed it just like you said! Ha! No item! Pc looks like hell! Ha-ha!" You got to know the right answer. You say, "You do so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." And then hover over him like a dark, vulture shadow, make sure that he does just those things. And he finds himself sitting there looking at a result.

This kind of surprises him. And when this happens to him and so forth, fine. But supposing several of these goofs got by, as in any large group doing a co-audit, supposing several of these goofs got by. And you've got a case that's hanging its head. Well, now, the basis of the training of 2-12 is: use it; see that it produces a result; and let that auditor get a subjective reality on it. That modus operandi is totally defeated by one mucked-up case.

Well, R2-12 won't muck up one case and be beneficial to fifteen more, providing somebody knows how to untangle them. Well, as many of you, right at the present moment, are in the stage of getting a good solid reality on R2-12, you're not yet up to the stage of un-
tangling a case. And I threw you an awful bomb, in the last lecture saying you've got to clean up a needle and that's what a clean needle looks like. And in fact it laid you out cold. I might as well do the same thing in this lecture, and say, "Well you think you're going to know all about R2-12, well, there's a special technology on top of R2-12 of how do you straighten out a case that's been goofed by R2-12." See, so it isn't enough to know how to do R2-12, you got to know how to straighten out a case that has been goofed on R2-12.

So you'd be very interested that this whole technology consists of simply then doing R2-12 right. And the only crime that is irreparable – there is one irreparable crime – is to lose the guy's papers and reports. Tih, you can't do very much about it if you do that. So that becomes the one thing you have to safeguard.

And one of the ways of losing reports is careless labeling. You don't have the pc's initials and the date and the page number and the question being asked on a separate sheet of paper, see. This piece of paper then can drift. Here's a long sheet of paper and it's got all kinds of names on it and items on it and it goes down to the bottom, but it joins up with nothing else and you don't know where it came from. One fine day somebody drops the folder. Hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah! That's all that can wash up a case in R2-12. Take my word for it, that's all that can wash it up.

So it doesn't become just a weird idea to label each separate sheet, see. It's not the top of every page. It's just let's make sure that every sheet, see, every separate piece of paper, has the pc's name, the date, and the question, even in shorthand. Let's suppose he's opposing roses. It's at least says, "W/W Op Roses." See. And maybe that's a four-way sheet. One of these big folds. Well, actually, it only has to be on that sheet once, because nobody's going to tear that sheet in half. That's... makes it an identifiable sheet. And you can get the folder back into some kind of shape.

Now, it's very interesting that in the last two or three days – oh, not the last two or three days, in the last week – I've sorted out several cases, two of them very noteworthy. Mary Sue was sorting out one last night, or night before last, rather. And let me tell you. If it hadn't have been for those labeled sheets, why, we just would have been from nowhere, see. But because those labeled sheets existed, and the thing could be assembled back into sequence, which it had fallen out of, we could find out what the devil had gone on from the lists.

And in one of them there was a demonstration – had actually picked up a slamming item. The item had never slammed since and that was what the case was hung on. Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! See? Just a fluke that was right there in that demonstration. There it was, R/S slant, R/S slant, R/S and then out. All right, so it went out in a demonstration, that doesn't mean very much, because the case had several dead horses, one right after the other. So looking for a List One item, which was R/Sing.

So, in patching them up you want the papers. And when – you let anybody do R2-12, as long as they'll keep the papers. But they've got to keep the papers. That you got to impress people with. Because you can really goof a case, irreparably, if you haven't got the papers.

This compares to goals. One case has gone on and on and on and on and on and on and on. Went on and on and on, I don't know, the case must have written two-three thousand
goals. I finally got very, very curious about it, and sent cables everywhere, and I finally picked up the terminal that gave the pc's goal. And that was the pc's goal. See? Finally managed to run down, in other words, the piece of data in folders, that delivered the pc's goal into our hands. It was on another list, see.

You will run into that, too. You'll be looking for the pc's goal, and the pc's goal, and it isn't on any other list, you start going back and nulling lists. Looking and looking and looking and looking. Then you remember there was a goals list in a *Handbook for Preclears*. Pc's goal appears as number one on it. See?

You get kind of nery when you realize that most of those *Handbook for Preclears* that people have been filling out over the years have been thrown away, and they're not any longer available. There was a little goals list.

But with R2-12 it is even more important. We now have the techniques that if you did them long enough on the pc and followed down along the track long enough, the goal would finally dump out in your lap. He isn't totally stopped. But supposing somebody has stopped R2-12. R2-12 then becomes, in its papers and administration, becomes more important than a goals list.

Now, I was down digging through folders – some of your folders – in the last few days. I was very, very, very impressed, with the near possibility of not putting the case back together again and in one of these cases the *key list* was only two pages long. *Heh!* The auditor had called it a complete list, see. We didn't know what it was or what question had been asked; it didn't appear on the auditor's report. And that list had been picked out of the pc's folder by the auditor and had been put in his own papers.

We were tearing the place apart trying to find that one sheet of paper. Now, when you figure out the number of sheets of paper that go through your hands on R2-12-any one of them, you see, might contain that one piece of data. And we found out what we had to know: that that list was only two pages long and that *two* items had been found on it, neither one of which R/Sed. The list was not complete and we had found where the bypassed item was. Very, very interesting. Case had hung up there. That wasn't what we immediately started to work over the case with. We started earlier than that on another bypassed item, which we got record of, which I myself had remembered. I remembered it. It was not part of the pc's record.

That's how touchy this sort of thing can be. Mark down what happens. Mark down what R/Ses. I don't care how many notes and scribbles that you add to sheets of paper and lists – how much data there is there. The key data that you want is: Did it R/S? Were things R/Sing when they were written down? In other words, was it a rock slamming list? Was there one rock slam on it, at least? Pain and sen isn't as important in listing or nulling, it isn't as important to note pain or sen because you can make a special test for that. But it's sure important to note down when, what, which R/Ses.

DR is not as important as an R/S. But a DR tends to become important on a list that you're going to represent. But what this list came from, what was being listed, how many pages does it consist of, you know, numbering those pages as you go down the line. And what did you do with it? What did you do with that item? That becomes very important. The tiger-drilled items, and this in almost every case, auditors don't make enough notations on. When
they tiger drill it what happened? Did it R/S during cleaning buttons of the Tiger Drill? And then not R/S when they said it?

You know, little – little pieces of data. The observation of what happened while they were tiger drilling this thing can be of considerable benefit. The auditor's report is not as important as the list. Because you always confirm the auditor's report by finding the list to which it relates. My auditor's reports on 2-12 are rather sketchy. I'm usually going very fast and too – too much on the fly to get very much down on the auditor's reports. So I tend to put it down on the lists. But I sure try to put lots of data down on lists. And then I'll go back and summate the session as to what the results of everything was, and put any piece of data that I had on the auditor's report. In other words the auditor's report doesn't become a long column of TA reads.

Matter of fact, TA reads are relatively unnecessary. We don't much care what happened during the – during the listing or during the nulling. We really don't care whether the TA moved or didn't move. It's relatively insignificant. But what is significant – the needle behavior. That's very important. And go back at the end of the session, I've got the TA at the beginning of the session, I've got the range of the TA during the nulling, and I just make a note of that, kept it on the list, see. Just say, well, it was high and low and it was moving fast, or something like this, any kind of notation. And then very detailed results of the session. Res-

The auditor's report, then, does not become an action report which is blow by blow during the session. It becomes a summation report, which is just what it is. It says "report." Meaning, "This is what I did during the session." And he writes it up with great rapidity. And he said, "We tiger drilled wedding bells and it all came to nothing. I guess the list is incom-

And then some hint as to where it should go from there in the auditor's opinion. Fu-

And the results of what the person did should appear on the auditor's reports. In other words, that auditor's session either added up to nothing, or it added up to maybe, or it added up to a win. And it doesn't matter what it added up to – the auditor shouldn't be sitting there trying to give anybody a sales talk. All you want to know is, did you get anything done? And the pc says… Of course you've got your goals, you got your LOL, Life and Livingness, you got your gains, you got these things noted on the report. You've got a couple of cognitions the pc had, something like that. Generally they give you some horrendous cognition or another, generally enough to give the cognition that they recall in their gains. That – if it's that big it'll last over to gains, you see. Not interested in the little tiny cognitions. But basically what did we get done in this session? See.
"We nulled three quarters of the list and had a hell of a time keeping in the mid ruds. List looks like it's incomplete." Now that isn't anything more than a guess, he'll find out tomorrow the list was complete or he won't find it out. In other words, it doesn't have to be a proven fact what his guesses were on the thing. In other words he doesn't have to be right in these reports. But the report consists of basically what was accomplished and what should be done. And if you get those into the reports you'll save a lot of pcs' bacon.

Also, an Instructor looking it over can say, "Hey, don't you know that – that's a bum one. You say this ought to be represented. It's slamming, man, it's slamming. You never represent a slamming RI. You just never do that." And he can catch this up, don't you see, on marking reports.

Those are the important things. The list itself stays as an integral part of the session, of course, and usually when I'm through with a list I'll pin the report to it. You know, give it a staple or something. I know you don't have many staplers available. But that's when I'm all through with a list. I'll keep a list I'm using floating on forward in the folder. It's perfectly safe for that to happen, don't you see.

But the point I'm trying to make, here, is the first point of repairing a case is having the data with which to repair the case. And you look back, an auditor's report, if you say what should be done with the case by end of session you've made up your mind what you should do with a case. The auditor's reports of that period say… I don't care if somebody's D of Ping it, see. The director... somebody is – somebody is saying, "Now, now the thing for you to do is, you've got to represent these three additional items which you found on List One," and that sort of thing.

If the auditor thinks something else should be done, well, put it down. It doesn't come as a source of argument. Nobody will be insulted about it. It's on the basis of, "We'll go ahead and represent the remaining items on List One, but I think personally that 'cat whiskers' should be opposed." At least somebody trying to put the case back together again goes back through that thing, and he says, "Hey! That auditor there thought 'cat whiskers' ought to be opposed at that time, it must have been quite a slamming item at that time." So he goes on in and investigates "cat whiskers," don't you see. And he says "Aha!" See? You could pick up a point there, with which to put the case back together again.

But now, lay aside the idea, as of now, that there are endless rules in R2-12 – there are not. If you got the idea that there are tremendous numbers of special cases and awful variables, and all kinds of things like that, and there are special things that you do here and there, and so on, you'll – you'll be in a state of defeat about putting a case back together again. Because you say, "Look at all the tremendous variables which could be done with this case."

First thing you start out with is there are only… Well, the chief thing that will louse up a case, really louse a case up, is to take a rock slamming item and represent it. Now, I can tell you from experience that that will louse a case up. It won't louse all cases up. It won't louse them up every time. You understand? But every – every few cases the thing that should have been opposed was actually represented and you get the roof coming off! Particularly if it's a List One item. And that's peculiarly true of List One items.
You want to make your pc look like he's eighty, and the roof has fallen in, why you just take something that's slamming like mad, and say we'll make the pc look good and we'll represent it. Yaoww! You just done him in! See, that's the tension... the attention factor, see. The pc should be watching at this fist coming toward his nose, and somebody's saying, "Dear, do you want your coffee?" Splits his attention up. He has kind of a feeling like he's going nuts all the time he's doing this represent list.

He knows he shouldn't be representing it; he knows he should be staying in there with the fixed bayonets, you know? And he'll go along with it and do it, the idiot! He'll be... tell you he's feeling fine, you know, and he'll look older and older and rougher and rougher. So then naturally if that's one of the things you mustn't do at the highest level, then that's the thing you should look for as having been done, in patching them up.

Did we represent something we should have opposed? That's your first question. Opposing things is senior to representing them. And that will account for a great deal. You find that somewhere along the line, it'll stand out like a sore thumb. You look on the auditing of the second of the month, and the auditing says, "Checked out List One, HGC R/Sing." Or you find that old assessment and it says, "HGC R/S." And on the auditing of the third of the month we get the piece of paper and it says, "Who or what does HGC represent to you?" You see?

Wrong wording, messed up, what's this? Oh my God! See. Should have been opposed, man! See? So you say, "That's it."

Now in repairing a case, always take the first List One mistake as your first repair action. List One. That has priority. Not because we're trying to safeguard Scientology, but just because it does... has more bearing on an auditing session than any other single list. So it has priority. You patch up the List One goofs before you patch up some other goof. And you'll find out that someday this guy – oh, you'll find a folder that will look something like this. It's almost impossible to even estimate the number of goofs numerically, the combinations of goofs, you see. Combinations can just be infinite.

Auditor plunged, found something R/Sing, see. Found something going R/S, so just took this, and represented it. Well, you don't quite know what it is. And it was his mother's aunt. Mother's aunt. Well, you say, that's a hell of a mistake, see. It R/Sed. If he found it. He didn't find it on any list. Where'd he get it? Well, he probably got it in the rudiments. Oh, well, so that's a highly suspect item already and actually will have very little goof-up for the case as a result. We don't know whether it was right, so on.

But we find out that the following Monday somebody got on the auditor's neck, and said, "List One! List One, assess out List One." And we find out that we had a DR on "Scientology books." And we look over the next folder, you know, the next list, and it says, "Who or what would Scientology books oppose?" That? DR? Scientology books – oppose? Pwt! Nuts! It may say, "Scientology books, sen." And then "Who or what would Scientology books oppose?" See. Now, that's a nice basket, see, of errors. DR – well, you don't oppose DRs. The thing had sen on it, so it would, "Who or what would oppose Scientology books?" would be right. You see how you can patch it up again. But you've still got "My mother's aunt" back here, rock slamming. Well, just brush her off. Return her to the poorhouse or
wherever she came from. Because it's your List One, your List One goof takes priority. That's the first one you put together.

The first goof you correct is a List One goof. And the biggest goof on List One is to represent when you should have opposed. Now oddly enough, you can oppose anything with less damage than reverse way to. In other words you could oppose a DR with less damage than representing an R/S. Quite interesting. But you don't even have to know a refinement of that particular character. You know that R/Ses should be opposed. That's just a rule. The thing R/Sed, so you opposed it.

Now, there's your – there's your first rule of patch-up, is take the first goof you can find on a Scientology list. Now, how many of these goofs can there be? There could probably be an infinite number of goofs, but there are fortunately just a few things to do right. Rule – head light rule is: If it R/Sed you oppose it.

Now, which way you oppose it has some bearing on it. And if you can't make up your mind which way – if it was opposed right, just tell the auditor to oppose it both ways, till one is going well, and then just keep on opposing it that way. Pcs often tell you fibs or they can't tell the difference between pain and sen or something like this.

Now, the closer things are to present time, the more possibly they will be coterms. See? Now a coterm is opposed both ways. "Who or what would it oppose? Who or what would oppose it?" And you'll find one of them after a little while will run smoother than the other one. So you use the one that runs smoother and seems to be producing more interest and action. Opposing a coterm is quite tricky. And therefore R2-12 has more of this trouble than 3GA Criss Cross because you get more coterms.

The guy's knees are in sen, and his skull is in pain. And it's rock slamming. All right, which way do you go about it? This is the commonest goof I'm giving you right now: didn't complete the list. That is the commonest goof and will probably be the commonest goof to the end of R2-12's days. And tried to figure out some way to make it oppose without completing the list – actually spend more time on trying to match it all up than in completing the list.

Now, one of the reasons the list doesn't complete is this coterm thing. Opposition lists must be completed because there's the perfect way to leave a bypassed item. You could actually keep on dumping represent lists without much liability. Don't worry about how many represent lists got dumped. No, just don't worry too much about it because the pc's attention is not very thoroughly fixated on them. There's lots of R/Ses to be found in the bank, there's lots of items to come up, and that item will probably come up again on some other list. But the opposition, when you start to oppose something, you key it in. And the commonest goof on that on R2-12 is the auditor didn't hit it both ways to – I'm talking about the commonest goof is incomplete list – but the auditor didn't hit it both ways to.

See, he didn't say, "oppose it" and "it oppose" and sort out which one was slamming best. But just went at the thing in reverse because the pc said he had a pain in his back and neglected to mention all this sen on his skull for the excellent reason that he always has that!

So your patch-up action so far – let me trace this for you again – is to find the earliest goof you can find on List One. That's your – that takes priority. And get your opposition list –
takes priority over represent – get your opposition list completed, and one of the reasons it didn't get completed is that it was a coterm and it was being opposed wrong way to. And the remedy for that, of course, is just to continue the list, swapping it around the other way. And you can actually swap it back and forth.

You can do half a page on "oppose-it" and another half a page on "it-oppose." You all of a sudden find that thing is just running like hot butter on "it-oppose" so just don't bother to turn it around the other way again, just let it run.

That's not infallible – that is not infallible, because the item may be – by this time has deeded down, so you can't tell whether it's R/Sing or not, or if it ever R/Sed. And it might be wrong source, don't you see? But if it's wrong source it never becomes nullable. That's your infallible test for wrong source. Never becomes nullable. Nullable is different than find an item on it.

Actually, a list which is from wrong source, if it's a goofed-up list, you can't get – you can't get ten items down it. You just can't. Just a dirty needle comes on, and it just all starts going to hell in a balloon. You're lucky if you can get three. That's a non-nullable list.

So, extend that list. That's high priority. And you must remember that there's a trick in extending an opposed list, and that is you reverse it the other way to. And if the thing has gone for a thousand items of opposition, and was nullable – if it was nullable on opposition it was not wrong source, don't you see? You can null anything that is an opposition list, if it was going up against a rock slamming item. And you get on down the line, it's gone a thousand items into this auditor's hands, and it hasn't produced any RI, well, you can just bet your bottom dollar it's been opposed reverse way to.

In other words, you were saying, "Who or what would oppose Scientology books?" And the pc is a Scientology book. It should have been, "Who or what should Scientology books oppose?" Now, what do you do with that list? Do you tell somebody to null it all over again? No. Here's a rule: Never re-null. I see on your papers you occasionally do. Why? If the commonest error is an incomplete list, why don't you just extend it and null what you've now got? Don't say that, "Well, the guy just missed the item."

Now, let's get over into another department, now, I'd finish up what the – extend that oppose list. Represent lists, don't pay much attention to them. Remember we're patching this case up. So we're going to specialize in Scientology list first, we're going to specialize in opposition lists and the commonest thing wrong with the opposition list is somebody's got it going backwards.

So that's not very much we have to patch up here, is it? Well, look it over. Can you... you got those little points I just sketched over? That's actually not very much to look for, and not very much to patch up. That's what you're going to look for.

Next thing you're going to look at is another type of case. No, I'd better tell you the rest of the patch-up on this other case. You just keep doing just what I said. You take the next List One goof-up and the next opposition goof-up from it. See the guy had a long represent list, he had a rock... he had a reliable item on that and nobody opposed it! See?
So there's goof-ups. And you just keep doing this, see. Finding the List One items that had been neglected or List One phenomena that have not been properly reported or cited or something of this sort and then patch up the opposition lists that go along with it. See? All those opposition lists, get those all patched up. That's actually the basic fundamental of patching up a case. Just doing those things. No more than that. It's not very complicated.

Let's take, now, a different type of case. You take any new group on R2-12, you'll have a – several members of that group who will be... come charging in to you telling you that it doesn't work, in one phraseology or another. And this is another type of case to be patched up. You understand this is another type of auditor; that it's not going right. This is the not-going-right.

Now, in actual fact, you don't have to do too much to trace this one back. The case that isn't going right is simply not going right because one of two things have happened: An R/S has been missed on List One and has not been opposed or somebody shifted the cycle of action. It's just those two things that can be wrong with it. Just those two things. R/S has been missed. And the other one is, of course, that somebody has knocked off a cycle of action.

Now, opposition cycles of action are always more important than represent cycles of action, so if you want to put the case back together again in a hurry, you specialize in opposition cycles of action. Which opposition cycle of action was not completed first? And you simply go back and complete that cycle of action, then take the next one consecutively and complete that cycle of action, take the next one consecutively – you got the idea.

In other words somebody wrote up an opposition list of twenty and it should have been two thousand. Something wild like that, see? And you get those cycles of action completed consecutively. The only thing that falls out of sequence, of course, is your List One. Maybe the guy didn't get onto List One until the fifth list was done. Some reason or other. Yeah, well, you're going to find all kinds of things. Didn't do List One, said that, "Well, we're only doing raw meat and they've never heard of Scientology, so therefore we'll omit List One," see. Something like that. And then finally decided to get onto List One, just to make a clean job of it, and then you see a great big goof, you see. You see "Scientology R/S" and then you see a represent list. Well, you push that one back to the first action which you undertake. And then from that one come forward with all the other incomplete cycles of action.

See, it's just List One that spoils this rule of take the cycles of action which haven't been completed from the first cycle of action to the... that was incomplete, till now. See, it's just List One that pushes this out of order. If you ever get one like that you'll be scratching your head, saying, "I wonder which one I take up first." Well, you answer it with List One. And if you've got it answered on List One, which goof on List One was first? And you do that one.

See, it's List One first, or the first goof on List One first, and that's the way you put it together.

Now, you're going to see the dead-horse case. See, this case has been... this is dead horses, dead horses, dead horses. Nobody can see an R/S. Nobody can find an R/S on this case. And this just about drives everybody daffy. Well, this already is an incomplete-cycle-of-
action case possibly. You're getting a lot of dead horses, look for that failure to oppose, particularly on List One. That is the big, exclamation point blunder.

Not because I say so and not because the gods say so and not because of any other authority, it just so happens, actually in this very room, there were about four cases that were laying lots of dead horses – highway was just getting stacked up with them. It was getting so the sanitary commission was going to complain – until the R/Sing item on List One was found and opposed. And at that moment the dead-horse phenomenon ceased.

See, that was... there's at least four cases that I know of right in this room that did just that. So that shows you that's fairly important. So important that on one case we simply just picked it out of the hat and said, all right. So the list at some time or another must have R/Sed. We're just going to write an opposition Scientology list. And we did and it R/Sed and it's the first R/Ses ever seen on that pc. Hah, this was done very indelicately, by the way. If I myself had been doing it as an auditor, I would have gotten ahold of the pc and I would have sort of tiger drilled some of the key things on List One, see, and so forth. But I decided we'd just do this one blundersomely. And I said, "Well just oppose Scientology," and they did and it's now rock slamming like mad. Interesting huh?

Now, so it isn't because anybody has said so that this is true. If you can actually get these dead-horse cases. Now, oddly enough, the only dead-horse cases which we have are all under that category: R/Sing item on List One which wasn't opposed. That's every one we have. But then remember we're kind of a special group. You've had lots of auditing and lots of this and been around Scientology and orgs, lots.

So this is not – this is not a pure proof. So we can extend it over to saying that a case that is now laying dead horses has an R/Sing item which hasn't been opposed. This is a raw-meat case, he was a member of the 137th infantry, and he was just sent in by his commanding officer to be processed, and he's never heard of you or anything else, you see. And you're trying to patch up this case, after he's been run in a co-audit or something like that, all you're going to do is look for the R/Sing item that was goofed. It must be in restimulation. Must be in restimulation. Remember this is a patch-up lecture, it's not what you do with this guy. Whatever was done with him, there must have been an R/Sing item that wasn't opposed, and the case has hung up ever since. This case is just laying dead horses now.

So, if a case is doing nothing but dead horses, one of two things is true. First and foremost is: an R/Sing item has not been opposed or if opposed was not completed. And the other one is: the auditor needed a white cane. This actually happened right here, that an auditor who was reporting no R/Ses was getting them. And wasn't seeing them. Didn't know what the R/Ses were. It's happened twice here. That sounds pretty impossible, but it has happened. So it's something that in case patch-up has to have some allowance made for, particularly in a co-audit where you don't have highly trained people. You'd have to watch for that one. And the question you ask, "Is the case laying dead horses?"

Now, what you do, you have to do an observation of this one. You let him extend one of the dead lists and see if it R/Ses. If you're auditing the case to get it patched up, why, nothing is easier.
Let's take one of these so-called dead-horse lists; let's sort it out this way: We find no evidence of any kind that the case has R/Sed on List One, we can't pick up anything with regard to that. We've even opposed something on List One, and told them to. Nothing seemed to happen, and we're just getting R/Ses, then we assume that the auditor can't see an R/S. That's sort of simple, isn't it?

Now, how you catch up with that one to patch it up, that's something else, because it takes observational time, and it takes this, but this nevertheless can exist. Now, you mustn't overlook that as a point. Needle is falling off the pin, you can hear it hitting both sides of the meter clear across the room. "No, the case hasn't R/Sed," see?

You also will get complaints about cases R/Sing too much. R/S so much you can't get the rudiments in. Now, I just answered a question on this sort. Would a case continue to R/S while you represented something they weren't R/Sing on? And the answer is no. Fastest way in the world to turn off an R/S is just start representing on something that would become a dead horse. By the time you've asked the pc for three items you'll have no R/S.

In other words, the rule is that a case will only continue to R/S when the subject from which the R/S is coming continues to be addressed by the auditor. In other words, you have to stay on that subject to keep up with the R/S. A phantom slam doesn't do this. You have to be listing the right list to have the R/S on it. I'll give you that security. In other words, there aren't a whole bunch of cases whereby somebody just continues to R/S forever, even though you're listing peanuts. The case actually is R/Sing simply because they're protesting listing on peanuts. No. By the time you'd gotten the third item on peanuts the R/S would be off. You see what I mean?

In other words, your rudiments won't continue to R/S just because they are out while you're listing on something else. In other words if there is an R/S on the list, as you're coming down the line, you haven't got an R/S from something else which is lousing up your list if it's a nice continuous R/S, do you understand? There isn't too much R/S, in other words. People don't talk about peanuts and R/S on chimneys.

Now, even the phantom slam tends to behave. This is what's peculiar also. You don't ever get a phantom slam on an uncharged list, which should be very heartening to you. The list has to be hotter than a pistol to turn the slam on. And the phantom slam may turn on, however, and louse you up here and there on the list, as to which item is rock slamming while you are trying to straighten them out. But a phantom slam always comes on and goes off, and comes on and goes off. And a phantom slam has this characteristic: that it never obeys the auditor. The phantom slam never obeys the auditor.

Your basic impatience with this type of case is they'll never do what you tell them, also. That's completely aside from the phantom slam. You say, "Has anything been suppressed?" and they don't think about suppressing something. They think about something else, and so forth. But right along with this, a phantom slam never obeys the auditor.

You've got a rock slamming item, catfish. And you say, "catfish." A phantom slam does not turn on when you say "catfish." But "catfish" turns on when you say "catfish." See, you say, "catfish" – "catfish" is a slamming item, it slams. It start... it keeps on slamming until
the pc's mind shifts, attention shifts, and the pc does a suppress. And you pull the Suppress and the Careful of off, and it slams again.

But because you're working with present time items, you can over-tiger drill your items. You can tiger drill an item to death. Tiger Drilling must be brief on 2-12. That's - that's a good one to remember. You can kill an item with Tiger Drill.

I've given you most of the data now, on case patch-up. Not very painful, was it?

Audience: No.

Now, you want to get fancy, you're going to get fancy now. And you're going to go back, and you're going to try to patch up this case, case isn't doing too badly, you're going to look for List One oppositions, failures to complete cycle of action, incompletes. And the case that has dead horses, you're going to assume something must have slammed at some time or another on List One has been missed - that's your primary source of dead horses - or to some slight degree, that the auditor needs a white cane. Now, that's patch-up. That's not very tough.

Now, you in running a case are a different situation entirely. That's how you patch one up. How can you misrun a case? Well, I won't, give a lecture on the subject. We haven't got enough time! And we haven't got enough tape. Tape costs money! Time you've bought forty, fifty reels of tape, you feel it. We just would have scratched the top of the subject. So it's very lucky that case patch-up is so simple. Because the number of things that you can do wrong in 2-12 I'm sure have not been estimated. I'm sure that nobody could possibly do it. Because there'll be variations, variations, variations, variations. And I've long since ceased to try to outguess the number of variations there could be of a simple procedure. They're almost infinite.

I have had loses on this, man, my you... my self-confidence in my imagination has been staggered by this! I think I've dreamed up all the reasons why, all the variations that can be done. And my God, I'm always outcreated! I don't say that sarcastically, but it's just a little game that I sort of play. Well, I keep my eye open. Somebody's going to dream up a new one. And they always do.

But it'll be something is real in crosswise. You know? Like opposition lists actually should dirty read. Shouldn't they? Now if opposition lists consistently dirty read, why, then, shouldn't you represent what dirty reads, on the biggest dirty read that you get, in order to establish whether or not it had any rock slam on... You could – you could get these things without count. You'll have all of these things pulled on you. So you better not get an idea that there are infinite numbers of special cases to 2-12. Otherwise you will feel like you're drowning. Because there are infinite numbers of things that can be done wrong.

This is one of them. And this is, by the way, the commonest. Somebody goes on representing and representing and representing – and this is also mentioned because this is part of case patch-up – representing and representing and representing and representing, and they get some slams, doesn't null, they go on representing, and they never check what they are representing. And they will leave a List One, particularly, item slamming like crazy! It didn't slam when they did the assessment. It just got a little tiny scrub. And they never, never, never go back to find out if the item that they're representing is now slamming. Because it will, being
unburdened. Of course doing that – a listing, a represent list from an item, if the item's ever going to slam, *that* will make it slam better than Tiger Drilling.

If you wanted to make something – if you wanted to make something fire better, it was firing yesterday, it isn't firing today – it wouldn't louse up the pc if you got ten or fifteen items off of it on a represent. I don't advocate that. I'm just saying it would do that. Instead of tiger drilling it, get ten or fifteen items off You'll find out it produced the same effect. This thing is now slamming again.

So – but that's just ignoring a slamming item. They never check it. Nothing is ever checked out. Another thing that happens sometimes, and this is something that you should do with 2-12. Well, let's see, it's part of the rules, is when you're doing a represent list on something, well, check the item to find out if it is now slamming. You very often will find that the item that you're representing is now slamming. Quite often find this!

You've got – you've got situations where the auditor has just gone totally knuckle-headed about anything and everything in the book. But normally false reports will give you the least difficulty. False reports. They – you very seldom get a false report. There's only one thing the pc says that has been found out to be not too accurate. Pcs will tell you the truth in all cases but pain or sen. And they'll do a big sell on pain or sen. They can have that dull pressure against their forehead and say it's a pain and knowingly lie about it. See, they don't even make a mistake. I mean there's been too many of that. And pcs will tell the auditor lies. And also will tell the auditor lies about the fact that they're invalidating items. We found pcs doing that.

They don't want to list on the thing, so they invalidate the items as they hand out the auditor. Well, they can only do that to somebody who was not demanding a clean needle before he started nulling or something, because all that material would have to be pulled up. But in final essence, the repair of a 2-12 activity is very simple. It just follows the exact materials I've given you. Doing 2-12, of course, follows that same thing in order of importance. The more items you bypass, the more gummy the case is going to be. That's for sure. The more incomplete cycles of action you stack up on the case, why, the less luck you're going to have.

So, running the case parallels repairing the case. That is the same rules of running the case. It's fantastic how an auditor will sell himself on the completeness of a list, try to put together items, how the pc will go along with him, there are only six items left in, each of them were DRing, and we finally packaged them up. You did? Where's the RI? It never occurred. And that, of course, you know right there, was an incomplete list. You never had a rock slamming item come off the list. Well, that rock slamming item never came off the list because the pc never put it on the list. Very simple explanation! List is incomplete. Which all comes under the heading of the patch-up I gave you.

This is relatively simple once you break yourself down on the amount of randomness and importances which you think you see around in it and actually groove it down to exactly what it is. It's a process of opposing rock slamming items and represent those that don't, in order to get rock slamming items so as to oppose them and so take apart the GPM.
The closer you enter to the auditing session, the less PTP the pc is going to be audited over the top of, so you have R2-12. There are other things you can do with R2-12 and you're going to get into an embarrassment someday, a horrible, horrible embarrassment, and that embarrassment will be this: Is you keep getting rocket reads on items. Supposed to be doing 2-12. Don't get rock slams, you get rocket reads. And sooner or later somebody's going to come to you with this terrible problem. Well, the first thing you do is establish whether or not it was a rocket read. And if it was a rocket read, a rocket read is superior to a rock slam. That's all there is to that. So the item rocket read, so you oppose it. Simple.

And then you do that and you're very, very embarrassed by the whole thing because the pc keeps continually intruding his goal into the session. What do you do with that? Well, the best thing to do then is to get the goal checked out and tell the pc whether it is or isn't and then go on running 2-12. That's your best repair for that embarrassing situation.

If you find a rocket reading item, your first action is to oppose it, of course. And then use it to find a goal with. If the pc hasn't already laid his goal in your lap. Or if you find a goal, get it checked out. Don't leave it in doubt! Don't have the pc sitting there for the next seven days wondering if that's his goal. Because it acts just like a wrong goal, all the way. No, get it checked out, get it checked out right now, and if you can't check it out, why, fine, clean it up a little bit more and check it out. Then the pc's got his goal, and you'll find out he'll do 2-12 better.

Remember that even though you do have his goal, is no reason he can run on his goal. We've had case after case that couldn't go Clear mostly because they had too much 2-12 bric-a-brac sitting in the session. And they were trying to clear across the top of a PTP. And you know that they could be forced all the way to free needle. But it never quite stays free. And that can go on for hundreds of hours – we already know – just because actually there's a PTP connected with the sessions. PTP connected with Scientology. They can't get across it, and it's always still there, and it never blows clear, and it's sort of like trying to empty a pot with the lid on. Can't be done. We've seen case after case after case. In fact about 80 percent of all cases that have tried to go Clear are hung up on that exact one right there.

That's how important R2-12 is. It isn't a case of something that an HPA can do, or a simple thing, or a simple way to produce a good result on a pc, it is simply that people will never go Clear unless 2-12 is run right.

Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Thank you very much.
Thank you!
Well, how are you tonight?

_Audience_: Fine!

I'm glad to see you again! I arrived just in time to save you from a fate worse than auditing!

All right, this is the what?

_Audience_: 8 January AD 13.

Eight January AD 13. The Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. The year started out beautifully; [laughter] for days I received nothing but good news. On New Year's Day I had, oh, I think there must have been six or eight telexes, nothing but good news. You know, the most good news I'd ever seen. The next day of good news, next day, I think, then the fatal fifth arrived and we don't know but what, that isn't good news, too. And before I get on with this lecture where I have something important to say, I'll take up the US government. [laughs]

The story is very, very briefly told. I've got it all in now, and all the returns are in and the casualties have been counted. But in August I wrote Kennedy; he was offered by me at that time help in the space race – speeding up the IQ, straightening out pilots.

And this, the White House has already asked us twice for presentations of Scientology and we've granted them, and they have done weird things like fire the fellow who asked for them and that sort of thing. But actually the president of MIT himself was fired, I think for trying to suggest that – at least it was within the same twenty-four-hour period.

And anyway, in August, thinking that it would be a good gesture I wrote him a letter concerning this, at the White House and time rolled along and the FDA suddenly became very interested and the organization was sniffing around the corners. And suddenly the US government – let's not compartment this thing down, see, it's just the government – issued a smear campaign in the Washington press, calling us all sorts of hard names, organized this thing completely, down to the last detail and actually the papers were on the streets before anybody appeared at the organization. Interesting, isn't it? Hours later somebody appeared at the organization.

Anyway, they raided a church and seized philosophical and religious texts for burning and meters. Armed raid on a church. Stop and think about it for a moment. How could they
get away with this? How'd they do this? Well, the way they did this was lie to federal court! And they're in trouble! Today are they in trouble, man! They didn't tell the right name of the organization to the court and so got a warrant. But there is no doubt about who issued the warrant. It says right there, "The president of the United States," issued the warrant. Says so, right on the warrant.

And they didn't tell the federal court who the warrant was for. They said it was for the Distribution Center and the Hubbard Guidance Center and the Academy of Scientology. The premises of which are all rented by and under the name of the Founding Church of Scientology of Washington, DC. And they avoided the mention of books. So in the papers, no church was raided, no books were seized. Not in the papers. So they carefully corral this and they broke into the organization and actually made quite a mess of things.

They burst into sessions and snatched E-Meters off the auditing desks and they just had themselves a ball. They got down to the DCI, by that time somebody in HCO said, "Do you realize that you're raiding a church?" And this kind of slowed them down. And they got down to DCI and bucked into Anton and he was wearing his cross that day and they got much calmer. In fact they got awful quiet. And they came in like a lion and they went out kind of tiptoeing. They knew they'd collided with something and they figured there would be repercussions. Of course there will be repercussions.

The immediate thing that – it will happen – there's supposed to be – we're supposed to go to court to claim our property and give reasons why and actually this is very easy action to win. The warrant is false, all of the titles seized, almost without exception, predate the E-Meter. And they cant connect the E-Meter and these titles because the E-Meter wasn't even in existence at the time of most of these – like Dianetics: Evolution of a Science. Furthermore, they're Dianetic titles and Scientology is practiced at the church.

These things are very easy to win, this thing'd be a hands-down, our New York attorneys say crash-crash, all we ought to do is go in and grab the property, and so forth. But our Washington attorneys say no, we had better use this to unseat the current administration. [laughter] So they're not going to fight on the court day of the twenty-fourth, they're going to delay that and the – bunch of ads are being placed in newspapers in the Bible Belt, giving the salient dates and data which I have just got through giving you. Kennedy isn't in much trouble, you see.

And today something was mailed to Congress which is just reconvening. Every congressman's - senator I think the program said, would receive a statement by me saying I would like to have a meeting with President Kennedy, because I'm sure that we could settle our religious differences and that… [laughter, applause]

Anyway, it may be very well, we may even make them Scientologists. I frankly was getting worried, you know. We'd been ignored too long! Here we are, sawing away at the very foundations of "man is mud – man is an animal," you see, chipping away at the sacredity of psychology and things like this, you know, and nobody paying any attention at all, sooner or later was going to break someplace. I didn't, however, expect it to break on the note of complete insanity. And it couldn't have broken on a better note.
They... I don't think they did one thing right. See, once they got the error rolling they really did it up well! And they'll probably be hearing about this for years. Well anyhow, the main danger of it is that we get very fixated on the US government, frankly it isn't a big enough target to be worried about. And we spend a great deal of time, working, sweating, slaving, trying to push over the government when as a matter of fact it's halfway over on its back.

The thing which we should do is to, of course, get on with the job of good processing and so forth, and there's where we have it made. Not fighting the government.

The government [laughs] – the government turns out to be its own worst oppterm! But I think – I think maybe if a few of the guys and I were holding a war council over in my office at 1927, trying to figure out something to get the government to do that would call some attention to Scientology, I think this suggestion probably would have been offered and we probably would have polished it up and I don't think we could have done a better job than the government did off its own little bat. So there we are!

Now, actually no auditor, no organization, nothing is threatened. They didn't – they didn't threaten anybody. And as far as that's concerned no warrants were issued for anybody, nothing like that, see. They did just a half... a half-delirious job and did it halfway, and – strictly straitjacket stuff. So anyway, the organization's going on as usual, everything's going on as usual, except those kids over there are doing meterless auditing right at the present moment.

I'm sure a few of them were smart enough, although they haven't put it on the wires because they're afraid it'd be inspected – I'm sure a few of them were smart enough to have their meter parked underneath their desk – or left home that day. And I'm sure there are meters around. Actually, there's quite a stock of old 57 meters and I imagine those things, [laugh-ter] you can – you can read a rock slam on one of those, you know?

So anyway, that's the sad story. Now, let's get on with something important.

You have been wrestling around now, with Routine 2-12, and this is a lecture on 2-10 and 2-12. And, show you what raids of that sort of thing do: they actually just slow down technology. I have a bulletin on my desk right now, which is one – about half-written – on a very fast, simple Routine 2-10. And you need it. But here's the gist of the situation on 2-12.

I put it in your hands, you've been wrestling with it, you find out what it's doing, what it can't do, what are the difficulties with it, and some of you have had considerable success with it. It's very, very good success you've had with it. And some of you have had moderate success and some of you have darn near chewed the pc to pieces with it, and some of you have almost spun in on it. This is a very varied set of results from one process.

Now, it's quite important that a process not give a varied set of results, so I've been taking complications out of this whole technology that you're doing, watching the mistakes you've been making, apprehensions and misapprehensions about it and have been boiling it down – boiling it down to its essentials and giving you far more indicators. When you see this, why this is true. And when you see that, that is true. Not leaving it up to any kind of de-
cision on the part of the auditor, he just sees— he sees the needle is acting this way and there-fore he does so-and-so.

This—this is much easier to learn. Now before you go into eight thousand nine hun-dred and sixty-seven questions, all of which are based on a complicated comprehension of Routines 2-10 and 2-12, let me give you a dissertation on the simple, pure version of what this came from. Okay?

All right. The basis of this technology is as follows: You do a list—and this is not as it was, this is as it is—you do a list. You don't take a list, see, you do a list—this is the pure technology—and get that down to a point where only one R/S is seen on nulling. Only one R/S on the list on nulling. If you had more than one R/S on the list on nulling, your list is in-complete. Now, what do we mean, tiger drilled? No, no, just seen the first time you go over it. You call an item off, if it's going to R/S, it'll R/S, and that's all there is to that.

You got that as a step. You take a list. A list. Not—you don't take an arbitrary list, you take a list question. And having taken this list question, you complete it. And having found the item that that list completes to, you oppose it properly. Now, you could oppose it two ways. In view of the fact that you make mistakes in opposition—and you do, most any of your long lists comes from mistaken right way to or wrong way to, such as, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" when it should have been, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?"—those are your long lists.

Why, just list it both ways. Just list it both ways for a page, just a page. And notice which one the needle was stiffer than the other on. In other words you'd list, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" and noting the character of the needle and tone arm—tone arm plays very little part in this—and then turn your page over and list "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" for a page and, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" gives you a looser needle than "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" The wrong way to always gives you a stiff, jerky needle. And the further you go on a wrong list the more the pc surges on cognitions and in-validations and that sort of thing.

In other words, if he thinks a thought and you're running a wrong list, why that would have been a tick early on the list and if it's...if you keep on going for another dozen pages it's a half-a-dial fall when he does this, you understand? In other words your needle manifestations are increasing and on a wrong list you have more R/Ses toward the end of the list than you do at the beginning of the list.

Let's take the second page of the list and compare it to the last page of the list: there's more R/Ses on the last page of the list than there are on the second page of the list, you probably have been listing wrong-way-to. The reason for that is the bank beefs up on a wrong-way-to. In other words, the bank is getting more solid, and so forth, and therefore your R/Ses become more frequent and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. You understand?

Now, in other words, you could tell, there, right at the outset, a pretty good guess anyway, because you listed "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" and this needle is, see, stiff! And it goes: Bzzz zzz zzz! Bzzz zzz zzz zzz zzzzz! Bzzz zzzzzzz! See, and then it maybe goes a rock slam. Maybe not! Who cares! But it's just stiff! That thing is not going anyplace. It is not rising. It is not doing anything. It is stiff, man!
And the other one, you turn around and you list it and the needle is stiff for a moment and then – then starts – starts flowing and drifting around and so forth and you say that's right way to. And you'd think it was the other way around, but it isn't. Okay?

And that's your second item and then you get that one the same way – to one R/S, when seen when nulling. One R/S seen when nulling. Nobody said anything about Tiger Drilling. One hasn't even mentioned Tiger Drilling. This one R/S seen when nulling.

And when you get to the end of the line, that's your package. Now, what should happen when you find an item? On that first list or that second list, what should happen? I got some nice indicators for you here; you'll be very happy with these things. This makes it a little – make life a lot easier to live with. I've been looking for indicators like mad. In other words, I've been trying to put up signposts. I had a half a dozen signposts up on this road and I… There was this rock, see, this big rock and it was a white rock and I said, well that's good enough. You just go down to the white rock and there you are, see.

And a lot of you are having trouble with white rocks. So I now – been putting up signposts around the white rock, you understand? And then signposts beyond the white rock directing you back to it. And this indicator – this indicator you'll be very, very interested in.

If you give the pc the wrong item, he will instantly have more mass, perceived by him than he had a moment before – markedly, this is. Now, that's not pain, that's not sen, he doesn't have more pain or sen. He's got more mass. See, he – where'd this mass come from? Well, it came from the fact you just handed him a wrong item.

In other words, you say, "Catfish! Well, I got your item here, Joe! Ha-haha! Ho-ho! I got your item here! It's catfish!"

And Joe says, "..."

And you say, "All right, did you perceive something when I said that?"

"Yeah! Ruddy thing with a tail showed up in front of my face!"

You right away – wrong item. Now, let's not worry about what he perceives. Let's not get into this one, see? Now, we say – now, you understand, he had item... he had some mass there and he perceives it. But it's not more mass than he had before when you say this first item to him, you understand? He always knew he had this little mass there. See? But it's this kind of action, see? Here's your pc's vision area, the top of the desk here. And you say to him, "catfish!" [demonstrates something, gives a thud]

He says, "Where the hell that come from?"

Got the idea? And actually it's this visible! Now, you may only perceive it by something crushing into him hard. But, you understand? I'll do that again, see. Here he is, he's got a relatively clear field, see. You say to him, "Well Joe, I just found your item here! It's catfish!" [demonstrates something, gives a thud]

He says, "What? Where'd that come from?" You know, that sort of thing. "That's very interesting. Yes, I guess that is my item, I've always sort of been like that..." See, it's that kind of a reaction. "Oh yes, that's my item, yeah..." You know, wild burst of enthusiasm, you know! [laughs]
Well, that's wrong source, wrong way to, or incomplete list. Of course you understand that a wrong way to is also wrong source. It's "catfish a opperm" and it should have been "catfish a term." And... but a wrong source, wrong way to or incomplete list. Well, with this test, whereby you're going to list it both ways, on your opposition, you shouldn't be making many wrong way to's. So it usually would boil down to the fact that you just haven't got a complete list.

Now, if your list is incomplete another indicator shows up. Your pc, in the next few minutes will ARC break inexplicably. And you won't be able to get your rudiments in. And you can run General O/W and stand on your head and wiggle your ears and do all kinds of things, try to amuse him and get him out of it, but he's still ARC broken.

You find that the very reasonable auditor says, "Yes of course, I can understand how he is ARC broke, because I did goof and so forth." They don't realize that this extreme ARC break is from Routine 2. That's a Routine 2 mistake. It's not an auditing error. It's nothing the auditor did, except he didn't complete the list.

The usual fact is that when an ARC break occurs, it isn't really that you've gone by the item, in my experience it's been it isn't on the list yet! I'm prepared to find an exception to that, but I have not found any exceptions so far. It just isn't on the list yet. Now, here in essence, you get completely the reverse aspect when you package.

Here sits this thing here, see. Pc already – always known it's been there. And you come along and you say, "Well Joe, I've got your item here. It's a waterbuck!"

And he says, "Oh, yes? Where'd it go?" Right item, mass diminishes. Wrong item, mass increases. That's a handy one, isn't it? And you'll find that's quite invariable, that is the McCoy.

Now, if it's incomplete list – not wrong way to, but incomplete list – wrong way to he won't ARC break because he's been ARC break the whole – ARC broken the whole time – a little bit, but he won't – he won't go up in smoke. Now, when I say ARC break, I mean up in smoke. I mean he goes into complete apathy, or blowy, or something – it's quite misemotional. He'll be misemotional all through the time to the next session, and so forth. He's liable to blow up in your face. He goes out of gear, fast. And that's usually incomplete list. That's usually incomplete list.

You get all kinds of puzzles – I've got a puzzle right now. Where's Ray? Yeah, I got a puzzle right now, on his pc. I just wrote in there – I just wrote in his folder – he... doing beautifully, see, he's been doing just this. He's been doing just what I described to you, as this Routine 2 activity. And he's got two R/Sing items, ah-ha-ha, on his list, ha-ha. And, the items are on the first page of the list and he's gotten many R/Ses that follow, but those R/Ses evidently don't fire on nulling or he hasn't nulled them, but – or – but they're not firing on nulling.

Now, that list is incomplete, or he hasn't got the item. He has not got the item yet. And the pc says, "Oh yes I'm fine, I'm not quite up to understanding what this is all about," and so forth. There'll be reservations of this particular kind.
He just hasn't got the item, that's all. It's either later on the existing list, but I don't think it's ever been put on the list, because he's got two R/Sing items. He saw one of the items kind of go pffff! and he took a little tiny "suppression of" off and it started to R/S about an inch wide. And he already found one of the other items an inch wide. And he – because he confused the second list he was doing with first list on Scientology, because the other item was Scientology. So he started to pick it up off the list. Oh, no! So I've got in there, big red letters, "No, no, no!" exclamation point. "Complete that list!" See?

Now, there's only one place where a pc knows, exclamation point, knows. A pc really – a lot of the time doesn't know whether it's pain or sen. A pc, a lot of the time doesn't know what he's worried about. And he doesn't – certainly doesn't know what his present time problem is, what is really eating him up – this always comes as a surprise to him. But he does know something. He knows whether or not it's the item.

Now look, if he didn't know what the item was, then the process would have – not be working. See, the item – see, it's only against the pc's knowingness. See, you're only auditing up to the pc's knowingness. So if he doesn't know it's his item, well, that's it. You've had it. That's good enough test right there, so that's another test. See.

Pc queases around even slightly on the thing. You haven't done it, man. Something's wrong here. He's got to say, "Oh, well, yes... catfish, always has been my item," and so on. You don't get that kind of response when you get the catfish, man. "Oh! Catfish! Oh! What do you know! Yeah! Yeah, catfish!"

See, a pc's knowingness is paramount in knowing whether or not it's the item. Not the – not the item you're representing perhaps, or something like that. But when you find an item, the pc knows it is it. And when you package it the pc knows that's a package. He won't even discuss the matter with you, that's it! See? But, if he isn't quite, "Oh, yes, yeah, oh yes, they go together as a package, yeah, yes..." That's not good enough, see?

"Oh well, of course! Yes! Ha-ha! Waterbuck-Tiger! Ha-ha! Golly! Funny I never recognized that before! You know, I often thought those that..." So on and so on and so on and so on. "Oh yes, of course that!" That's the kind of response you want. Got the idea?

Because if you don't get up to the pc's knowingness, where have you got to? You haven't got any other place to get to! Now, the funny part of it is that Routine 2 carries forward a little miracle all by itself, when it's done in this fashion. Now, you understand, I'm talking to you now, about just this Routine 2 I'm talking to you about, see? You do some sort of a list and complete it. Now, not – now understand that list is – I'm not even talking about it being from anything, you understand? See? Just do that list and complete it and then you oppose it and the two items go together and the pc knows all about it.

When you do that you get the funniest little miracle you ever wanted to see. They go pffssssffffflf! Gone! Where the hell's the mass? You no longer got a rock slam on one, you no longer got a rock slam on the other one, you might have a little dirty needle if the pc had a withhold or something on it. But it's gone pffffssss! But the mass is gone, too.

So properly done Routine 2 delivers less mass, and wrongly done Routine 2 delivers more mass. Now, this is so marked you can even put the pc on a scale day by day. If the pc
gains three pounds on Tuesday, he had wrong Routine 2 on Monday. See that? This is the old havingness test, you know? The thetan does develop energy. And the way he got that energy is you saying to him like this – this is where the energy came from, this is the three pounds that he got, see?

You said: "Well, well Joe, that's – got your item here, it's a catfish!" Three pounds' worth, see? Catfish! [laughter]

Says, "Where the hell did that come from?" See.

Now, actually you didn't materialize it, as the auditor. Don't get spooky about the thing. Because the thing was there to grab. See, it was there to grab and it did have mass the moment his attention went on it, but the reason it had mass is it was not fundamental.

See, it's like grabbing the third withhold from the bottom of the chain. It sticks. Now, the fact that you've grabbed a nonfundamental mass and told a lie about it, that it is the fundamental mass, brings about this instantaneous solidity. It doesn't take place tomorrow; it takes place right now. Bang! Funniest looking thing you ever saw. Funny – funny experience.

And then let's take up the next step, then, of – you might say, this is pure, theoretical and can be done, it's not just in theory, it actually works right out in practice – Routine 2. Then we find another way to list another complete list. See, we make another complete list and we oppose that. And this has not been completely carried forward, but maybe one of the easy ways to do that is to reverse the first list. Now we're invading 3-21.

One of the ways of listing a goal and crossing up Routine 2 with Routine 3, is one of the best ways you can possibly list a goal. This is a – this is a doll. You say, "In present time, who or what would your goal (whatever it is) influence?" See? And you make a list "influence." And that list has got to be complete to only one R/Sing item on that first list you do of it, see? It's complete to one R/Sing item and there it is.

And then you take that one R/Sing item, you determine whether it's the terminal or an opposition terminal, and at that time you oppose it, get yourself a complete list to only one R/S, seen on nulling – see, there could be a dozen R/Ses you see, on writing it down – but only one R/S seen on nulling. Now, how do you see this R/S? Well actually just by calling them off. You say, "boots, saddles, catfish, waterbuck, uh-gulp!" There it went, R/Sed. Didn't do anything else to it. You understand? We're talking about R/Ses you don't do anything else to it to get them to R/S, when we say only one R/Sing item. You got that?

We're assuming that your pc is sitting in the auditing chair being a pc. Not completely snoring with missed withholds, you understand? And we assume that the pc is not being audited up against a horrendous and screaming ARC break that you could have figured out that your Routine 2 was bad, day before yesterday and you haven't solved it yet. You understand? We're talking about a pc, he's in shape to have something nulled, not necessarily a clean-as-a-whistle needle, but he's in shape to have something nulled and you're nulling it and you just see that thing.

Now, oddly enough you call it the second time and the R/S maybe won't be there, but just – that you saw it the first time is enough to say the list isn't complete. The way you do that – I'll give you the exact way you do that. You come down here and you say, "Waterbuck,
tiger." Now, let's just get the idea of forty items between each one of these, see. But we say "Waterbuck, tiger," tiger goes ﬂfffl! Little R/S. And then forty items and then, you're nulling, see, so far, it's tiger, see. And then you said, "Willow wand," ﬂfffl! Ha-ha-ha! Your list is incomplete! And at that very moment you don't say to the pc, "Willow wand is your item," or anything stupid like this, see. You don't say anything to the pc, except, "Well, I think it'd be a very, very good idea if we added some items to this list." See?

I don't care if we got two more pages to null. Don't null a list down to the end before you add to it. Stop at the second R/S. Always at the second R/S! You got it? And after you've added to it, if you see no further R/S on your meter as you're adding to it, you either missed it – missed seeing it – or the pc hasn't put it on the list yet, so you better go a little further – heh! The pcs will sometimes argue about going further on a list when they got more to put on a list, too, don't forget that. It's the delicacy of the auditor to get him to list further without making him list under protest.

Usually the pc lists under protest, usually only when the auditor's really goofed, the item is on the list, or is answering the auditing question some other way. "Well, let's see if I can get enough items on this list in order to get away... 'Who or what would oppose catfish?'" so that I can get enough items on this list so that we can get away from it and do something else?" That's the question he's answering. See, he's not actually thinking over, "Who or what would oppose catfish?" at all! And you have to get that question there straightened out.

But anyway, it's always the second R/S. Now, after you've – after you've got... seen an R/S on your meter, here, you've gone down the line and you've seen an R/S – and by the way I'll bet some of you are pulling a gag I saw an auditor doing the other day. And here was the way they were doing this. This – this'll amuse you. They were listing with the meter over here on the extreme left. And writing over on their extreme right. In other words their pad was over here and their meter was over there, so they'd only occasionally be able to look in the direction of the meter. You got that?

Actually the meter belongs up there almost in the pcs chest. And this list, you can actually put your meter on the clipboard if you have to do it on a small restricted area. But for God's sakes don't be writing anything on a list further than about six or seven inches out in front of that E-Meter. You understand? Because as you write, the needle is in your field of vision, and you can see it out of the corner of your eye. So you never miss these R/Ses when it goes down. Do you see how you do that?

In other words, you keep your listing up close to the dial, and the dial in line. And if you can get the list, the meter and the pc in a line, you can keep them all in order. Just one line, see, straight out from the auditor, list, meter, pc. Why you won't miss these R/Ses as they go down. Do you see how you do that?

All right. That's just a point.

So anyway, you've had your second R/S. So you added to the list. You saw an R/S as it went down, you say that's good enough. All right. You go back and you test your first R/S. Even give it a little Tiger if you want to, you know, just on been suppressed or anything of the sort, you know. This thing is now quiet. It's quiet when being called, quiet when being tiger drilled, it's quiet! There's no charge on it. See?
You go to your second one. Now, you understand, if there were two of them, neither are it! You want to... I got an auditor the other day on this, and the auditor couldn't get this either. Now, listen: *Neither one can be it.* Why? Why can neither one of these be it? Because putting the second one down didn't take the charge off the first one. So the second one can't possibly be it. It's never going to be either of the two that R/Sed. And you'll know if your list is complete now, if you can't get either of those two to R/S. Got it? So you test both of them. And if either one of them gives you an R/S your list is incomplete.

You could go on cycling like this but ordinarily you don't. It's usually just you find two R/Ses on the list and you continue the list and the R/S disappears off of both of them no matter what you do to them and you go on down the list and null the new part of the list now, and you'll find out it R/Ses like mad and there aren't two R/Ses on it, or anything of the sort. There's just one and that's your item, you tell it to the pc, you get the less-mass phenomenon, pc's happy as a clam with the thing, you oppose it, runs like a well-oiled dream. There you are. You understand?

But it's never either one of those that R/Sed. If you can get anything on a list to R/S by standing on its head, by shaking it in a paper bag, by putting brown sugar on it – I don't care how! See? If you can get anything on a list to R/S except the item, the list is not complete. You get two R/Ses on a list regardless of how you get those two R/Ses on the list – I'm not telling you methodology now, I'm just telling you the basic truths of life about the bees and birds. Two R/Ses – item not on the list. If either one of them R/S after you've added to the list, your list still isn't complete, because it can never be those first two. Got that?

And ordinarily those R/Ses are perceived just by reading. Someday you'll have the bad luck of having a very suppressed pc and you'll go down the list and when the pc listed the thing they suppressed it like mad and you'll miss the R/S and you'll know then, that you goofed. And you will have to do something extraordinary. And also, as far as I'm concerned the item is not on the list, because the pc inexplicably ARC breaks. There is no explanation as to why the pc ARC breaks and yet he ARC breaks.

You say, "Well it's a waterbuck."

And he says, "Well all right, it's a waterbuck... What do you know, I never noticed that over there before, anyhow, you know, it-it's-it's right all right, I got an item here that... Yeah," [sighs] "It's a waterbuck all right. Yeah, guess it is... But you know, I haven't been getting any of your acknowledgments lately! I wish you'd speak up!"

And you, *heh!* Don't do this, man! Don't do this, "All right, in this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Is there something I've nearly found out? Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I..."

"Well, yes! You missed a withhold on me. Of course you missed a withhold on me! Naturally! You haven't gotten anything I've said in the whole session! You don't acknowledge! Naturally!"

You say, "All right." Finally got him to say something, see? "Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold..." Two hours later: "Have I missed a withhold? Is there something you nearly found out?"
You could go on like this three sessions later. Trying to clean rudiments, "In this session has anything been suppressed? In that session when there was that terrible ARC break, is there anything you invalidated? Is there anything you failed to reveal?"

Now, that's taking the course of auditing to heal up gone-wrong Routine 2. And auditing won't heal up gone-wrong Routine 2, believe me. Take it from me, it won't do it. That's one of the troubles you're having, is your Routine 2 goes wrong and then you try to cure it up with auditing. And of course you're trying to put out the fire by spitting on it. It just doesn't go out, that's all!

Finally you get smart enough to say, "Somewhere around here I'll bet I've missed an item." Which of course is the biggest missed withhold the pc can have. And you say, "All right," so on.

"Well I don't want to list on that list, I've answered all the questions on the list, you got everything."

"Well just for fun, let's list on the list."

"Oh but I haven't got anything, yeah," and so on. "That's the whole trouble with the thing right now, is I'm listing under protest!"

I, about this time – say, "Well what question have you been ask... answering?"

"Oh, I've been answering 'Who or what would doodlebug a wup-wuk,' or whatever it is, whatever question you've got, that's what I've been answering."

And you say, "Well all right, now, at any time have you answered it for some reason? Have you deeded something about this answer? Have you decided?"

"Oh well, yes! I decided I put it on the list when I said 'tiger.' And, heh! I've been listing since, well, heh! What would oppose a tiger, heh? Heh-heh!"

He hadn't been listing "Who or what would oppose a waterbuck," see. Or he's been listing, trying to get enough on the list to make the auditor shut up. See, it's... there's something different going on here with the auditing question. Now, we're just down to the basics of auditing, don't you see? You finally say, "Well I don't care whether it's tiring you or not. It's evidently right way to, we've already stressed that. Apparently the source was okay. Apparently that. And the only thing we've got here that could cause this is you're not putting enough items on this list. So you just sit there and start giving me items, no matter whether you're ARC broke or not, goddammit! Come on, next item?"

"Oh, well, if you put it that way." [laughs]

Pc goes on, all of a sudden puts the item on the list, you'll see the thing R/S, as a matter of fact he's been fighting the item, don't you see? And see the thing R/S and boom, he's got it on the list, you check it out and it's all of a sudden that phenomenon happens, see? Where'd it go? You know? Whole package, if it's the second item, goes psssss!

And you say, "Well, how's that ARC break?"

And he'll say, "ARC break? ARC-? What ARC... oh, oh, well, oh – oh that! I don't – I don't know why you were worried about it, I'm not worried about it!"
That's almost the only ARC break you get in this. Actually you can take it from a wrong source and the pc'll grind on forever just muttering, a little bit now and then. But you get these spectacular ARC breaks just when it isn't on the list, that's all. You got a few indicators now, on this? See this?

All right. Now, I said the stylized, the pure method of all of this was very simple, in that you completed the first list. Now, the more arbitraries you introduce in it – I'll take my hair down here and give you a few of the facts of life – the more arbitraries you introduce into any pure technology, well, the more trouble you're going to have with it. I'm not talking about signs, rules and indicators as to how to do it right. I mean the more arbitraries as to how it is done – that you introduce into something – which are unneeded, unnecessary to its execution, the more trouble you're going to have with it.

At the time that R2-12 was developed we were having a lot of trouble with rock slammers, and we were having a lot of trouble with this and that and the other thing. I coped with this best way I could and knew and found out – now listen very carefully – that R2-12 could be done at several levels of action. It... you could get several different kinds of results out of it. If you do R2-12 right, even against an arbitrary that's quite arbitrary, as your first source...

Well, let's say they had five rock slamming items on List One. And you pick one of those closest to the session; you do that, you're going to make a change in the pc – just listing it, regardless of finding the item. And you list that out and so forth and you get the thing more or less complete and you find an item over there and you oppose it, see. All right, you're going to get change in the pc.

Well, let's say that this was kind of poorly done. And you found one of these rock slamming items and you listed it out and all of a sudden a huge mass materialized for the pc and you oppose that and so forth. Hell, man, you've still changed his mind! With regard to this situation, see? You still have. You'll still get a result.

Now, nobody, in what I'm telling you now, is invalidative of this, because I'm telling you on the basis of a – of an improvement of something that was already pretty good. Now, therefore, you could get a mediocre result that'd be quite impressive to the pc simply by listing a list, not even nulling it. See, you can even list the wrong thing and get some kind of a – of a result.

There are a lot of results to be had here. I'm here tonight trying to tell you how to get the purest, best result. I'm trying to tell you how to get a miraculous result. Now, I found out in doing these other things you ran into more trouble than I ever thought you'd run into. Quite a few cases around ran into a lot of trouble – probably a lot of trouble in organizations right now, as they're doing it on staff.

So, let's move this thing down to its absolute essentials. And let's take a look at the source of any of these difficulties you have had. Now, any time you pick something, there's either of two sources of lists, actually. There's the present time – three sources of lists – there's the present time environment of the pc. There is the auditing environment of the pc, we're talking about his livingness environment, don't you see, that's one list source. And then
there's his auditing environment. You know, the auditor and Scientology and that sort of thing. And then there's parts of existence, as a source – so these three pet sources.

You'd say number one and number three might overlap and true enough they very often do, but nevertheless you can ask for them separately. Now, I gave you this in... this influence for the goal and this not-influence for the goal. That's... You already have the pc's goal, so you get two entirely separate attacks on the situation, "In present time who or what would your goal influence?" and you'll get a rock slamming list. And then you get – you've packaged that all up, see? That's all packaged, you want to take off again. Well, you're not likely to get much on influence in present time, but you can get a not-influence in present time gives you a rock slamming list, don't you see?

So you could say: "What is part of your life and livingness in present time?" and "What is not part of it?" This gives you two separate sources from life and livingness. Each one of them could be handled as a complete list. And each one of them damn well better be a complete list. That's your first list I just described to you, see.

Now, if one of them doesn't rock slam, the other one will. But usually if the first one did, the second one also will. So you've got two separate entirely different list sources in life and livingness. Now, let's take the session. Now, we got to find something that isn't rock slamming in order to get a list. Now that's a new look, isn't it? You never represent a rock slamming item. Just never never never. I don't care if it was done in 3GA Criss Cross. We got away with it then, for various reasons, because it wasn't long and we weren't packaging and we weren't doing it for keeps and we were just using it, it was softened off by goals.

But it becomes fatal to do this in a Routine 2. You just never – must never, never, never write "a represent" or "a consist," or "an influences," or "an upset about" from a – or anything like that – from a rock slamming item. In other words, "In present time, who or what does your life consist of?" Well, that's a somewhat clumsy question but I'm just giving you an example here, see. And the pc'll go downhill like a toboggan, if your "life" rock slams. You got to test the source. Just make sure the source is not rock slamming. DR? That's okay. Rock slam? Boy, that is definitely not all right.

See, actually, you should tiger drill your source a little bit, see if you get a rock slam. If you get a rock slam, you do one of two things. You can either oppose it or skip it and take something else. And the best thing to do is skip it and take something else, you got that? Don't be so triumphant that you got that thing to rock slam because you'll be representing a rock slamming item and that's fatal. And you mustn't – that's a big rule – you mustn't ever represent a rock slamming item. You only oppose those. Never represent, always oppose, a rock slamming item.

All right, so, "Your life…" Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang! You better not write "Who or what – in present time who or what does your life consist of?" you know, nothing like that, no, no, no, no, no, no. Because that's representing a rock slamming item, I don't use – care if you use "consist of" or any other such word, or "associated with" or any such wording will give you the same mess. No, you'd better say – you'd better say something or other that doesn't rock slam.
You'd better say "Who or what do you associate with..." associate with – associate with – it's all right, see "...in your life?" No, no, no, no, no. "Who or what do you associate with?" That's all right, you'll get a list there. Got the idea? This... in other words, you avoid the R/Sing source for a represent list. That's another rule. Avoid it.

Now, why do you avoid it? Because it's always out of the context of another list, which is always incomplete. So, you actually, to do pure, beautiful, magical Routine 2, you never pick something out of midair that the pc hasn't listed. You all of a sudden find "me," you know? Ho-ho! You say, "'Me!' Hey, that slams! Oh, well, heck! Now, we got to oppose that." No. You had better avoid it. Why? Because "me" is a part of a list you don't know the heading of and which is incomplete. You got that? That list is incomplete. And "me" is probably right out of the middle. And if completed would probably give you something else.

So just any out-of-the-blue rock slamming item that the pc presents to you, just consider it as part of a list that hasn't been completed. Now, it may or may not have been completed.

Now, actually there's no great destruction to doing something with that. But it doesn't give you total and optimum Routine 2. That's not terribly destructive. You've been doing it. But you notice how long those lists can run? You notice sometimes they don't complete? And you notice the great percentage of coterms that you get out of it. You notice that? And furthermore I'm finding out that it takes you longer to handle one of those than to find out what the original list was in the first place and get it completed.

Now Routine 2 goes very, very fast, on raw meat particularly. It's... well, you take a session, you get a list. You know? Take a session and you null it. I'm talking about two, three-hour sessions now. I mean that'd be slow sort of Routine 2, but pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, see, you're always coming up with a result.

All right. What if you – what if you found that Scientology was rock slamming. Now, from a security measure and in actual fact, you could oppose Scientology and the case will make a gain. See, that's in actual fact. Even just oppose it and write a long list and abandon it and the pc'll do better. But that's got a liability. That list is liable to go forever, it's liable to be out of a context of another list. What's the title of the list? So we've got our life and livingness, see, type list and there can be positive and negative life and livingness. Unless one of them rock slams, at which time you'll have to find some way to get around that rock slam. See, don't do anything with a rock slam from source.

Avoid that random rock slamming source that came from no place, see. No matter how attractive it is. And your second is your positive-negative Scientology list. Well look what you're up against. Supposing the pc rock slams on Scientology. You can't say to him, "Who or what does Scientology represent to you?" See, because that's doing a represent. Now, how are you going to get around that? You're going to have to take some part of Scientology, or some way of stating Scientology, so that you're not representing Scientology.

It'll be... have to be something identifiable by the pc that doesn't rock slam, and then you've got the positive and negative side of that. What does represent it? What doesn't represent it? See? What is part of it, what isn't part of it, I don't care how you state it, you – it's the same list in actual fact.
And then, you have as your third category, also positive and negative; you've got existence, parts of and you're actually asking him now for anything on the whole track he can dream up. You not asking for a present time anything. He usually gives you the present time item that's next to come up.

Now you go back over some pc's folder. And you find out you did a Dynamic – Dynamic Assessment on this pc. And here are the dynamics all beautifully written out. And four of them rock slammed. That tells you your source. It's from an incomplete list. And it'll behave like an incomplete list source. And you say, "You rock slam on Scientology" and he's instantly got this mass. Where'd it come from? Do you see that? In other words, it obeys all the rules of an incomplete list. It's not something different or special.

Well it's up to you to complete the list. How're you going to do it? Well, you're going to get clever. If Scientology rock slams, how are you going to complete a Scientology list? Well, you'll just have to find something about Scientology, that is broad and embracive – "Mental activities," or "Ron's work," see, something! We don't care what it is. Avoid that R/S. And then you can list it positive and you can list it negative.

See, you list it positive and get your whole package. See, you do your original list, see, that's that complete list, down to whatever it is and then you do an oppose to it and that gives you your package. Now, that saves you one list, doesn't it? And it saves you the hardest, toughest list, so it's much shorter to do it this way. So you get this, that packages, and, if you do it right, just like I've been telling you, here, see, it'll go bzzzzmmmm! A lot of mass disappears and the pc feels great. In other words that will blow. That will blow with rapidity. He won't feel somewhat better about it, you understand? He'll feel terrific.

All right. Then you can do a negative. "Who or what isn't part of Scientology?" If Scientology didn't rock slam. And then you can do a Dynamic Assessment. And you say, "What are the parts of life and existence?" And "What are not the parts of life and existence?" And it gives you two more potential packages – two more packages, not two more items, you understand.

So there's a source of six packages, right there. Now, I would say that they were the basic packages of Routine 2. Six packages – twelve items. You should be able to get off that. If you can't change a fellow's life with those twelve items you ought to quit.

Now, you... the degree that you will succeed in this, the success that you will have in this, is monitored this way: As long as you repair Routine 2 with Routine 2 and not auditing, you're okay. If you do right Routine 2 and repair things that go wrong with Routine 2, you can keep everything beautifully polished up and flowing beautifully with a little bit of auditing. But with a little bit of Routine 2 and an awful lot of auditing, mid ruds and general O/W and preparing the pc and getting the rudiments in – boy you're just going to get that pc no place. See?

Because you can straighten up the case with Routine 2, where auditing will fail. Routine 2 is more powerful than auditing. Why is Routine 2 more powerful than auditing? Because it is hitting at the present time problem and the hidden standard of the pc. The hidden standards of the pc and the present time problems of the pc are the things which has gotten in
the road of pc progress from the beginning of Dianetics and Scientology. That's the one thing the pc can't get across: that he doesn't know these things exist.

He really doesn't know what present time problem he's got. He appears that he has know... does know, the moment you've gotten it. But he actually didn't know until that moment. A case makes no forward progress to amount to anything in the presence of a present time problem. A hidden standard is another thing.

He is finding out if his sciatica still twinges. And that is everything he is doing. In all of his processing he only compares it to his sciatica. That's the hidden standard. You ask any pc you're processing, to some degree, he has a hidden standard. You say, "Do you feel better because of processing? All right, how do you know you feel better because of processing?’ And he... if you drum at him for a while, he'll come up with his hidden standard, and sometimes these things are quite interesting- whether or not the tips of their ears burn. See, he knows he's getting better because he gets a warm feeling in his chest and so forth. And he's actually sitting there in session waiting for the warm session to turn on so that he knows he is better. It's quite amazing!

It's a very interesting little – little side alley of research some HPA Academy student should undertake sometime to do. Just ask them how – ask – go around and ask his fellow students how do they know they're feeling better. And an Academy Level without any 2-12 at all, why they'd have abundant answers! "Well what would – what would – what would some healing have to do to you, what would some healing have to do, to you in order to – that you knew you were better?’ And you'll get an almost automatic response on the part of most people. Sometimes they have to think for a while. And they finally tell you, "Well I'd... back of my neck wouldn't be tired anymore.” Well, they're telling you they're trying to find out if an item is shifted – that's what they're actually telling you.

Till you get the hidden standard out of the road, he does everything through this. And oddly enough, because it's really a circuit he's consulting, all of his answers as to whether or not he's better are from the circuit. And this goes much deeper than you would think. He's in consultation with a circuit. Supposing it was a member of the FDA! Ho-ho! [laughter] Any case gain – it'd tell him he's worse! Do you see, that's the hidden standard.

Well, a present time problem, it's just – present time is just plowed in. He is so fixated on present time, you see, that, huh-huh, he can't take his attention off. Be quite painful for him to invest any time in improving. He's just got to be totally alert and up here in present time, bug-eyed fighting this thing all the time. You've seen pcs come into session worried about their... the wife, or worried about the husband, or worried about their job or something like that. You actually could process them, bang! Bang! Thud, thud! Crash, crash, crash! On and on and on, with the most violent and wonderful processes and so forth and take a graph on them afterwards and they got absolutely no change whatsoever on the graph. We've done that many times.

You run a liability now, with omitting your Model Session, of not catching that momentary PTP. That momentary PTP can keep the more fundamental PTP from showing up sometimes. But, Routine 2-12 is usually worth taking a chance on. It's usually worth taking a chance on, because it is so much greater a PTP and it is so much greater a withhold and it's
got so many more overts in it than you could possibly get off with rudiments, that most of the
time you can get away with not using a Model Session on it.

All right, so what do you do? You get, you pull the dumbbell to pieces, you make it
disappear; there goes their PTP. Another dumbbell; there goes their hidden standards. Maybe
the same one went both PTP and hidden standards, don't you see? Then you get another one;
here's their fixation on this, that or the other thing. Here you get another one; and they can all
of a sudden see the walls and didn't ever know they couldn't before. You work it on up, you're
suddenly at a position where if you list goals on them, they won't give you these first eight or
nine items.

If you had listed goals on them before, they'd just give you the intentions of these PTP
circuits. And you'd just get nothing but on and on and on – intentions of these circuits. I got
some actual case history on this, which is quite interesting. I don't care how long the goals list
was, the pc was just listing their PTP circuit goals. They never listed back of that, which I
thought was fascinating. So, of course, you could never get the pc's goal on the list.

Now, they can move on the track enough now; in order to put a goal on the list, you
could do 3-21 after you had a few packages out of the road with Routine 2. Now, that is actu-
ally the purpose of Routine 2. There isn't any other purpose back of it. It's not really to make
the pc feel better and it's not to make the pc fly and it's not to make the pc get a big reality on
Scientology, nothing. It's none of those purposes. Any of those that add in are simply bonuses
and they're all very, very worthwhile; and you do perfect Routine 2, you will get some very,
very miraculous results. It's very well worth doing.

Now can you get a goals list? You get a few packages off of somebody and you get
them off of him well and he all of a sudden just starts presenting you with his goal. Various
things of this character occur. But you're trying to clear up the PT environment to a point
where the individual can be run on a Goals Process and cleared.

Now, there is your essence of the thing. Now, the repair of a case, or anything like that
may be another story entirely. And it has nothing to do with this very pure rendition of Rou-
tine 2, which I've just given you. If your auditing can compare to the very pure rendition
which I've just given you, you'll have marvelous success in auditing, there is no doubt about
that at all. Okay?

Thank you.
CASE REPAIR

A lecture given on 8 January 1963

Thank you.

Lecture two, 8 Jan. AD 13. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. This is about case repair.

Now, I've given you a very pure rundown in the first lecture on the exact plot of what you can do with a case with listing and opposing and so forth. And if you were to do that – succeed in doing that and so forth – you would get a very miraculous gain on a case. This would be less mass as opposed to more mass.

Now, if you goof you will get more mass and things will become more solid and the first symptom of goofing is actually more mass. More mass has shown up on the case than was there before and consequently more R/S than was there before. Those are the things that you know you are going wrong with. You know you're losing with the case if on Tuesday you have more rock slams on the case than you had last Wednesday.

Let's say you went over the Scientology List originally and it had no rock slams on it, but from some other sources – 1A or some of the other list headings that we had like "What are you upset about?" – and you did a lot of that and you got a lot of packages, and then you go back to the Scientology List and you'll find out Scientology and Central Orgs and things like that are now rock slamming. The case is not improved up to a point where it can rock slam. The case actually has become massier and that is reflected in more rock slams than previously.

Now, you get these two symptoms of case worsening. These cases – case bettering, case worsening. You get these two aspects then – more mass and more rock slam – as being a worsening symptom.

Now, along with this is your best indicator for visual inspection of the pc is tone of the skin. Pcs get discolored skin tones. They go gray or green or yellow or black and this happens sufficiently rapidly to be noted in a session. Actually you can list a list wrong way to and sit right there and watch the mass close in on the pc and the pc gets blacker and blacker and blacker and at the end of the session the pc is more black than they were at the beginning of the session. Well, something is very wrong.

2-12 does not work that way, or Routine 2 does not work that way. They should be lighter. Their skin tone should be better. And actually it's about this – you should be able to tell halfway through a session whether or not their skin tone is better than at the beginning of the session.
Now, you can also tell with the eyes. And the eyes look like they have more sen on them halfway through a session than at the beginning of the session, I would check over what I was doing. I couldn't necessarily abandon it because it merely means they're running through a sen period or something like this. So the eye is not as reliable as skin tone.

Skin tone – inevitably, invariable a darkening or worse-off skin tone halfway through a session than at the beginning of a session shows that you're doing something very wrong. So you should learn to spot a pc's skin tone at the beginning of a session – at the beginning of auditing and get a fixed idea of what it is so that you could use that as a point of comparison. Beginning of the session take a look at your pc. Pc a light shade of yellow? Well, at least at the end of the session they should be a lighter shade of yellow not a darker shade of yellow, do you see that? So remember to pick up a point of reference by which you can compare what you are doing.

Now, the other symptom here is age and that is very easy to look at. Does the pc look older or younger? And that is also progressively easy to compare. It isn't whether the pc looks older at the end of an intensive than at the beginning of an intensive. It's not that gross. It's whether or not the pc looks older halfway through a session. See? And it's quite gross as a yardstick. You should be able to sit there and see the pc look slightly younger halfway through the session than at the beginning of the session if you're doing Routine 2 right. And the pc will look slightly older halfway through the session.

Now, this goes down to such a thing, and don't laugh now, but it goes down to such a thing as gray hair. Suzie used to be very amused at me on this because my hair would turn gray and turn red and turn gray almost at will. And this is quite easy to tell, but you see that a pc's hair is grayer at the end of an intensive than it was at the beginning of an intensive, why, something really went wrong.

Now, this also refers to mass. Now, that is a fairly – that is a less gross – age itself is very gross. That has big differences that you can see. But I'm just talking about this – it's just a little part of age, see? Weight is another factor and that goes – that's not quite as gross a yardstick – but weight goes something on the order of two, three sessions you should be able to markedly tell a weight improvement.

Now, the pc actually should weigh less. How much less can a pc weigh? Well, on some pcs who are obsessively thin and too light, actually a little more weight is an improvement, but you have to use your head on that one. But ordinarily, why, an increase of weight means an increase of mass.

Now, these are the things you tell by, because the graph is not available to the auditor midway in the session and midway in the intensive and so forth, so these are very precise mechanisms by which to tell improvement. But I'm talking about the auditor's mechanisms to tell improvement and they fall into just those categories, no others. Don't bother with any other categories. You can usually look over charts. You can usually look over the pc's auditor reports and find out if he made his goals. Well, if the pc has consistently made his goals in the session, why, you can conceive the pc is getting better, so forth. Those are indicators. But the things I have just told you about, such as skin tone and age, they're exclamation point. See?
They're right. They're dead-on. And mass, to a slightly lesser degree but very positively, is an indicator.

Now, all of these things add up to an auditor's observation of the pc.

Now, a meter should behave better. I don't say that a meter – a meter has a good way of behaving on a pc. I'm not trying to set that up as some hidden standard to you. But when you ask the pc for a withhold you get a response when the pc has one, you understand? Whereas last week when you asked them for a withhold you couldn't tell. In other words, it's simply a matter of the meter doing better by the auditor. This meter is easier to use, that's all.

Now, the needle's cleaner. Just... it's the meter is better for the auditor and it's always for the auditor. Meter behaves better. You don't have any meter trouble with this pc. See? You used to have meter trouble. Three sessions ago we had more meter trouble than we have now.

Now, height of tone arm or obsessive lowness of tone arm are alike indicators, but in actual fact Routine 2 doesn't give us a perfect score on the tone arm. The tone arm can almost be neglected. We're more interested in needle behavior than we are tone arm positions to show bettering in Routine 2. This tone arm can actually consistently ride at 5 with the pc getting better and better and better. That's interesting, isn't it? Not even tone arm motion means anything in Routine 2. So you list and get no tone arm motion; so you list and get tone arm motion. There is no adjudication can be made out of that. But sometimes you'll find an item that rock slams on the tone arm; but that is so rare that we're not particularly worried about it.

But if, after a while, our E-Meter has not changed in its position we begin to worry about what's going on here, you understand? After a while. At the end of a... the pc has consistently ridden at 6 and we've gotten three packages and it's still at 6. Well, we conceive, then, that we must have been plucking things out of the air. Something here is not fundamental on this case. We conceive this pc still must have the PT problem the pc has. It isn't the pc isn't getting better. Yes, the pc looks better, the pc acts better, the pc does better, but he still must have some kind of a present time problem here or that mass that's giving that 6 wouldn't be that visible, you understand?

About that time we go back and review the living daylights out of the case. What would we review? We'd look for a wrong source on a list that should be completed. Now, the only one I'd worry about is the fellow that rode at 1.5 and we found two packages on the pc. Two packages, that's four items, and the pc still riding at 1.5, I'd sure review the living daylights out of that case and find out what earlier item because there's something here that's real weird. And if I didn't find anything and the pc is feeling better, and his skin tone was better and he looked younger, I'd go on and find another package. But I would treat the case with considerable "hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu," you know? And sooner or later this pc's going to go bzzzlt and go up through 7 and around down the line. But if I didn't make it happen after a while I'd start worrying, you understand? That's all the tone arm means.

That the tone arm doesn't pump madly up and down while you're listing, that's nothing to worry about. It remains motionless while you're listing; that's nothing to worry about, see. We don't care what the tone arm does. Needle, on the other hand, when we are listing wrong way to, the needle invariable is stiff and jerky and the longer we list the more jerky and active
and \textit{rrrrrrr} the needle gets, and that's wrong way to or wrong source. There's something really going on wrong here. Your needle behavior should soften up, loosen up and eventually when the list is complete and for some little time after that... You shouldn't just stop a list the moment it gets clean, by the way, it should go about, well, I don't know, as many as fifty items beyond that point.

A list will go clean before the item will get on the list. That will happen. So just because the needle stopped going dirty and so forth is no reason that the list is complete. I'd let it sit there and flow for a while. Not beating the pc up to a point where the pc goes into a super protest, but I'd get as many items on the list as I could. I would avoid short lists and after the list was complete avoid listing. When is the list complete? Well, when it can be nulled to one R/Sing item seen on the first nulling through that stays in and that's that, and the pc is happy with it and knows it's it. That's how long the list is.

These lists that go to twenty-two pages, twenty-five pages, forty-two pages are wrong source or wrong way to, either one or the other. They are just too long. Lists that run four pages should be quite adequate. Lists that run – I'm talking now about your big double pages where you have your – lot of them. My pages have about – only about twenty items on a page. I list five, six of those pages, that's plenty. If it goes much beyond this there's something wrong. The source is wrong or the list is wrong way to.

Now, don't go on listing forever on something and butchering up the pc. Your case repair should be done in time to avoid this sort of thing because you'll waste more time on a case running wrong on Routine 2 than you will on scrapping the lot. You can waste – the only time you really have a long time of it is when you're doing something wrong. And the funny part of it is, the wronger you are, the longer you'll take.

The right way is fast. The wrong way is long and slow. 2-12 being done right just goes swish, swish, thud, thud, \textit{list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list}. Pow! Pow! Pow! Thing rock slams. Pow, pow! There's another rock slam. \textit{List-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list} Pow, pow! There's another rock slam. \textit{List-list-list-list-list-list-list-list} Blang! There's one isolated rock slam! Blang! Whole page without any rock slams on it! Pc says, "I've just run out." You say, "All right, let's take a crack at it." Down the list \textit{pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa}. All those items that rock slammed when you wrote them down no longer rock slam and you get to one toward the end of the list and it rock slams like crazy! \textit{Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang}. You say it again, \textit{Bang-bang-bang}! You didn't Tiger Drill it, just \textit{bang-bang-bang-bang}! And you take a look at it, and you say... I'll tell you what to do wrong at this time, I'll tell you what to do wrong. You say, "Well, that item R/Sed," to the pc and then call the next item. You just about knock the pc's head off every time. You finish nulling before you tell the pc anything. After you know for sure, tell him, and then keep your attention on the pc. Don't do anything else to find out if it's massier or less massy or what is going on, but don't shift the pc's attention after you've told him the item. Don't! There's the source of more ARC breaks and upsets. Pc is going to ARC break if it's the wrong item so stand by – stand by for boarders! Get your boarding nets out right there. Just prepare to say, "That's fine, thank you very much!"
He says, "Well, I don't know. I guess it's a great big item," and so forth. "I don't know what these lightning bolts are that are going. Yes, it must be the item because of these light..." and so forth.

And you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. That's good. Thank you very much! All right. All right. Well, just come to notice here this thing, this list appears to me to be just a little bit strong. Do you mind if I prove the item out by listing a bit further?"

"Oh, well, ha! Yes."

As a matter of fact every time you get "Oh, yes! Yeah, that's fine," see, it's a wrong item. You're going to list further when it is the item? *Pow!* Pec's skull all over the ceiling! Do you know what I mean? Pec knows it's his item.

All right. Now, what are these various manifestations? What do they amount to? They amount to auditor observation of the pc and auditor observation of the meter. If it is hard to do, you are probably doing something wrong. And if you're doing something wrong with Routine 2, you're not going to put it right with auditing. Just make up your mind to that. Make it up now! Because there just isn't any auditing process run in present time that can overcome the strength and power of one of these items in Routine 2. He's just not going to be able to make it. You can smooth the pc out, you can make it feel better, you can groom up Routine 2 with auditing and good auditing – there is no substitute for good auditing – but something goes wrong with Routine 2 it won't heal with auditing. So you better have your Routine 2 right. So if your sessions are just going all wrong don't look at the auditing. I don't care if you think the auditing was lousy. Don't look at the auditing. Look at the Routine 2!

So when do you repair a case? When it won't run right. Don't try to – don't try to make this case something new and strange and peculiar with auditing. You're not going to do it. Why, I'll give you an example! Last night I patched up an incomplete list with auditing to make the pc feel better – didn't know quite – quite know what to do about this thing. Pec completely unwilling to go on listing on it and yet obviously it's an incomplete list. *Hehheh.* What do you know about that? So I patched it all up – I got all – you just – very rapid Tiger Drill. It didn't take me any time and so forth, but I got the list question beautifully clean; big, beautiful, flowing needle. Pec today ARC broke. Didn't know about what; just ARC broke! Pec ARC broke. I said, "Well, obviously we didn't have the item on the list!" Pec brightened up at once, but last night was saying, "Well, it's a complete list and I can't think of any more." You know? Pec brightened up right now. Do you get the difference there?

All right. What is the commonest source of error in Routine 2? Wrong source is the commonest source. And what is the commonest source of wrong source? It is an incomplete list.

All right, does that mean a list you took from source? No. No. It means the source list was incomplete. Always regard, always regard any rock slamming item as having come from a list. There are no prime movers unmoved. You got that? The big worry of the Greek was how did God build the universe if nobody built God, see? Well, we haven't got that thing in lists. Lists inevitably and invariable are built. And even though they've never been listed, any item is viewed as having come from a list. You got it? Any item is viewed as having come from a list. And that gives us one of the most imponderable pieces of nonsense anybody ever
heard of, because you are inevitably and invariable starting a case, then, from a case that has somehow been started. Now do you see why you have trouble with the source?

But the three areas where the pc can be in trouble is in his life and livingness, in his parts of existence or in his session. Well, his session is a part of Scientology, and his life and livingness is a part of his life and his associations in present time, and parts of existence are what he has considered existence to be composed of.

So they give you three different areas. One is more backtrack than the others and that's the parts of existence – that's more backtrack. What's his life and livingness composed of? In other words, what is he associating with? What does he connect with in present time? What does he bang up against in his life and livingness present time? This is different than when is he banging up against in a session?

So you've got your present time of his life and livingness and you've got the present time of the session, do you see, and there's where you are at.

Then, of course, you've got all the parts of existence and that goes back on the whole track.

Now, there's all of your zones that are immediately available. There's present time life and livingness, there's session connections and that goes out to organizations and books and auditors and all that sort of thing, and then there's your third one of what is existence all composed of in his estimation for everybody.

Now, the one that is most intimate to the pc and will most prevent him is sort of a tossup between one and two. If he rock slams on auditors or an auditor, but is every day being invalidated by his wife and rock slams on a wife so in session he catches hell from the auditor and out of session he catches hell from the wife, which hot brick are you going to be pick... is going to be picked up first, because oddly enough both hot bricks have to be theoretically picked up at once, but that's impossible.

Well, let's at least let him get some help from the auditor. Now, you see why the arbitrary stress on List One existed. But see, equally, that somebody who rock slammed on three portions of List One was listing from a wrong source. Somebody had three rock slams on List One – obviously he's listing from a wrong source.

Now, to List One has also been adjoined parts of existence. So if he had three rock slams on parts of existence and two rock slams on List One he now has two incomplete lists. So your sources are being taken from two incomplete lists and those sources are not complete. The odd part of it is, is they might be mixed. That is to say that might be two lists under the heading of what you're calling List One but in the pc's estimation they should be two. They should be the technical aspects of Scientology and the administrative or organizational aspects of Scientology. See he might have them subdivided in some fashion. Well, how are you going to tell?

Well, this is the old Greek problem of the prime mover unmoved. All source item – you're taking one source as an item – that has to be regarded as having come from a list. That has to be regarded as having come from a list.
See, it's a list that never got written, but it's still regarded as having come from a list. So you're always starting from a list that has never been written.

There is always a list on the pc that has never been composed by the pc. The auditor's responsibility in this merely goes this far: He makes sure that the list source question does not rock slam because if it rock slams that means it's obviously part of a list – and he can't use it.

I'm talking now about doing pure Routine 12... Routine 2, that is absolutely grooved in that you'll never make a mistake with, see, have no trouble with. Let's say – let's say, offhand, that you're going to pick up, "What does present time consist of?" You've got to test present time. That's a source, isn't it? Present time actually belongs on the parts of existence list. But if it doesn't rock slam you're all right; you can represent present time. Therefore all lists start with a represent.

Your first list is always a represent list, but how do you find out what to represent? Well, sometimes you're going to lay an egg on this. You're going to say, "What does present time consist of?" and you're not going to get a rock slamming list. Whereas as you say, "In present time, do you have any problems?" and you do get a rock slamming list.

Now, let me give you a real imponderable imponderable. This is a real interesting imponderable. We say – we're going to assess now those little Zero Ones and we find one of them slamming. What does this mean? The slamming one is part of an incomplete list and we don't have any way of knowing whether or not it is the final item on the list or not, so we avoid it like a plague – or we run a list. How many list headings could there be?

Then after a while we check "list" and find out it's slamming. We're wrong. That's wrong. Got more slams than you started with. You did something wrong. You missed. You always wind up with slams but they shouldn't be as frequent, they should be getting less frequent. Do you see the problem?

So "reasonable about" slams. You say, "Aha!" – the way we were thinking before, see, and I'm trying to make life comfortable and livable for you, which I think you'll have put your vote in for – those of you who aren't rock slamming on yourselves will vote for this.

We find "Reasonable about" slams like crazy, so what do we do with it? Ho, ho. We get out of there, man. We've two things we could do, theoretical: One, we could complete the list of what is a list – what is a list heading; but the best thing to do is to take something that is not in its immediate vicinity or instantly and immediately associated with. "What would you be reasonable about?" You wouldn't ask that question at all. You don't dare pose it because you see you don't know that it's the item on the last list.

All right, let's supposing that you found out that this character slams like mad on Scientology. Well, obviously if he slams on Scientology there is something wrong with the session. There is something going to be wrong with this session, obviously. So, therefore, it's very much in your interest to put together the session list. But can you say at this stage of the game, "What does Scientology – who or what does Scientology consist of?" Oh, no, because you're doing a represent on a rock slamming item, you see, there's your enigma. So what kind of a question are you going to use to get a Scientology list from? Well, you could ask this, you could say, "What question, if I ask it to you, would cause you to answer it "Scientology"?"
That at least gives you an anatomy of how you would go about it, you see. You've got to work the problem out backwards. You've got to have some other thing. You just can't say, "What does Scientology consist of?"

Now, once in a while you've got to check your source. So you ask your source once in a while and watch your meter and that's the best way to do it. Don't get so TR0ed that you ignore the meter, see. There's no sense in saying, "Who or what does present time consist of?" see, with good TR0, you know? No good at all, see? "Who or what does present time consist of?" with your meter centered up there to see whether or not you get a slam. This thing starts to slam, you're in trouble. "Present time" slams.

Well, I'll tell you a mistake you could make. Saying, "Aha, 'present time' slams, let's oppose it." Cut your throat, man. That's prime mover unmoved that you're looking for and it doesn't exist. Present time must be coming from a list.

Now, you could chase this thing backwards, of course, and say, "What question would I have to ask you for you to answer 'present time' to?" and get a list on which "present time" would occur. You may find yourself doing that some time or another because the pc keeps laying dead horses, see?

But this is your – this is the enigma. "Present time" began to slam, you'd better get out of there man, you'd just better just quit that right now because you're getting more rock slams than you had before. Didn't slam, now it does slam equals wrong source. Bank must be beefing up. See, you can work your way through that one rather easily. Didn't slam, now it does slam; something's wrong. It isn't that the pc unsuppressed, so what you've got to do is find a negative question that will produce rock slams – a negative rock slam question that produces rock slams – that's the whole trick and that, sometime or another, is going to be found to be quite a trick to you.

Now, you go back on the dynamics of existence of the pc and you find an arbitrary – this is case repair now – you go back and you find an arbitrary assessment of the dynamics and somebody took a "whiffinpoof" as parts of existence, you see, under living things there were "whiffinpoofs." Aw, more than that, let's say the pc rock slammed on groups and the pc rock slammed on mankind. You've had it. Two R/Ses on that third type of list, and you'd better say, "What are the parts of existence?" son, and you'd better complete that list and again it's "What question would I have to ask you for you to write all the dynamics down on?" And maybe the pc also slams on the second category, which is "session material" and "dynamic slams," so you have to get the session straightened out before you can straighten out the parts of existence.

You might find yourself in some silly circumstances here of some kind or another but you'd be able to work them out if you just realize that you had to have a virgin negative slam item to proceed from which if it began to slam tells you that you are wrong. In view of the fact you've got three zones from which these things could come, there it is. There's the present time life and livingness of the individual, the session present time and sessions in general and Scientology and all its ramifications and then there's parts of existence as a whole which tends to give us bank and whole track. You've got three sources to work on. You've got positive and
negative for these three sources and you should be able to turn yourself out quite a bunch of packages.

If you found some raw meat out on the street that was in trouble all you would have to say to that person is, "Present time, present time." And they'd say, "What? Well, what about present time?" And you didn't get a rock slam on it, you see? And you'd say, "Well, I just wanted to know what present time consists of." No rock slam, it's okay. And you write a big, cracking, long list about what does present time consist of and you carry it out, but when you null it you only get one R/S and you get one and continue it until you only get one R/S on nulling and, just like I gave you before, and you find out that a package is a terminal or oppterm, list it both ways to find out if you get a loose needle, and what have you got? You wind up with a perfect package. It'll go phhff! No mass. What happened? Where did it go? Where'd they go?

Actually, the fellow will improve and get an awful lot of ideas and so forth even if you miss, which is kind of wonderful. But why miss? Why not get the full gain the first time. I'm just talking what you do to a raw meat person.

All right, supposing present time consists of, and "consists of" was brrrrrr. You'd say, "What did you just think of?" "Oh, nothing; what you're saying." You say, "Consists of," brrrrrrrrr. You'd better find some other question to ask.

"Present time – what do you connect with?"

"Present time – what do you connect with?" No R/S.

There we go. Do you understand? Or you could go back and say, "What would be the list heading of a list on which the word 'consists of' would appear?"

You might be able to actually, to figure out some way to work it out.

You've got a slamming item so you know you'd have a slamming list. Either way to, you'd wind up with a complete list and that's what you want.

Now, that's raw meat.

Now, supposing somebody is – absolutely will not under any circumstances get an R/S on parts of existence. Well, you've still got the negative side to try. "What isn't part of existence?"

Supposing he just having an awful time, oh, he – it's nothing but dead horses and he doesn't get anywhere in session and he's crying all the time about it and he's chop-chopping the auditor 100 percent and you haven't even started anything so how could you have missed anything on him, you know? And it's all this and that and he's had a terrible bad history and he had some 8-C run on him back in 1949 before it was invented and… I'd assume about this time that he was a rock slammer on List One, see, and that he isn't going to get anywhere until we do a List One type of list.

Now, the job is how do we work out a List One type of list heading that itself doesn't rock slam. And that's going to change from pc to pc, so I just hand it to you as a problem.
Now, let's say he doesn't rock slam on that list. Oh! Well, let's shift it slightly and ask the negative. See?

"What isn't part of the activity us guys are engaged in?" Slam, slam, slam, slam, slams all the way down. You find Scientology isn't part of Scientology. Now, you've got your item, whatever it was. But it's still the last item on that list – the last R/Sing item on the list.

These are your methods of introduction into cases. Now, remember that a case has got to be able to answer an auditing question for Routine 2 to run on. The interest is usually so great that even an untrained pc usually falls right into it and answers up very, very well. However, sooner or later you're going to run into somebody who won't answer any questions at all and sooner or later, I don't say under what conditions they'd be under, or why, because I've seen it run on, now, little kids and everything else, and people who wanted nothing to do with processing and all that sort of thing. I've seen all the stylized cases, the types of cases that couldn't have been run on earlier processing, running on this. But I just say in fun, let's say we – supposing we have this person and they can't give you a list and they can't list anything and they can't do this and they can't do that. I think they'd be booby-hatch types, you know, strictly booby-hatch, or perhaps members of the government or something like that, see? You know, utterly unreal dogs, and you've still got all of your – you've still got all of your background music on your CCH type processes and all that sort of thing. You'd be surprised what that stuff can do. So you've still got a case entrance – see, we're still talking about case entrances – you've still got a case entrance.

All right. Now, how about a case that's been run for a long time with wrong sources, wrong way to, and every time anybody said this was the item, a four-foot-thick block of concrete showed up and knocked out their front teeth. Is there any hope for this person? It's pretty sad. Actually, the funny part of it is that even a random slam taken amongst five slams and opposed just as a list, would have cured somebody from being so edgy in sessions as long as that list was complete, see. But it would have given them a bit more mass and it would have made them unhappy but it might have made them auditable.

You understand? We're very far from invalidating what we have been doing.

How about this guy who already has six packages? All right, so he's got six packages. Fine. Probably doing better than he was. Everything's fine. So he's got six packages. Nobody's – I'm trying to show you now how you can undercut it. And every place it went wrong it will wipe out with a bzzz. And that's simply find the first incomplete list. You understand, even though it's a suppositional list that appeared on the case. Now that could be 3D Criss Cross. See? What didn't he agree with or something, see? Could have been. Could have been. But it's much more likely to be these arbitrary lists – the Dynamics or List One – and you treat those as incomplete lists. Look them over. So one of them had two slams on it, must have been an incomplete list. In other words, just start from there.

Get some kind of a list question that itself doesn't rock slam, test it and complete that thing. Now, what do you have to do? Do you have to go back and null it all? Well, no, usually, if things that were marked in that R/Sed on it before. So you only have to take those – so you just add to it and null what you've added and then try to tiger drill alive afterwards what was there originally. So you don't null all the way through everything and so forth. But look,
it's a simpler test than that. If, while adding to it, you get a rock slam, you have two choices: That was either the item that just went by or you're getting more rock slams than you had before.

Well, one of the ways to test it very thoroughly is to keep on listing, and let's list a page on which we get two rock slams, then we list the next page on which we get three. *Di-di-di-di-di-di.* Something wrong. It's either wrong source or wrong way to. Got that?

Well, you again take a grip on the situation and turn it around the other way and list it the other way and your needle goes loose. So that meant it was just wrong way to and your source is probably all right. But let's turn it around the other way and have the needle misbehave just as thoroughly. Brother, that's really wrong source. When it won't list right either way and your needle is just raising hell with you and it isn't cleaning up and so forth, that's wrong source.

So *in extremis* you've even got a test for wrong source – is: either way to, it won't list. You only have to list a page or so to find that out. You don't have to list forever to find this out.

All right. Now, as we examine the – as we examine the case, then, for case repair, we want to get rid of all of the dust and nonsense, all of the bric-a-brac, all of the items that are solid and all of the bad auditing and all of the mid ruds and all of the this's and all of the that's that has occurred on the case so far. All we've got to do is to go back and find the earliest list and complete it, that can be completed. That's all we have to do. And find the right item for that list – find the last, single one R/Sing item, oppose it and take off and go ahead and do a package. And you'll find a lot of bric-a-brac will drop off the case if that thing was really completed as a package. See? Both lists were nicely completed.

You find this bric-a-brac that the pc had been complaining about on some of that later stuff that came from that wrong source. Well, let's say it was a List One and they'd gotten a lot solider stuff on opposing Scientology. And you went ahead and completed List One in the pc's own words and found something else, and that was rock slamming and then you opposed that, Scientology, and any list proceeding from Scientology, drops out. They become null. Simple?

In other words, it eradicates itself. So if any of the pc's packages are wrong why bother to check up whether the packages are right or wrong? Just find your earliest list – your earliest incomplete list that can be completed and complete it and proceed right from there.

Now, you'll find that lists have genus, they generate from something, and you only examine the generators of lists. This is the easiest way to repair a case. You don't go over endless lists that have been listed on the pc. You only look where the list came from – where did the item come from. And you're usually examining and completing understood lists, lists that have never been listed. See? Like List One, he never listed List One. Parts of existence, he never listed the parts of existence. He took a canned package of dynamics, don't you see? So you've got to complete that dynamic list. You've got to complete List One. Or you've got a 3D Criss Cross list of some kind or another and he was busy listing what didn't he like. Gosh, there are a lot of rock slamming items. And after that the pc got on it "judges" and the pc still talks about this one. Well, if the pc still seems interested in this one is no indicator whatso-
ever that it was right. That's no index. Because if it's still slamming after all this time, even though it was opposed at that time, it must have been an item which was on an incomplete list.

So all you've got to do is complete the list from which "judges" came, get it properly opposed, and the package goes bzzz, and you'll never hear him open his yeep about judges again.

So where the pc's interest hangs up is a sure index of an incomplete source list. This is a tricky thing. You say to a pc – I've told you all this trick now so it probably won't work on you very well – but, you say to a pc, "Now, we've really found quite a few items on you, now, from time to time, which one are you still most interested in so we can do something about it?"

"Well, I'm still interested in goats, we found goats on that list and I find them very fascinating." And his eyes get somewhat lambent and the slits lengthen, you know? Well, you don't want to do anything about goats, don't oppose goats! God help you, don't oppose goats! I've already put this into great practice, see. No, let's find out what list goats appeared on. It was an understood list or an actual list or otherwise. But let's find out what that list was, and if we possibly can, complete that list to its proper item and oppose that proper item to – with a complete list that packages in the total knowingness of the pc and go bzzzz, and then you say to the pc, "Ah, all right, what – how do you feel about this 'goats' ?"

"What about it?"

"Well, how do you feel about goats?"

"Well, goats, goats, goats. How do you feel about goats? I suppose I've been one at one time or another, hasn't everybody?" No interest.

Now, let's say the item which we did find on the thing was "milk pails." You say, "How do you feel about milk pails?" He'll say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha, yes. Yes, sure gave me hell during the war." You just milked a little bit of cognition on the milk pails, see. Every time you mention the real item to him, why, he'll give you a cognition. He won't discuss it with you. He won't have an opinion about it, but it still is not effective on him. In other words, that's an erasure. It's an erasure of interest. He can always cognite on it.

He often had time – a hard time remembering the right items, but they always remember the wrong ones because, brother, they're stuck there in pillars of stone.

Now, these are all indicators and indexes and so forth, but you can use these various indicators I've just given you for all kinds of case repair.

Now, I want you to forgive me for giving you a process which could be done wrong or that could have a limited application or could have this or have that, but I won't forgive you if you think I've invalidated all of everything we've done because I actually have no intentions of doing so and I don't want to and I'm certainly not invalidating what packages have been found on you. Packages that have been found on you did some good. Now, if they stay erased when you complete a list some place, fine. They won't beef up, so that's dandy.
But there's one thing that you have taught me is that we needed a faster, harder set of indicators, a better set of indexes to telegraph to the auditor this and that, and we needed to reach just a little deeper technically in order to get a pure, sure-fire gain out of these things. All right. I've been working for a couple of weeks now watching you sweat around. I've been working for a couple of weeks' improvement. I recognized a couple of weeks ago that you weren't about to get some of these lists straightened out. And I started to say, "All right then, on all cases we have to cut to the ultimate and we have to get back to an ultimate foundation and begin from there and so forth or auditors are going to have a hard time with it."

All right, that's fine. But this is gain. Now, what you realize that you should be realizing here is you're actually simply opening up the present time problems, knocking them out, and knocking out the hidden standards, because these things have been stopping clearing in some enormous majority percentage of cases. These are the important things that bar clearing. These are the barriers. And that's why I've been working on Routine 2 stuff. You actually probably could keep on getting packages if you could keep on getting sources. You could probably go right on back down the track and you'd finally hit the rock and opprock, and there'd be the guy's goal.

All right, fine. There's easier ways to do it. You can clear away the chaff from PT and untangle the GPM, you can get back there and find the rock slamming goal and run it and life becomes much easier. But of course, remember that pieces of the GPM can still key in after you have found the goal and you can still bypass items, you can still miss things, you can still do this and still do that but if PT is cleaned up and if things are knocked out of present time consistently that are going to barrier the pc onto a free needle and so on, even with more Routine 2, he's going to clear easily. So long as you've got Routine 2 you can always find an entrance point. That's the purpose of Routine 2.

You haven't got a devil's chance of finding the goals on a lot of cases without clearing away those two things: the chronic PTPs and the hidden standards. You haven't got a prayer. And if you did find the goal you haven't got a prayer of running it because the PTP will clonk... bang in on him and wipe it out.

Now, therefore, we've got to keep a wide-open track on the pc and therefore the use of Routine 2 does not necessarily cease on having found the pc's goal. You might run everything his goal influences in present time and package it up and the things his goal doesn't influence in present time and package that up and he's going fine and he seems to be getting free needle. Then all of a sudden he hits some terminal, like somebody did in Perth the other day, motion with exclamation points, or something, hangs up like mad, can't quite see which way he's going, whole thing caves in, goal read disappears and now he doesn't know what is happening and so forth. Ah, well, you don't know that the pc simply hadn't caved in on a brand-new present time problem. And instead of spending hours and hours and hours of prepchecking, you've got another weapon called Routine 2. You just use Routine 2, not with any difference at all. You don't change Routine 2 just because you're running it on somebody who is back down the line, see, on a goal. No, you just assume that something's caved in on this pc in PT or something.
So you just, "What does present time consist of?" That's all, see? And you're off to the same races. Or "What doesn't it consist of?" or "What does auditing consist of?" Or, she's a temple priestess and all of a sudden, by George, by George, there's only one way to get Clear, see, and that's by jumping into the maw of the flames. Everything hangs up, there are no flames or something.

See? The pc – the pc has, perhaps, missed an item in goals clearing. Now, everything that applies to straightening up lists also applies to your Routine 3-21, everything I've told you about it. Everything I've told you about having a list complete applies to 3-21. You do a list from a goal, you've got to get down to one rock slamming item.

Now, one of the hardest things you will use to get a rock slamming item from is a goals list. Let me put this two cents' worth in. Goals lists almost never run out of rock slams. When they do, fine, but they behave just like any other list of items. They don't behave any other way.

Let's say you had a lot of slams early on a goals list and then had one slam late on the goals list that's still slamming, see?

All right, in that case you could take that last goal and oppose it because it's just an item from a list, if you want to call it that. The funny part of it is, because the pc skips all over the place with a goals list and can run all over the bank with a goals list, you get some very wonderful complications with these goals lists and probably the hardest list to straighten out for a purpose of doing Routine 2 with, but not goals, of course, is a goals list. It's the spottiest and the least satisfactory of them. But you will still some day be prepared to find the earliest list done on the pc, a goals list, which has – now has only one rock slamming goal on the end of it and use that to oppose and the whole case blossoms.

Now, remember that a rocket read is senior to a rock slam. And for your purposes you do everything with a rocket read that you'd do with a rock slam, except the rocket read is accepted above it.

Let's say you have four rock slamming items on a list when you start to null. Boy, you're not about to have a complete list so you complete the list and get it down to one rock slamming item and there it is, beautiful, single. You go back and find out those four no longer have rock slams on them. You've now got your item. This is fine. It follows through all tests. It doesn't generate a lot more mass – it generates some pain, sen or something like that, but not lots more mass – and you go ahead and you oppose that properly and you get your list out and you find that item and it all blows up. Fine. That's just Routine 2.

But what if you found four rocket reading items on the list? You better complete the list to one rocket reading item. This has already happened, by the way, and they had four rocket reading items on one list. And I told the auditor to complete it – a Saint Hiller, just left here a short time ago – and I told the Saint Hiller to complete it. He went ahead and completed it and he found one rocket reading item and the other rocket reads disappeared.

Now, that's perfectly valid for opposition. It's also valid for goals finding. You can do a lot with a rocket reading item, so you mark those down rather special in caps. But remember that the four – that more than one rocket read on a list – now we get something complicated.
whereby you have three rock slams and two rocket reads on the same list – well, what's perfectly answerable is the rocket read is senior.

But all those rock slams and earlier rocket reads have got to disappear before you accept that last rocket read. You got it?

Anyway, there's your case repair factors.

Now, I've tried to give it to you in such a way that you don't have to memorize 8,645 bulletins. But I'll still write all those bulletins for you to memorize anyhow just so you can't miss it. [laughs]

The... now, to show you how you can make mistakes, you can take a perfectly elementary case, sail down with enormous cockiness, be just absolutely grooved in and you know you're just sailing, you've got the first item and the pc is singing and everything is fine and then you get your opposition list. And you get down the line on the opposition list pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa and there was one rock slam and there was two rock slams and there was three rock slams. And that was the first page. And on the second page there was one rock slam and there was two rock slams and there was three rock slams and there was four rock slams. So on the third page there's one rock slam and two rock slams and three rock slams and four rock slams and five rock slams. And on the fourth page you have rock slams.

The funny part of it is your needle, because you've picked the case up to the stars by finding the right item, doesn't cave in, and neither does the pc. The pc just becomes a little doubtful or something like that, and you say, "Well, it's merely anxiety." You're listing the list wrong way to. The needle is so beautiful that you don't notice it. You say, "Well, it's better than I've ever seen a needle on a pc before." Well, list it the other way to and the needle would still be looser. You've got to watch it.

But this test of the frequency of rock slam, I think you will find quite valid because it says the pc's bank is beefing up by reason of the listing. Of course, we expect sometimes the list to go a page, a page and a half, before the first rock slam occurs; then we expect a whole spate of rock slams. That's quite normal. But down on the last page we don't expect the rock slams to be more frequent than they were on the second or third page of the list. That tells us we've got a wrong way to.

Now, if our first line was so beautiful and came out so lovely, we certainly aren't dealing with a wrong source. We're just dealing with a wrong way to list, you see? Everything checked out and there we were. But if we still listed it the other way to and couldn't make sense out of it, then we would decide that that list just before that we just did, that we grabbed the item prematurely. And the way to test that is to add to the list and see if some new rock slams came about. We might find that that was the one that was wrong way to.

You see how we could straighten it out? We'd have to be pretty knuckleheaded to be wrong, but be prepared to be wrong. Be prepared to be wrong. Don't be so persistently, cockily right when you are so horribly, devastatingly wrong. And always straighten out Routine 2 before you straighten out auditing. Spend ages straightening out Routine 2 and briefly straightening out auditing. If your auditing is perfect and you never have to straighten out
auditing with auditing, your Routine 2 is perfect, the auditing is very, very rapid. But the paramount importance is get the Routine 2 done first.

All the cases that are here at this particular moment are easily straightenable just by the rule of finding the first understood list – the list that was never listed from which you took an item. I mean just if we went back to that.

We didn't even have to go back to 3D Criss Cross or anything, see. I mean, just if we did that, we would be in clover. We take List One. What's the question that would complete List One? We simply complete List One, get all the rock slams off List One down to one rock slam, oppose that, then everything that has gone wrong earlier on the list fades out. Got that?

I think that takes care of most of the cases present. You talk about case repair, that's about all the case repair there is. Sometimes an item has been found as the single rock slamming item on a list and it's never been opposed! You'll find that kind of thing going on. I know one case right now where that is true. All kinds of assessments have been done since. Here's this bypassed item sitting back there, see?

All right. Well, I hope you have good luck in straightening these out. I think you're getting to be much better auditors and I want to give you one small compliment. You turned me in a whole bunch of papers on what you do with case repair and in the understanding – in the complete understanding that you had at that time – the incomplete understanding which had been issued to you at that time – the case repairs which you advised were right on the button. I had to then make up my mind and realize that you could learn even a complicated a procedure as you were handling and that you could repair a case under the headings of that complicated procedure then.

I was very happy to know that and I got very proud of you and I even said it in a bulletin a short time ago.

So, thank you very much.
All right, this is what? The 10th of January.

Audience: Yes.

AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

A little bulletin here – Aussies, hang your head in shame! All through the Commonwealth with the greatest of ease, I was able to slow down this government raid on the church in Washington, but not in Australia. You see, the lines go straight from Australia to the United States and back and forth. And the whole rigged government release in Washington landed scram-bang into the press in Australia. So Australia is a seething mess of "God 'elp us" now, and somebody from the Australian syndicate is coming down to see me tomorrow, and they want to know all about it.

I'm not going to tell them very much beyond "a fascist government raided a church." I'll tell them, "Be very, very careful, though, because apparently there's a million dollars in the offing to fight this in the United States. They actually got all kinds of leads and money pouring in like mad from all directions, and the situation looks very dark for the United States."

[applause]

You should really understand this a little bit. You see, they've done everything they could do. They've shot all the women and children, you see, and kicked the dog – there isn't any more they can do. They've shot their bolt. And having lied to a federal judge and done a few other things like this, all they can do now is stand and take it, and man, we – we're loading up the guns! [laughs]

You shouldn't expect the situation to deteriorate anyplace; actually, we'll handle this in Australia with the greatest of ease. But isn't it interesting that Australia takes orders from the US to that degree. Only Commonwealth country that has published a line. Interesting.

Well, regardless of all that, let's get down to something important – something important. Such as why your pc ARC breaks, you knucklehead!

Ah, this is very interesting. All this cost us today was the bulletin I was going to write on the subject. That's the second one that has cost us.

But there's some very, very important data here. Some extremely important data. 2-12, 2-10, the Routine 2, has a liability and this is a very, very, very important liability. It's one that you must not lose sight of. Otherwise you're going to lose pcs like mad! And Scientol-
ogy's going to lose people like mad instead of gaining them. I'm not joking now. Somebody can be put off but good if you miss an item.

Now, what is a missed withhold? It's a nearly-found-out, isn't it? All right, now you just apply anything you ever heard of to missed withholds – to this other activity. And boy, a missed withhold of the size of a missed item – when it turns up and comes to view and isn't picked up by the auditor – is really grim. And I do mean grim.

Because not all the pulling missed withholds in the world are going to straighten it up. You've got to get that missed withhold – which is the missed item.

Now, you think I mean one that isn't opposed. No, I mean one that isn't put on the list. You stopped listing too soon and this is under the whole subject of incomplete lists. Now, fortunately – fortunately, you can bypass items and incomplete list and maybe 60 percent of the time, 70 percent, something like that, get away with it. This is on one pc, not 70 percent of the pcs, you see. Most of the time you get away with it, I'd say even higher than that – 85 percent, 90 percent. You get away with it.

And the time you don't makes up for the whole lot. You can go ahead and do a sloppy job of Routine 2 and incomplete lists and oppose them and have a ball, endlessly list, and so forth. Nothing catastrophic occurs.

And then on one particular list – there is no telling which list this might be; you didn't need to finish all the lists, and you could abandon some of them, and so forth – but on this one list that you're doing, you grab the item before it's been put on the list. After that your pc's unauditable. Your pc becomes unauditable. Right there. Right now. And you as an auditor get your head knocked off and say, "I'm tired of auditing," and the pc natters and screams around and says he's tired of being audited and that ends the whole thing, if you don't know what it is.

So this becomes the most important single piece of Routine 2. How to patch that one up is very important.

Yeah, you can be reasonable and you can say, "Yes, I've made a goof. Yes, I've goofed. Yeah, I goofed. So therefore, of course, he's ARC broke. Or he's got missed withholds. Maybe he was, one time or another, a member of the US government." See, some other scurrilous action maybe has taken place on the part of the pc. And you say, "If I just sit there and pull missed withholds, well, I'll be all right, because obviously it's a missed withhold. He's been sort of dopey in sessions, and he's been this and he's been that. Now, all right. 'Is there anything I nearly found out about you?'"

And the funny part of it is the pc doesn't know what it is. He doesn't know why. He will give you missed withholds; and if you go on with pulling missed withholds to cure this ARC break, then you will drive him around the bend. Then you compound the felony.

Why? Because the missed withhold is the item he didn't put on the list. Now, give any ten lists, see, on the same pc – we're not now talking about an odd pc that behaves this way, we're talking about every pc you will ever audit – and you have ten lists, and like a complete chump you didn't complete any of the ten – any of these nine lists. They weren't completed, they weren't the right item, your opposes were all wrong, everything – nothing ghastly happens. But undeterminedly, and just for some reason, because of the peculiarities of that list…
This – one of those lists out of that ten, you don't complete that one, and that's heading right for the center of the bank. And you don't complete the list. You get to an item "odd bod," and it must be it because only five items before that R/Sed.

And you say, "That's your item, 'odd bod'."

Big mass immediately appears in front of him. And he says, "Well, I-I… Yeah, I guess I can see how this is. I… it adds up. Yes, it… I guess that's right. It adds up. I guess it packages up all right. Eh-eh-what are you wiggling your pencil for? All the time you sit there wiggling your pencil. I've been trying to – trying to tell you for some time, the motion bothers me. Uh-yeah. Well, you say were going to have another session tomorrow. I'm actually going to be pretty busy. Uh-well, all right, I'll come in for the session."

And you know what he does? The only place you can really detect this – I don't mean to be sarcastic like interjecting such comments as "even you can detect this," and so I won't put it in there. But there'll be a fee.

Now, listen very carefully. His session goals the very next session will not be as brisk and bright as his session goals have been in the past. And as you continue to oppose this wrong item, which you've found on this tenth list – you're now doing an opposition list to it – his goals will get worse and worse and worse.

And the way you patch this up – the way you patch this up is you look over session goals and you find what set of goals for a session did this pc set that were less optimum than his previous goals. And then if the auditor has been very clever and if he's heard a rumor that you should write things on auditor's reports – like what list you were listing, what's the name of the list you're listing; in other words, other pertinent information; or dated the lists, if he did that, dated the lists, all of which he's supposed to do – all you have to do is get the list he was listing on immediately before and complete that list.

You understand? It is not – not eight days before, you understand. It's the list that he completed in the session before he set the goals for the next session. You understand? Or the list which was abandoned. You got it? And you watch those session goals, and it'll tell you every time.

Now, actually, you'll also see him looking darker, blacker, older, looking like hell; all these other manifestations go right along with it. And he's very ARC breaky, and when he was given an item or not given the item, from that point on, why, he is ARC broke. In other words, the list was abandoned or it wasn't complete or he was given an item off the list, but it was something wrong with that list.

And that's what causes that deterioration and that ARC break. Now! Now, listen to this very carefully. That he ARC breaks or is upset because you tell him to complete that list doesn't have anything to do with it. Because you go back very often and try to complete that list, and he natters and screams and tears his hair and bites his fingernails and says to hell with it and bashes the cans, but he'll go on and complete the list. And then all of a sudden you'll get his item on the list and there it'll be.
A wrong-way-to list actually doesn't act this way. It doesn't act this way on the pc. The pc – just under strain and looking older and so forth – but he isn't ARC break Wrong source very often – wrong source actually doesn't cause ARC-breaks like this.

So this is a peculiar manifestation having to do with completeness of lists. And your indicated action – your indicated action is to watch a pc like mad when you abandon a list. And to watch a pc like mad when you give him an item. And watch for that ARC break that may follow within the next few minutes or certainly at the beginning of the next session. You understand?

Because pcs are sometimes quite propitiative and they don't blow up in your face. They just go out the bottom. But, you can see it reflected in goals. That's the easiest place to see it reflected – right in goals.

Now, you get this as a single indicated repair item. Now, let's say somebody has been listed against one of these things, setting sour goals for the last eighteen sessions. Well, all right, it was eighteen sessions ago. Eighteen sessions ago, that was when it happened. And if you've got his auditor's reports nineteen sessions ago, you'll find a bright... you know, good goals, you know: work hard, get in and pitch, find this, do that, you know, bang-bang, get better, snap to, get the tone arm down, find my goal, get Clear, see. Next session: "To see if I can't improve my case." Single goal set. Huh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh.

Well, what was he working on at that time? See? What happened? And you'll find out in that last one that has the bright session goal – just before the bad one, see, the bright session goal one – either a list was abandoned or it wasn't completed before the item was given to him. And it just all comes under the heading of "You missed a withhold." There's a missed item, and that's all it amounts to. The missed item. Right there. Bang!

You missed the item – maybe you didn't notice at the end of that session or the rest of the session, and so forth. Maybe this pc is so propitiative you didn't really – really notice, or you weren't on the ball that day or something, and you didn't see this. Or you felt your auditing was a bit off that day and you're prone to blame your auditing or something like this, See.

You adjudicate, "Well, I better pull his missed withholds." Well, the first thing you better pull when you pull a missed withhold is to go find the item, and pull the item that was missed. And that is paramount in missed withholds.

This all comes under the heading of missed withholds, and it all is incomplete list. Because naturally, if he was given the wrong item on the list, the list was probably incomplete. Of course, you could grab the wrong item off a list – the item on the thirteenth page was slamming like the devil, but the auditor thought that some other item looked better and you know, did something like that. But that we're – we're looking at goofs there that are too magnitudinous to even be included in the perimeter of auditing, you just understand. That's just ylaah! That's just auditing goofs. We're talking about 2-12 goofs, see.

So, something happened that had to do with an item being missing. That's all you got to know. Because, believe me, there'll be many ways that items can be missed – many ways. I'd hate to try to invent all the ways items will get missed between now and the year 2000,
you see. And they'll probably be multitudinous. You're going to find some new and original ways yourself.

Now, you understand, if the list was backwards, that he was listing, you won't get quite the same thing. You'll just get a continuous strain. And he won't necessarily ARC break because you missed an item on the backwards list, because that's all missed. You see, you're not going in the direction of it closely enough to cause it a near miss. So a backwards-listed thing won't give you the same manifestation. It gives you another variety of strain on the case.

Now, you can always tell a backwards list – always tell a backwards list with the greatest of ease – because the rock slams get more frequent. The frequency of slam increases as you keep listing. There are more and more slams. And theoretically, if you went to a hundred pages, they'd all be slamming; everything would be slamming. You get the ne plus ultra.

I'll give you an idea: There's two slamming items on the first page; there's three slamming items on the second page; there's four on the third page; there's five on the fourth page; you see, there's fifteen on the fifth page; and then the whole rest of the list slams. Now, that's an exaggeration of it.

But just count your rock slams. As you're coming down the line, those end rock slams, if there are more than there were on... per page than there were on just the preceding page, you can figure out there's something wrong here. That's backwards to – that list is backwards to, because the bank is beefing up. And the bank is beefing up, indicated by these gratuitous rock slams – there's more and more rock slams. Of course, you... the pc might be wearing two rings of a certain magical constituency that gives you a rock slam on everything.

Did you know that some pcs with a ring on each hand, holding the cans, will rock slam for a phantom slam all the time. It's quite remarkable. We had an audi... a pc here that was doing that a few months ago.

But the crux of the situation is that slams are becoming more frequent as you list. But on a right way to list, the slams are becoming less frequent as you list. Always less frequent. So that you'll see maybe three slams on the first page, and then he could have four or five slams on the second page, because he's just warming up, you see, but on the – on the third page, why, he's got two slams and on the fourth page he's got one slam, and...

Now, here's one for you that joins right in – and why I'm talking about this – it joins right in to the missed withhold situation. And this you can shudder in your boots about; I'll let you quietly shudder in your boots about this one. The next rock slam on that list may be as much as six pages away from the last rock slam on the early pages. You can list six pages, in other words, with a relatively clean needle, and then all of a sudden get a slam, and that's the item. And that's on, particularly, one of these hot lists.

But sometimes, as an auditor, you're going to be knocking your brains out. Or you're going to be supervising a whole bunch of co-audits and you'll see some of these... one of these co-auditors knocking his brains out. The pc is going yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap! Howl, howl, howl!

And you're going to sit down to try to pull the missed withhold. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. You're not going to repair with auditing what's been done wrong with Routine 2, let me
tell you. You'll find out ordinarily that a few minutes before, the pc's been told he had an item and was apparently satisfied with it. Or the session before, something was abandoned. The list was abandoned as not being complete, or something like that. Something of this sort has happened in there.

You look over the Routine 2 and you raise hell with people who don't put the pc's name, date, and page number on the list sheets. The pc's name, the date, and the list heading that they're getting the list from. "Sheet," I have said, not "page." Each separate sheet of paper has got to be so marked. Otherwise you can never trace this back.

Now, when they're doing auditor reports, for God's sakes make them mark in what they are listing! "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" "W/W wd catfish op" is the way it's usually written. Doesn't take any time to write it down. Why leave everybody in a mystery? Because that may someday become of the greatest importance. Three days later: pc, "Yow, yow, yow, yap, yap." Or just total apathy: "Oh, I don't know what's gonna happen or what's gonna happen to me. I always felt all right before Scientology came along."

Well, you set it back and let's look at the day before – the pc set bright goals? Then it happened yesterday. Pc set bright goals day before yesterday but not yesterday? Ah, well, then it was day before yesterday. Get the idea? It'll be in the session that the pc set the last bright goals for. You got it? It won't creep up. It won't sneak up on you. It's not on a gradient. This thing is about as gradient as dropping all the crockery in the house, two stories! See, it happens now! And your cycle of action on the thing is you say, "Well, here we are, we've got 'an upchuck.' That's right. We've got this item, 'an upchuck.' And does that sound like it's the right item to you?"

"Oh, yes, yes, I've always been vitally interested in that." [laughter]
"Well, do you have any mass?"
"No, no, no, no. Never have had any mass."
"All right. Upchuck. Upchuck. R/Ses very nicely."
"Yes, I suppose it does."
"All right. Well, that's that! We'll – glad we found an item for you," and so forth. "Now, did you make any part of your goals for this session?"
"Oh, yes, I guess so," and so forth.
"Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?"
"Well, yes. Has your meter been plugged in during the session?"

You say, "What the hell's happening here?" See? I mean this would even be a propitiative pc. One who is less propitiative just takes your head off and throws it up against the wall.

But it'll be something like this. It's just offbeat. They really haven't had time maybe to really get this going.

Now, the next session you start to oppose it. The pc sets some sour goals like, "To get well, I guess," "To get through the session, somehow."
And you'll say, "All right. Now, we're going to list 'Who or what would oppose an upchuck.' That all right with you?"

"Oh, yes, yes."

"All right. Well, who or what would oppose an upchuck?"


"Do you have an ARC break?"

"No, no, I feel fine."

And it'll just go from there on, man. It'll just keep going, from worse to worser. This pc will be violent about three sessions from then, or just go into complete apathy, "Uuuuhhh." And the goals will continue to deteriorate. And that's all there, back there on that list that you got "upchuck" off of.

Now, the funny part of it is -- the funny part of it is, you'll occasionally say to a pc, "All right. This list here 'Who or what has been agonizing in present time,'" or whatever it is, "that we got the upchuck off of," you see. "Now, we're going to complete this list!"

"Oh, the hell you are. I just don't see anything. It's complete! You already gave me the item, didn't you? I can't think of anything more."

"Well, we're going to get the rudiments in on this list, and we're going to continue it anyway."

"But I just can't think of anything more!"

Quite ordinary; you'll get that kind of a response. They won't complete the list. It's incomplete. They're now getting even with you, sort of. That's the whole motive.

You talk to them a little bit and persuade them. They say for a while, "There aren't any more items. There aren't this… Something."

Then all of a sudden, why, they go, brrrrrr, bang-bang! Just... almost in the middle of the time when they're telling you they can't add to it, see, why, they start adding to the list. And they add to the list and add to the list and add to the list and add to the list and add to the list and add to the list. And you're liable to go four, five, six, seven, eight pages, without a single R/S on it. And then all of a sudden there's a crashing big R/S. Well, null it down, in case you missed an R/S, just by reading them, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, "Hey, we may -- I really got one on you."

Talk about nulling of lists -- for a week for a list, you know? I clocked myself the other night on a -- on a six-page list. And it took ten minutes. I wasn't wasting any time marking Xs and things down, you understand. I had it clean enough so I could just write "page Xed out" before I turned it, see.

And you don't have to wait any time to see if an R/S is going to develop. If it isn't an instant R/S, it only takes you something on the order of about a tenth of a second of lingering
glance still on the meter to see nothing is happening. And what do you mean you take your eye that far from a meter just to read the next line, you see?

You can really null these things down if you get in the groove, bow, bow, bow, bow, almost that fast, see. So you don't care how much you null.

And it's just on the off chance you might have missed one or something was up, something like that. Sometimes one that you can't really tell which one R/Sed, or something like that – there was just a big R/S going on during the time.

Anyway, you get down here to the end, and bow! you see, there it is. And it's "a tigerbat." Wasn't "an upchuck!" at all, you know? There it is, "a tigerbat."

All this time the pc has been very cheerful. Where was the ARC break? Where's the hopelessness? All the time you were listing, all the time you're nulling. And you get down, and you say, "Well, we've got 'a tigerbat' here. A tigerbat, tigerbat. Yes, it R/Ses very nicely" And the pc says, "Could've told you that all the time".

Actually, he's been swearing, you see, all the time that the thing was "a baseball." But, actually – yeah, he could have told you it's "a tigerbat," and he's all perfectly happy. And you oppose the thing, and he's happy. And what happened to all this going-to-commit-suicide-tomorrow-morning and all that kind of stuff? That all just evaporated.

Now, here's another test you can make sometime and that's quite interesting. I don't say to do this intentionally, but sometime when you find you have done it, mark this very carefully! You say to the pc, "Well, got your item here. It's 'an upchuck.'" And the pc, "Does that sound like it's real to you, and so forth? You think that's it?"

"Oh, yes, yeah, that sounds quite real."

And then the pc starts to kind of scrape at you a little bit, one way or the other, and just watch the pc do a tone curve. Just watch that curve go down. If you knew damn well it wasn't the item, and you did that, you'd see that curve down. I'm not telling you to do it intentionally, but sometime or another you'll do it accidentally, and you might as well sit there and watch the – watch the thing curve. And then do this: "Well, did mass show up?"

And the pc says, "Yes, some mass showed up, and so forth."

And you say, "Fine." Now, you say, "Well, I'm sorry but I don't believe that was your item." See, you watched the curve. He didn't know. You watched him start to ARC break, and some mass showed up. What more do you want, see? And you say, "Well, I don't think that's your item, we're going to have to continue the list." And watch the pc bright up – brighten up, right now. Bang!

"Oh! Well, are you?"

"Yes!"

"Oh. Is that so? All right. Okay. Matter of fact, I got a couple right now."

It's very funny. The pc apparently has bought it, you see, to some degree – no cognition or anything. Sometimes he'll even cognite a little bit, you know. Because it is a lock on the real item. And you kind of watch him go down. And if you – if you just held off giving
him the good news about the fact that you were going on, anywhere up there to thirty seconds, 
you can start to watch that ARC break. You can start to watch that thing. If you let it go, the 
pc will be tearing up the auditing room, see. That's a missed withhold of an item. That's an 
item that is missed, and that's all that it takes. That is all that it takes.

That's interesting, isn't it?

Well, this has much more far-reaching potentials than you would think. There are a 
few pcs around – they are very, very rare; up at HASI London we know of four or five of 
them, I think, in all the years of operation up there – who just are ARC breaky as hell! And 
have been for two or three years.

They come back and get audited, but it's absolutely gruesome. You know some of 
their names. It's gruesome, man. Every time they get audited, I get letters, too. It's horrible.

You know what I'll bet's wrong with them – every single one of them – I'll bet you, 
somebody left an unflat repetitive process, years ago, perhaps. That interesting? They didn't 
put the answer on the list, you understand? There wasn't even a list! They didn't put the an-
swer on the list! No list. They never enunciated it. Somebody didn't flatten the process. 
Somebody was running – somebody was running something on the order of "What would 
knock down a bodybuilder?" You know, way back. Well, they've assessed something like "a 
bodybuilder," or something. All right, "What would knock down a bodybuilder? Thank you. 
What would a bodybuilder knock down? Thank you. What would knock down a bodybuilder? Thank you. 
What would a bodybuilder knock down?" And then the auditor for some reason or 
other was changed or got tired or got bored or something of this sort, or something new came 
out on a telex the next day, and nobody flattened that process and that pc hasn't been auditable 
since. Now, that rarely... but I think those cases do exist here and there. That isn't every case 
by one awful long ways. But there are some of those cases around.

Now, a Problems-Intensive-type approach would handle that very well. Just search it 
out to find out when they were happy about auditing and pinpoint it down; help with the me-
ter. See, you wouldn't even need the guy's auditor reports, only they very often are available. 
And pinpoint it on the meter, "When – when was that?" Help the guy out. Run a little bit of 
Suppress, you know, on auditing, or something, and keep finagling around trying to get this 
period. You can fish the command with some care, and running Suppress, and so forth, and 
Careful of, something like that – just the suppressor buttons – you all of a sudden, the pc 
comes up with what process it was!

Now, you theoretically could prepcheck it out. And I say theoretically, because in ac-
tual fact I haven't seen one of these missed-item ARC breaks mended by auditing alone. Why 
not let him complete the process? See, you understand?

Now, that doesn't mean... This answers a burning question for some of you guys. 
Would it be best to go back and complete every process that had been left unflat on the pc? 
Well, this gives you – this gives you an index. And a very, very neat, nice index it is. Only 
those processes that left the pc in a complete state of bedraggled ARC break with the auditor 
or the organization should be picked up. Because they've got a missing item on it.
There's some item answer that the pc didn't give. Something happened. It was probably some very significant session to the pc, like "From where could you communicate to a foot." And he just didn't put the answer that was the completed list, you understand. There's a missing answer there. He never flattened it. And there's possibly, maybe, no more than one of these on any Scientologist's case line. I mean, you, as a pc, sometime in the past, audited over the years, have undoubtedly had a nonflattened process on you.

But not in all cases would this necessarily have admitted a missed withhold. But you get somebody who is pretty upset about auditing, and rather ARC breaky; well, find a time when they were not ARC breaky about auditing, flatten that process, and they'd smooth right out.

Actually, it should turn up on opposing "auditing," or something like that, if "auditing" rock slammed. But I'm giving you – and I'm giving you something here. Now, this is not necessarily something that would be done on a case, you understand, unless this case had a long history. There – as I say, I think there are either five or six through the HGC of HASI London over all these years, but those five or six actually ought to be looked over on this basis of the missing answer on the question sequence. They should be looked over from that basis. Rather than try to do a new list on them.

See, it'd be a freak that a repetitive process of some kind or another actually left an unanswered question that was severe enough to cause them to severely ARC break about auditing from there on. But that can exist and it's something that you should be aware of just as a pro. You just should be aware of it as a condition that can exist.

Now, as far as Routine 2 is concerned, this can happen on every case you audit. It's not a selective case condition. You can do this to every case you audit. You get some kind of a manifestation like this: Case is improving and improving and in beautiful shape, and you've got two packages now and then you go for the third package and you're getting the first item of the third package and ifs just all running wonderfully, and the pc comes in and says – sets some goals like this: "To get through it. To see if I can't get well after all."

You say, "What the hell's happened here?" Well, what happened here is that third list that you were doing, that you were working on just the day before, whatever it was, that thing was – something wrong. Something wrong. But it all added up to a missed item. Whatever's wrong with it, it had to add up to a missed item. That's the common denominator of all these mistakes.

Now, all you have to do to square this up is not necessarily to go back and get the earliest list that ever got earlied on the case, or get the earliest complete that ever got uncompleted and go back to China, patch this up – no, it's yesterday. And you just watch those goals. The big indicator is goals. And catch that one, right there, the one – the one they set a good goal for that session, and then a bad goal for the next session.

What was done in that good-goal session, right there, achieved a missing item. Whatever it was, it achieved a missing item.

Now, there's another source for missing items, is failure to oppose. And the basic rule of failure to oppose is this: Here and there in organizations and field, and so forth, people
were only getting the first item off List One, you see, getting it opposed and then leaving it. And then everything crumpled up like scrap paper for the pc, because they didn't oppose what they had now found. You see, actually they'd taken it from a locked package.

The rule is simply this: That anything that keeps on R/Sing after you try to package it has to be opposed. Now, that could give you four oppositions. It could give you only two. A real Routine 2 that is perfectly done, perfect source, perfect everything – the real thing – actually blows up into a whoosh! and you can't find any trace of anything. But one that's a bit done off – the source wasn't quite right, something like this; the... you took the source off of an arbitrary list, let us say, something like that, and what you wind up with is something that has still got a DR on it, and the other side of it is still slamming.

Why, I'd look it over awfully carefully to make sure that we didn't have incomplete lists, is what resulted in all this. But for sure, you're going to have to do something about that slamming item. Unless the slamming item came from a rock slamming item by represent. If you... you know, you never represent a rock slamming item. And you can actually get a pc in the soup. This is delicate. This is delicate. You can get a pc in the soup by taking a rock slamming item represent list and getting a rock slamming item and then opposing it.

If it is a real reliable item, it'll be the only one that occurred on the list, and it'll be an opposition-type thing or it was on there... But it would constitute a missed dumbbell; half of the dumbbell is missing.

I'll give you an example. Under old 3G – this is wrong – old 3GA Criss Cross, we get an item "groups." And it slams like mad, and the auditor did a represent list on it, so he could have something to find goals with, and he got "Rotarians." And "Rotarians" slammed like crazy. And that was seven... six months ago, or five months ago, or something like that, and it is still slamming like crazy. Well, you just let it go on slamming! It'd be very wrong to oppose that. Because it's in an incomplete list.

Actually, the only action you can take is to oppose "groups." You see, there's that great big, constantly slamming item staring you in the face, and you say, "Boy, we better do something about it." Ah, but if "groups" was slamming – if "groups" is slamming – ah, well, that's a different proposition, because you can pull something proper with "groups."

So you have to look at an item's source. The source of an item has everything to do with an item. And you take an item that comes from a wrong source – yes, it'll go on slamming for quite a while till somebody straightens the source out. But an item from a right source, if it continues to slam... It's off a completed list. Everything is fine. You examine those little elementary things: Is it from the right source? Is it right way to? Was the list complete? Was it the last and only R/S on the list? Yes, yes, and the thing is still slamming. Oppose it, man! And if you don't, you'll get another ARC break situation.

Oddly enough, you can abandon this crashing slam on "Rotarians," and the pc is relieved, if anything. Pc says, "Oh yes, I'm very interested in that. I'm very, very interested in Rotarians. Yeah. Oh, yes, I'd really like to know what opposes Rotarians." The first time you try to oppose "Rotarians," the pc will ARC break a bit. Because there's something wrong there, you see. It's not really an item. It's just held there because it was taken between two other items.
It's actually some kind of a lock item on an improperly opposed item, "group" – "groups," see. Then when you get "groups," and get that all straightened out and that list is totally complete, you'll find out "Rotarians" will probably mysteriously vanish and won't rock slam anymore. You see how that would be?

Now, R2-12 is something that is very easily done right, from scratch. If it's right, from scratch, and it goes along right, all the way, see man, you've got a winner like mad!

The only thing that's going to cause you trouble is where you did something wrong as you were carrying it along, and now you've got a pace... a case-patch-up situation, or it's somebody else's case that has been run wrong, and you've got to put it back together again. And those are the difficulties you run into.

Now, that's why I've been trying to find indicators, indicators, indicators by the ton. Been trying to find all the ways you can tell if it's running right, see. And I've been picking up new ones every time I turned around. There are lots of indicators now. And they're more clear-cut as indicators.

Now, another thing that... about this is, there is no doubt about this that it can do some really marvelous things. There is no doubt about it. It can do some marvelous things. But it has enough boot to it that if you run it off the rails, it'll wrap somebody around a Telephone pole.

It's something like driving a racing car, you know. He can really get there in that racing car, you know, but it isn't – it isn't... Well, as a matter of fact the only thing that'll get you there is a racing car, don't you see. But by God, those curves! You know, every time it comes to an unbanked curve, why, it leaves several dollars' worth of rubber on the concrete. And you can very easily wrap it around a Telephone pole – very easily.

Now, this makes an auditor have to have two skills. Not just the skill of driving a racing car, but the skill of putting one back together again after he's wrapped it around a Telephone pole. So, you're not only an auditing pro, you see, you're also a case artisan. And at no time has artisanship on cases' repair ever been as important as it has right now.

If you're going to take these cases and get them out of the woods and square them up and head them on the right road, if you're going to do that, be fully prepared that all of a sudden you hit this unbanked curve. Pc has just been going marvelous. The pc is... now looks fifteen – looked seventy-five before – pc looks fifteen; pc is doing beautifully; rave notices to the family; everything is going along fine, you see. And my God, there you hit one of these unbanked curves, you know. Pc comes into the next session and says – you say, "All right, what goals would you like to set for this session?"

And the pc says, "To get through it."

"All right. Any others?"

"No."

Well, for heaven's sakes, be alive. Don't try to repair this from last July. See, the time is readable on your wristwatch. It was just two clock winds ago that that unbanked curve connected with the wheels.
Now, you sometimes will tend to say, "Well, it must be my auditing, because after I've been a little bit crude lately, and the pc's been fighting the mid ruds, and there's probably some various things here which I -- so on, so on. So I'll be reasonable about the whole thing, and I'll try to pull the missed withholds which are causing this pc to ARC..." And now you want to really see an ARC break? Because the pc sort of conceives you're asking for the item, and boy, it just keeps restimulating and restimulating and restimulating. Only, of course, he's got no way to give you the item. You're not listing. So every time you ask him causes another missed withhold on top of the thing, you know? He gets very upset!

The only way to patch up Routine 2 is to patch it up with Routine 2.

That's the way you patch it up. And you just go back there and you say, "Well, that's a sour set of goals." Now, instead of trying to tie the pc even more thoroughly around the telephone pole, you take a look at the pc, and you say, "All right, now, let's see, we said we weren't going to continue listing that list last session, but I've changed my mind about this, ha-ha, and we're going to continue listing that. Were not going to abandon that one. Were going to continue that one."

And the pc is liable to say, "Aw, are you really." or something. And then, all of a sudden, brighten up.

It's very often the pc will tell you they can't. Very often they'll tell you, "What are you doing, trying to invalidate this beautiful item, 'an upchuck'? I mean it explains my whole life, except I haven't been explaining it."

And you say, "Well, we're just going to continue that list."

Sometimes you'll be horrified to find out how many pages you can go without a single R/S on it before all of a sudden the vital item goes blang, blang! That's about the only discouraging thing about all this I know, but you... just be sure it's there. Just be sure you get that item on the list, you understand. That's the criterion. Be sure you get it on the list.

Now, knowing 2-12 and knowing other things about it and being able to run it in the first place, that's the only one you can go headfirst into the snowdrift on, see. Now, any auditor can make this mistake; and can happen to any pc. So this is very, very interesting as a datum, isn't it?

And you can do it, and you'll pull the pc right out of it, and so forth, if you know exactly what it is; and if you don't know what it is and you try to take some heroic or auditing measure to correct the thing, and boy, you're going to be in awful shape trying to figure out this, see.

But I finally studied this down to its common -- simplest common denominator. It's just right there in the session goals, is where you'll find it, and you can trace it back.

And I don't care how ridiculous it seemed as an action. Don't let anything like that get in your road, you understand. You say, "But, my God, the thing is... Actually, what we were listing in that session was just a brandnew consist-of-present-time list." How the... the pc was going around the bend trying to add items to it, and there hadn't been a rock slam on it for -- you know, at all! There were apparently no rock slams on it at all, and couldn't be vital to the
pc, and must be something else. No sir. What I've just told you takes precedence over all the something elses. It's right there. That's it. It's that one where the pc shifted and it'll be a big shift.

Now, if you know that one, if you study up that way, if you keep good auditor's reports and you make very sure they are kept, you make darn sure that you keep an eye on these session goals as you go along and do straight Routine 2 – keep it as straight as you possibly can. It's, by the way, been getting straighter. I've been working with you, and watching what you've been doing, and so forth, and working, also myself, to make it easier to recognize what it is. Removing all possible things that might be going astray. Grooving down – it's getting there. But that, this error I've been telling you about in this lecture is something that you can make. You can – you can have this happen to you. It can happen to me. It can happen to anybody. You understand? For some reason or other we missed the item.

Now, here's one that you must remember on missed items: If there were two rock slams on the list, it might be when you went over it one didn't slam. Pc might have been distracted or something. So therefore, you say there's one item on the list. And because it's the last item on the list that slammed, you – and because it came after a page, or something like that, of no slams – you say, "Oh well, that's obviously it." You pick it up – no sir.

Never unload an item on the pc without great care – and this is my last message on this basis. When you tell the pc that it is his item, go ahead and tell him so with hope and enthusiasm, and anything else. We don't care how you tell him as long as you don't do anything else immediately afterwards. You want to be a real chump or a real knucklehead and practically spin the pc in, do something else at once.

Say, "Well, your item is 'an upchuck.' Now we're going to test for the next one. Consider committing overts against an upchuck. Consider an upchuck committing overts agai... What's the matter with you?" He'll be halfway around the bend if it's the wrong item, because you've given him a distraction of attention.

He's already trying to grip this situation. He's already trying to cope with more mass than he had before. You've hit right into the center of his bank – you might as well have hit him with a sixteen-inch shell, don't you see – and then distracted his attention.

I'll give you another method of doing it. "Well, I've got an R/Sing item here, uh – a tigerbat, and uh – here it is, and so forth, and now, we'll go on finishing er – the list. Uh – a waterbuckbat, a catfishbat, a klughflat, a klu... What's the matter with you?"

Even if it was the right item, man, he's going to be having a time. See, you gave him the item, and then you shifted his attention and you just mustn't do that. That you said, "A tigerbat R/Sed," has practically presented him with the item, don't you see?

Or sometimes you're writing out here with your pencil, in very clear view, and he sees you mark the R/S down late on the list, and he says, "Haha! That's it! It's a tigerbat!" And you go right on to the next one, and you just pull him through the hawsepipe, see. Brrrr! You understand? You've shifted his attention badly. That's why I say that the meter in line with the pc – the list in line with the meter face in line with the pc, and all obscured on what that pencil is doing, is actually your best action.
I've been adopting a rather slippy one of making a strike, a noiseless strike, after an R/Sing item, which, before, when I close the page, I go back and write R/S on it. There's so few R/Ses you see when nulling anyhow. Use red pencil, you know, and make a strike on it. Just a single strike and mark nothing else. I'm trying to get this down to speed.

I'm not advising you to do that. It's just a method that I'm testing out. I find it works very well – as long as you don't miss marking the strike and marking in afterwards "R/S." That's the crime.

Well, what I'm saying here is don't give the pc something and then distract his attention, because it'll aggravate the ARC break if it's the wrong item. It'll really aggravate the ARC break; it'll tie him up in knots.

You say, "Tigerbat," and all of a sudden he has a new hat on his head he'd never heard of before, you see, and it's out this big, and kind of furry ears up here, and he can feel wings out in back of them, and "Where the hell'd all this come from?" you see.

And you say, "Well, have you made any part of your goals for this session?" He says, "Waggllaglugh." You could say "Squeeze the cans," or something. He just won't know what the hell to do, see. You give him a hell of a discombobulation. Now, that will catalyze the ARC break if it's the wrong one. He'll go right into that ARC break. You can throw him completely into apathy; you put him in a screaming fit right now, if you pull that trick, See.

What you want to do is make darn sure from where you sit that it's the right item. Then you check it, and you tell the pc, "That's the item. That's your item." When you say, "That's your item," or "Your item is a tigerbat," don't you look back at the meter; don't you look at your auditor's report; don't you look at another damn thing – you keep your eye right on the pc. Why? You want to see what effect this thing had. Because you just… What's the matter with you? You fire a sixteen-inch shell into somebody's midriff and you don't want to see the explosion. All right, so you've got guilty consciences from other things you're doing in the past. [laughter]

No, you give the pc the item – you give the pc the item, you keep your eye right on the pc. Because, actually, if the item is wrong, you can see his face go dark; you can see him age right in front of your eyes; and you can see the ARC break and the uncertainty. Even though it's very tiny, you'll see all of that. And then ask him, "Do you now have markedly more mass than you had before," or "Do you have – do you – are you sensible of – lot more than you were a moment ago?"

"Yeah," he says, "there's this big thing out in front of my face. I never realized it was there before."

"Well, does that seem like your item? Does it make sense to you? Is that real to you?"

"Oh, oh, yes, yes, yeah, that is. Ah-was your E-Meter plugged in during this session? Ah..."

Well, you've got all the signs there, man, for a wrong item, you see. As second by second the time he has that thing as an item is increased, his tone curve will be going down, down, down. You can watch it descend by the second! I mean, it's that – it's that rapid. And
you just see this is for the birds as far as you're concerned. And then boy, don't use the fact that it can be a wrong item to invalidate a right one! This is touchy business, see.

And you say, "Well, if it's all right with you, I'd like to list on this list a bit longer, because I don't think that's your item."

And you see the pc pick right up and get brighter. Or if it's the right one, he'll tear your head off – but you can take that. "What the hell do you mean? It's my item! What's the matter with you?"

Sometimes in desperation when they are so nervous and upset, and so forth, they'll sometimes protect a false item for a short time. And you say, "Well, we're going to list a little bit longer just to make sure, if it is all right with you. What is the next item for this list, 'Who or what would derogate present time?'"

"Well, you put it that way," and he'll give you some perfectly nice items right away. Do you understand this?

This is the art of presenting the item. And the art of detecting whether or not a list was left incomplete, or an item, more pertinently – an item had been missed by an auditor in the immediate past history of the person's auditing. If you can do that, you can repair any case because, by and large, you can get a lot of wrong sources and abandon them or finish them or list them or package them. Nothing happens to the pc, but he improves. But on this one list in ten on any pc, if that one isn't completed, cut my throat! That one's really going to go to hell. He comes back, dragging in – ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.

I think we have one person here who had a wrong item on the 21st of December, or an incomplete list or something, and then went to the 7th of January to the next session. Sounds a little rough – sounds a little rough. Told that the item was abandoned, or that list was abandoned, on the 21st of December, and has evidently been sitting in this ever since then. Because as far as I can make out from the auditing reports, that's apparently the day, the last day a cheerful audi... set of goals was set by this pc. So it must have been.

All right. Well, there's a – there's a brand-new – a brand-new look at this. There's some better indexes. There's a way to really see this, and so on. And it'll also – it's also a good thing to keep your eye on the pc and do nothing – and do nothing right after you've given him the item anyway. So you might as well be observing the pc as doing that, because otherwise if you shift his attention, and it's the wrong item, you'll practically cut him in half, man. You just presented him with a bunch of gruesome mass that he hasn't had before, and he's very doubtful, and he's sort of lost and half spinny on this thing, and it's going down wrong way to, and all that sort of thing. Now, if you shift his attention in the middle of that, hell have a screaming ARC break, and you just won't know what the hell to do with him.

But there, as far as I'm concerned, is the basic danger – let me not minimize it – the basic danger in Routine 2. That's the basic danger in Routine 2, and right along with it there are the indicators to tell you if you run into it. And there, as well, are the cures for having done this thing of missing the wrong item on the pc.

Okay?
Right! That's it!
Thank you.

All right. This is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 10 January AD 13. And I've told you all you have to know now, so there isn't anything here to lecture about in this particular lecture. And you have become wise beyond measure, here, in the last hour.

I'll talk to you about the implications of processing. We have had a problem for all these years of auditing somebody and everything was fine and then auditing another guy and everything was fine and then auditing a third guy and he starts tearing up the neighborhood. Well, this comes under the general heading -- and only this heading, only this heading -- of missed withholds. And the biggest missed withhold you can have, of course, is the missing answer to the auditing question. He didn't give you the answer. He didn't put the item on the list. That is the biggest one.

This is so gigantic, that if you did that right all the time, you practically could omit pulling missed withholds. But you can't omit pulling missed withholds and I'll tell you why.

On your May third bulletin, I think it is, a great many manifestations of missed withholds are given. And amongst those are dope-off, boil-off, ARC break and that sort of thing. Now, in Routine 2, you're pulling missed withholds by the carload lot. How many missed withholds do you think are in one Routine 2 track item? See, that's ... Well, when you miss that whole package, this of course makes a terrific, crashing missed withhold, see, because it's a conglomerate mess, as well as a mass.

Now, you however, have to pull and continue to pull the little icky-dicky ones, you know, about "I bit my fingernails last night," you know? Because you're liable to make this mistake: You say, there is so much unconsciousness in the bank that of course a pc will go anaten -- to use one of the old-time words -- will go unconscious, under the impact of this list. And brother, that isn't true.

A pc won't go unconscious under the impact of an item, even when you fire it straight to them and shift their attention. They won't go unconscious by simply reading lists. They won't get dopey or groggy simply by reason of reading lists. None of these things are going to happen.

It sounds so reasonable to you that under this much impact -- and reading down one of these very vital rock slamming lists back to them again -- because of the anaten contained in the list itself, natively and naturally, that they're going to dope off a little bit, that you tend to
miss the fact that that's the little "bite the fingernails" missed withhold that you didn't get in the session.

Any time – now, mark this – any time that you see a pc go dopey, boil off, anything like that – or even go groggy and start shutting their eyes and slumping down on nulling, you pull up right there and get those nearly-found-out's.

Now, of course, this is aided and abetted if you have just got through missing an item on a list. But the missing item on the list doesn't cause that anaten. It merely gives it body. They've got to have a PT type nearly-found out before they will go under on a list or as a result of an item. In other words, an item won't do it all by itself and a list of items won't do it all by themselves. Now, just mark my words, here: It's just not possible! I can't say this too strongly, I know this phenomena of boil-off and that sort of thing. It is just not possible for a pc to go anaten, groggy, boil off, without a near present-time missed withheld.

You give them an item, pc thinks of an item, goes anaten; you give them an item, they go anaten; you read a list to them, they go anaten; they groggy and, you know, thuuh. That's not items! Now listen to me: that's not items! They've been biting their fingernails last night, that's what that is! They haven't told you, that they've actually been haunting the door of the theory room, getting the questions being asked currently on bulletin so-and-so, you see. They've been doing something. They've been carefully contemplating busting rule 28, see? Something is awry, here. It takes that present time booster to knock them out.

And the ordinary behavior of a missed-withhold-free pc during listing and nulling and receiving of items and thinking of items, is bright awake! That is the expected behavior. Not grogged-out at all. Bright awake. Oh, they can close their eyes so that they don't watch your pencil wiggle, or something. But they're bright awake. That is your expected attitude on the part of the pc.

Now, during nulling this is terribly, terribly important, because you are depending on reading an item once to get it to R/S. And although, on test after test, Prehav Scale ticks would register, even though the pc is out, a meter will not rock slam while the pc is anaten. Now, that's pretty dangerous, isn't it?

You're counting on that meter rock slamming just by reading the item once. And you won't see the rock slam if the pc is boiled off. Pc can't tell you the last six items, five items, three items, four items, didn't hear them, because he was boiled off. Hm! He wouldn't have rock slammed on them, either. So that is enough for you to have some cold chills about.

And you see that pc sitting there and he goes zzwaawel-youummgo-mummm-khh. [snores] Somewhere – anywhere on that gradient scale you cannot count on the meter rock slamming. You can count on it doing a tick; you can count on it doing a tiny reaction, if you hit something significant, which is all we were counting on, on doing Prehavs – assessments. But you can't count on it rock slamming. There's just insufficient attention present to charge up the package so it'll slam. So that is a marvelous opportunity you have there of missing a slamming item. That's enough to give you cold chills, unless you know it. Now that you know it, that's easy.
Now, that will work the same way on rocket reads, and so forth, on goals checkouts, and this is still data for 3-21. An anaten pc won't rocket read. Anaten pc won't rock slam. Ticks, yes. But not – not a good healthy, crashing manifestation like a rocket read or a rock slam, see. They're not that active, because they're not there.

Now, you get yourself an accustomation of keeping pcs bright awake. Not using the Dianetic method – Dianetic methods are frowned on these days. The FBI thinks that they're very bad, so that ... used to kick them in the soles of the feet. That was the method of bringing a pc awake. That's right! That's right. You didn't audit them when they were boiling off – you kicked them on the soles of the feet and woke them up.

There were two schools of thought on this. One, you went on auditing them, even though they were boiling off and wait until they woke up, and the other school of thought was that you kicked them on the soles of the feet and woke them up and went on auditing them. And finally I remember during Suzie's day, in the Wichita Foundation, I think the accepted method was if they began to snore, was the borderline. And you kicked them on the feet if they began to snore, but otherwise you left them alone.

Had a Director of Training there in those days – he used to blow bubbles; his method of boiling off – how to keep from getting audited.

The point here is that, that was way back when. Now midway along the line, I found out why people boiled off, what boil-off actually was. It actually is a flow which is run too long in one direction. That's what boil-off, anaten, and so forth – a flow, running too long in one direction. That is to say, this person audits – gives an auditing command too long in one stuck flow, he can eventually walk into a situation where he is groggy. Now, that's essentially what it is.

Now, where does this fit in with the missed withhold? A missed withhold is a restrained flow. And because it is a restrained flow, any effort to outflow by the pc while he is busy inflowing causes him to inflow harder, and when the pc has a missed withhold, he's inflowed as far as he can go and he's very, very prone to boil-off. In other words, he's holding back a flow, see. So he gets a stuck flow real quick. Anything sticks! You get that?

The withhold that has been excited, that is restimulated, see, the restimulated withhold there, causes this flow to lock up. Right now! And it's a very funny thing. You might get a subjective reality on this someday. Somebody is very, very industriously pulling these things and you all of a sudden find yourself bright awake. You give him the one which was knocking you out. You go thuu! Bright awake. Room gets bright, everything gets bright, see?

And you're sitting there holding on to a withhold and things start to get dim, and very often a trained auditor being audited... A trained auditor being audited actually doesn't do the same things that raw meat does. You know, I've noticed that they keep their own rudiments in [laughter] and do various things and they always have – no matter how deeply interested they are on this and that – and there's always a small section of one eye cocked on the professional skill and aptitude of the auditor auditing. [laughter] Always is, he can't escape it! Anyway, not even an ARC break involved – he's just keeping an eye on it.
Found Suzie out of session here. A few weeks ago I was auditing Suzie and I found her out of session, I just knew it wasn't quite right, so I pulled a missed withhold on the thing and she'd been sitting there very brightly and alertly, finding out how I was getting that many items called. [laughs, laughter] Tricky. So even she'll do it.

Now, any pro will do this kind of thing and it doesn't constitute very much. But it's probably a bigger trick to keep a pro in session than it is raw meat. Raw meat is attitudinized and they don't know how you're supposed to do it right, and auditing is... Even rather crude auditing looks flawless to them and you give them some real smooth auditing, my God, they don't know what hit them! There's no thought of any criticism in this department, don't you see.

But there it is. The fellow's sitting there, he gets this little withhold and – now mark this – the session withhold quite commonly keys in a pre-session withhold. You almost never get the session withhold as the sole source of the anaten. So that's very interesting. See? In other words, session withholds tend to key in missed withholds.

In other words, we didn't have any missed withhold at the beginning of session. See, we had – it wasn't keyed in so you hadn't been missed. And then something happens in session, and... You see, we've cleaned it up beautifully, "Since the last time I audited you is there anything you have failed to reveal?" You see, that's fine. So we obviously got the last twenty-four hours clean as a wolf's tooth. Nothing showed. This will explain a mystery to you, maybe, if you've ever wondered about this.

And then halfway through the session, the fellow starts to say something, doesn't say something, forgets what it is, then remembers and then thinks he'd better not say it and starts to look a little groggy and then you try to pull this missed withhold: "In this session, is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it doesn't pull.

And you say, what's coming off around here? Pc just gets edgy. Well, of course, the withhold you're looking for is not in the session. Got that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The key-in is in the session. But the withhold isn't. Well, nearly found out, "In this session, is there anything I have nearly found out?" is quite fortuitous and usually takes care of the situation. But an auditor should know this as part of his bag of tricks.

PTPs don't necessarily key in. Willingness to talk to the auditor remains the same. Actual overts and that sort of thing, they tend to come off at the beginning of session. But a session, something happens in a session can key in a missed withhold that happened before the session. So that's why that has to be kept as a random rudiment. And fully expect, in a session, that something the pc did and was missed day before yesterday will key in. See, it doesn't happen every time. But it happens often enough to get in your road trying to make this person wake up. You got that?

You – you'll see that every once in a while, you'll see that every once in a while, it isn't every time. But, pc holds something back, doesn't give you an item. You're listing, doesn't give you an item. "Is there anything you failed to reveal?" Gives you the item and gets groggy. Says, "Yeah, I didn't reveal this item, so-and-so," you expect him to brighten up, see.
You say, "Whoa, wait, wait. Why doesn't he suddenly come up here, you know, and start in here battin'?" Instead of that he gets groggier.

Somehow or another this item keyed in – every once in a while, enough to make it part of the auditor's bag of tricks, see – something keyed in that he did last week or yesterday. So, never fail to – never be completely unwilling to uncork a whole track sort of withhold question. Oh, dangerous, it'll keep you busy! But listen, it'll get you out of more trouble than it'll get you into.

Like, "Has anybody missed a withhold on you?" you see, or, "Is there anything anybody nearly found out?" Horrifying! Here we expect this guy to sit there and give you now two hundred trillion years' worth, and make it a terrific missed withhold all over the doggone place. Well, in actual practice, in actual practice, it will get you out of more trouble than it gets you into. Doesn't say that it won't get you into trouble! But it'll get you out of more.

Sometimes I'll date it on this, you know, on the basis, of "In the past week..." even though I've got between-session rudiments in, you see. Now, that's used that way only when you can't wake up the pc. You got that? You start uncorking this kind of a trick – you understand this – and you uncork this trick of just broaden that missed withhold question, if you can't wake the pc up, ordinarily and generally. Like "In this session, is there anything I nearly found out? In this session, is there anything I nearly found out? In this session, is there nearly found out? You got that? Fine." The pc's bright. Oh, well, don't break anybody's back, see. That's fine. So that did it. So you're all set.

But, let's supposing the reverse happens. "In this session, is there anything I nearly found out?"

"Glug. Uh, so-and-so."

"In this session, is there anything..."

"Aonnowsmmsdunn..."

"In this session, is there anything I nearly found out?"

"Uyuhyuyu ..."

Or worse than that, you put it in at ten minutes past the hour and you find him boiling off at twenty minutes past the hour again! Now, you just got to wrap that thing up, and fire it, man, because you've got a keyed-in nearly found-out. It didn't exist, to amount to anything, during the session, up to this point. But the session for some reason or other, which we needn't even bother to inquire into, is keying in this missed one. And it's now keyed in. And it wasn't keyed in at the beginning of session. And that causes and causes and causes.

Now, something else you should know about a missed withhold that I hate to have to tell you, but you're old enough to know the facts of life. One of them is that not all missed withholds are on the second dynamic. I thought that might... [laughter] People have been known to let air out of other people's tires. And you start steering missed withholds, by dynamics, or something weird like this, you're going to get yourself into more trouble, you're going to start more unfinished lists... So you just keep this question pretty broad and pretty general.
Now, you do have to know this about the nearly-found-out question: It is a left-hand button. In other words, a suppressor-type button and does not necessarily read on the meter.

So, you run into a situation where your pc looked a little bit groggy early in the session and you said, "In this session, is there anything I nearly found out about you?" and he gives you an answer and that's good enough, he brightened up, and fifteen minutes later he's twice as groggy as before, you know exactly what's happened: He's got a pre-session, earlier-than-the-session nearly-found-out, of some kind or another, that your question is not capable of eliciting an answer to. And the thing for you to do is to prepcheck the nearly-found-out question.

I don't care whether you give a time limit or not. It's going to do you a lot of good to straighten this pc up to that degree. Doesn't come under the head of no auditing. Auditing a pc who is boiling off, while you're reading lists to him or trying to get lists from him, amounts to no auditing. See, this is the point where no auditing is not no auditing, definitely. Well, you can't do anything with a boiling off pc, his needle won't slam. So, what have you got to do with him? You've got to... Because it's a left-hand button, you know, Suppressed, Careful of, Nearly found out – Failed to reveal comes under that heading, too. Those are all left-hand, suppressive, buttons. They do not cause a thing to read, they prevent things from reading. All the other buttons cause things to read unnecessarily. So that's fine, you can see all those. These are visible to the naked eye.

We've added one button recently, to big mid ruds, that I ought to make some reservation about, and that is Anxious about tends also to be a left-hand button. But now we're getting into the very big mid ruds, when we add that. But Mistake, Suggest, Decide, Protest, these all make things read. They don't keep things from reading. Your suppressor buttons over here, they prevent a read from occurring.

Actually you realize that you can check out a rock slamming item with Suggest, Invalidate and Mistake just about as alive as they can get. You realize that? The ones you've got to worry about are Suppress, Careful of, and Nearly found out or Failed to reveal and, to a less extent, Anxious about. Now, of course, a Protest follows on the heels of a Nearly found out, or something of that sort, or a Failed to reveal and so it tends to be the point where these two tie together—the left and hand-right-hand side. You actually, you know, can use Protest as a random rudiment. Did you know that?

All right. Now, as we inspect the pc during nulling... Of course a pc who is boiling off can't list, because he won't talk. That's very obvious. But it is less obvious – a pc slumped back in the chair, particularly if he's not snoring – it's less obvious that this pc is suffering from lots of unconsciousness, see? That's less obvious. You got to keep an eye on that. Got to keep an eye on that. And the only cure you have today is not kicking them in the soles of the feet – they've been known to ARC break when this occurs and it doesn't do much good because it'd just ARC break and close your meter out – the thing to do is to get off the nearly-found-out's. And if the session nearly found-out's don't cure it, why, expect a lot of the time, if it goes down to severe a thing as boil-off, to have to cure it with a much broader time base.

Now, there is – there's fairly important data in running Routine 2s. And the way you prevent this thing from happening in a co-audit – you go down the line of a co-audit well,
HPA student, something like that, or public co-audit of some kind – one of the things you must watch as an Auditing Supervisor is that somebody hasn't grogged out, particularly during a nulling session. That you must watch. And the way – the best way to cure this – the best way to cure this, is to sit in on it. Don't try to teach the auditor how to get the missed withhold off the case, for God's sakes. And take it for granted, if it's happening, that it's out of the session. Don't even bother to put in the session mid ruds, don't you see?

Just swing the random rudiment right in against the guy. "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" When you say "we," you also give it a time limit, because he's probably only been around for a week or a month or six months or something like that. And see if you get a response on the part of the guy. Worm it out of him. Or get his auditor to run it totally repetitive. Say, "Just sit there and run this for the next twenty minutes," see. Then when you finally see the pc is starting to ARC break on it, decide it's flat and tell him he can go on listing.

I mean, there's crude ways of adjudicating and handling these things as rather... as well as neat ones, you know? See, the pc's starting to look desperate. You know? You look down the line and see this pc, kept your eye on him, he's looking desperate by this time! "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" The auditor's been going on.

Go over, peer over the shoulder and grab hold of the guy's meter, "Is there anything we nearly found out about you? Yeah, that's – that's good and flat, go on and list. That's it." Something like that. Doesn't take any more than that.

Because, let me tell you, it's pretty gross – you get it on the public like that, it's a fairly gross manifestation. But it's a very fine thing, what really put him to sleep. That's what's amusing about it: the slightness of the thing that actually kicked him off, the slightness of the key-in. Maybe it keyed in something important behind that. Maybe you got that, maybe you didn't, maybe it won't key in and maybe it will. That's beside the point.

You sometimes ask – you get this down searchingly and the pc has just got through saying, "Well I – I uh – I nearly found out – I-I nearly found out something! I-I nearly found out what the item was!" Or something, you see? "Then I realized I hadn't," and so forth. This'll be the type of answer you'll see him suddenly brighten up a little bit, you know? "I nearly found out." You know? The thing is reverse end to. But that's perfectly acceptable as an answer, on a broad, generally, "Was anything nearly found out?" And then you... he still.... you could see that if you went on doing whatever you're doing he's going to go off again. So you press this question, just another time or two, and all of a sudden he says, "Well, actually, this morning, Herbie offered me a ride and he nearly found out that I thought that it was too dangerous." [laughter] You know, a little thing like this. It wasn't any vast deeds or anything of the sort, you know.

And all of a sudden the pcs bright, as awake as a gopher, see? "Where's the list?" You know? "Well, fine! Where's the list?" You read sometimes too much significance into these things. It's how it locks into the bank, don't you see?

Maybe the guy is about to give you an item that you won't get for another session or something, or maybe he's about to give you an item, "a coachman," you see, and anybody
refusing a ride in a coach, this is a terrible moral break, or something, you know, or something like that.

You don't care much how it adds up, you actually don't care about the significance of it. It's just that is what knocks the pc out. And you just mustn't audit a knocked-out pc. That's all. You got all the cures for it, why not use these cures?

Something else – you're probably all at sixes and sevens: We've been knocking auditing around and giving it a bad name lately. Doesn't mean you shouldn't be able to do it well. You're probably wondering these days what is a Model Session? What is a goal finder's Model Session? What are all these things, you know? Well, I'll tell you. I use as much auditing as I have to. And that's what I use as a Model Session these days. And it certainly has these elements. You can't really reduce a session now, for safety's sake, knowing what we know about goals. You can't reduce a session below this and still be fairly safe.

Before session, ordinary, usual routine is, of course, you get the room all right and adjust the pc's chair, get his can squeeze and put in the reality factor. You certainly do those things, because this thing could go very awry if you didn't do at least those things. Look around and see if the room's all right. Adjust the pc's chair, get a can squeeze and put in an R-factor for the session. Now, that's certainly minimal action. You'd get into trouble if you took any less action than that.

And then you have to give him a start of session. And you give a pc a start of session, of course, with a Tone 40 and you have him there and then you find out if the session started for him. This is – also you could get into trouble a little bit if you didn't find out. And then, "What goals would you like to set for this session?" You certainly can't avoid that, now. But, in actual fact, that could stand a trifle of an overhaul. It's distracting to have goals for life or livingness come after the session goals. They probably should be in reverse. I wouldn't say that we're putting them in reverse, I'm just pointing out that that improvement would be an improvement, but we are not at this time using it. Got it? Be released in due course, if it's ever released. I'm just pointing out to you there's a possible improvement there.

Goals for the session, goals for life and livingness. All right, you're fine so far. Now, it depends utterly on whether or not you are going to do a listing or a nulling session. Depends utterly what you do now. But let me tell you, that if you had a good complete list yesterday and the needle was very free and flowing and you thought you were all set to null in this session today and the pc's needle is free and flowing today, and you do more than take down the goals and say, "All right we're now going to null this list: pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa." You're taking a risk if you do more than that because it becomes no-auditing. You see that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

You thought the list was complete yesterday and the needle's clean as a wolf's tooth today, and the pc is all eager-eyed and bushy-tailed, and we're all set to fire here and so forth, just – well, you got the goals down, all right, you say, "Now, I'm going to – going to null this list."
There you go, start nulling! Take your chances on whether or not he has any between-session mid ruds out. Because generally he's so interested in the list that these are more or less pushed aside.

Now, only get worried if he starts to boil off. Now, he's going to boil off, why, there you are. You better get in your – not mid ruds – you just better get in your random rudiment on a nearly-found-out basis. "Since...," we don't care how you word it, just as long as you pull those missed withholds and get them quick and get back there to doing what you're doing. If your missed withholds didn't do it, the list isn't complete and that's all there is to that. Simple – add to the list. Now, that's what's known as really short-handing sessions, right down to nothing.

All right, pc – now, let's take a listing session. We do exactly those things, in other words, we give them the basic form of an auditing session, listing session. Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. What are you doing on a listing session ever getting in a missed withhold or any other damn thing.? What you doing? What – what are you doing? Why? "Start of session. What goals would you like to set for this session? Any goals you'd like to set for life or liv- ingness?"

"All right, we've got this list, 'Who or what would oppose a catfish?' All right. What item would you like to put on this list now? All right, here we go. Who or what would oppose a catfish? Po-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa." I don't care whether the needle's dirty, tying itself in knots, rock slamming; to hell with it, who cares what it's doing. You understand?

Audience: Um-hm.

Because that action is far more therapeutic in cleaning up the needle, than anything else you could do and it's probably dirty because of the pc's thoughts about doing it! You got that? So, listing session – list! Don't do anything else. If you can't hold the pc in-session or something like that – or something like that – the pc won't sit there and list, why that's another thing. Now, if the pc stops listing... And I say it's another thing, that's a missed withhold situation... But if the pc stops listing, what are you doing getting in a dozen mid ruds? You know there's only two mid ruds that stops a pc from listing – Suppress and Invalidate. And those are the primary mid ruds.

They're the primary rudiments, as far as mid ruds are concerned – Suppress and Invalidate. Very often, if a pc is on a fairly hot list, you never have time to get in more than Suppress and Invalidate and he's off to listing again. Well, why try to get in anything else? Why try to get in anything else? Just call those two the primary rudiments and if your listing interrupts and the pc stops listing, get in the Suppress, get in the Invalidate and there we go. Suppress is by a Prepcheck, by the way. And fire on down that list. And! And-and-and-you get in the Suppress and he gives you a suppress and a suppress and then you ask Suppress and he gives you an item. You want to get the case tied in an absolute knot? Don't take the item. Just abandon Suppress and Invalidate right there. You're not going to do anything more with them. Just go and go on listing. Got that? You're not going to say another word about it!

"Anything you suppressed?"
"Well, actually, I was suppressing here – I got an item. I got an item. A waterbuck. Yeah. There's a waterbuck and a caterwumph and…"

You just – to hell with it, see. Skip any of that other stuff, see? Go right on listing, see. Because why did you put them in? You put them in to get the pc to start listing! Now, you're not going to sit there and try to get your auditing question cleaned up. He hit something and there was something he failed to reveal there, or something of the sort, in actual fact. But it'll all come out on Suppress and Invalidate.

Now, if you can't get him to list again, get in the rest of them. But I've never seen it happen. I've yet to see this happen, where you had to get in more rudiments than Suppress and Invalidate to get the pc back to listing. See? So, what I know is – I'm talking now about just cutting short corners around auditing, see?

All right, we get down to the end of the day's session and we discuss what we're doing here and where we have gotten to and we put in a bit of a reality factor on where we are going and what we – don't necessarily put it in for the session tomorrow, but just say where we got and that's it. And then say that's the end of the body of the session, you see. And that closes off the body of the session.

And now, what I've been doing, is cock the meter up here to 64 on a Mark V and say, "In this session was the room all right?" And pull any stuck reactions on the thing and get the needle back to flowing again. In other words, get him out of the auditing environment as the most important thing that you could do for the pc to keep him from being stuck in the session.

Just that one. "In this session was the room all right?" Clean it. Sometimes you find a pc starts protesting this question and that sort of thing. Well, take it easy and do it next session, too. You know, say, all right, he's protesting the thing and he's probably nervous and there's probably a missed withhold, something like that. Don't beat his brains out because of the thing. But you can also assume there's probably something wrong with the room. Get your auditing question answered, but don't necessarily clean this thing up, you know – grind him to death.

Here's what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to give you the answer to the pc who is inventing answers, so he can answer the question, you understand.

One of the best ways to clear that up, "Is this question being protested?"

"Oh, yes."

"Have you invented any answers?"

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Oh, well, thank you very much."

And then just don't touch it. Don't ask the question again. Just come off of it, see. You understand? Because it's more important to pull the protest and the invented answer, than it is to try to get the auditing question driven home between his ears, because it's just a courtesy. You're trying to get him out of the auditing environment.
I refer to you... to a book which is not liked at all by the... phew. The – the department of the government, phew – Scientology 8-8008. Now, that talks about a thetan in the physical universe, see. And actually all the thetan is doing is stacking himself up against the physical universe and batting around like the blue bottle in the cage. And if you want to do something to free him up out of his session, well, you just ask him if the auditing room was all right. You get the modus operandi? Then you've got the thetan and the physical universe, and you've got the sixth and seventh dynamics – these straighten up and the pc feels better, you understand?

Sometimes they become very, very gratuitous and start inventing answers for it. Why, then, you're in trouble and you don't bother to clean the thing up, you assume there's probably a missed withhold or something of the sort, or he feels nerved up because of the session. You're not going to do anything about it anyhow with the room. You got it? See, you're not going to do anything about the room. So get the invent... invented answers, the protest off – get off of it. Go ahead and do it next session again. Don't be scared off just because the pc has objected to it, because he probably was objecting to it because his mind was on something else, see? In other words, you don't have to kill that one with shotguns, axes...

Now, we move over into the next action, which is the can squeeze. And normally, you ask this other question, "In this session was the room all right?" to cut down the number of times you have to run Havingness. Because very often, if the pc has answered this question and cleaned it, "Is the room all right?", his havingness will snap back, quite often, and you'll save auditing time by answering the question. This is all in the direction of saving auditing time.

And then you get the can squeeze and you ask him to squeeze them up. Make sure that you've got the same thing. And if your pc has actually been beat up in this session, about the best thing you can do for that pc toward the end of session is not beat him to death with a lot of rudiments. You know, you normally are getting short-timed, toward the end of session. You could very easily – because of the time nature of your sessions, you see – you could very easily leave him with only part of the mid ruds squared away or something like that. Or in an HGC, and so on...

So your – actually your best trick is to run some Havingness. If you don't know the pc's Havingness Process – what are you doing auditing a pc whose Havingness Process you don't know? "Feel that," "Touch that," and "Notice that," are the best Havingness Processes there are. And normally any pc will respond to one or another of those. It's a very funny thing, though, they very often don't respond to "Touch that," when "Feel that," is their Havingness Process, and vice versa. You tell me why, but it's true! It's true. I figured out the other evening it might be – I was auditing – it might be that "Feel that" requires more confront than "Touch that." There might be something in that. It's only a few commands of this thing.

I was watching a TV Demonstration you were given the other day, and so on, and some – whoever it was who was running that Havingness on that pc was going far, far too long, man. It only takes a few commands. You just want to get that can squeeze restored. How long does it take to get a can squeeze restored? Well, let me tell you something. You can start running the bank with Havingness with the greatest of ease. We're talking now in the direction of about a dozen commands or slightly less. See? And if we're not sure of the pc's
Havingness Process, we're certainly not going to run more than five commands of a strange process.

All we're trying to do is just run this pc's havingness can-squeeze test back up, that's all we're trying to do. And that takes very little time. So, you snap him back to battery with Havingness and that's your... and then take up goals – never take up life or livingness – never, never go over your life or livingness goals with a pc. Just go over the goals: session goals.

Now, you take up gains and you take down whatever gains the pc says and you make your own comments over on the side of the thing and the pc can sit there and hold onto the cans while you scribble down whatever comments you make, too. And don't take the cans out of the pc's hands until the session is ended. Don't fall for a practice like that. Because it gives him a double change. It ends the session materially before it ends the session mentally. And it tends to kind of throw him out of balance a little bit.

All right, you got your goals, you got your gains, you say, "Is there anything you care to say?" and the pc says, "Oh, yes, yes, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." Something like that. Usually it's a question. "Did my tone arm go down?" or something like that. Answer it! Be crisp.

Now, because you're started – you've started the cycle of ending the session, don't err... I myself make this mistake occasionally, I all of a sudden get interested, you know, again in the session. Confounded thing rock slams, you know. You say, "What – what was that?" You know? That's bad practice. You're ending a session. Sometimes it's so vital that you have to know what that is, though, and you still ask him. But end the session, and "Anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?" and so forth, and he says it. Well, don't prompt him to say anything else, is the point I'm making here! Cut that off, man! Usually it's a, "Thank you," or something like that. And you say, "All right, here it is," and give him a good Tone 40 end of session that leaves no doubt in his mind whatsoever! Tell him, "Tell me I'm no longer auditing you," so as he shakes out of that, and that is through.

Pc who continues to talk about his case to you, it's almost inevitable the PC will make some kind of remark about his case. Give him an entirely altered aspect – is the best trick of ending the session, now, visually, too.

I never put it... doubt – much doubt in the pc's mind, but if the pc looks... is shaking his head when I've said, "End of session," going like this – I'll end session again for him, see? I'll ask, "Has session ended all right?" You know, I take a little care, if it's kind of obvious he didn't get out of session. I'm not going to spend any time on it. I'm not going to put him back on the meter and do various things of this particular care.

If I've given him an item and said, "That's your item, and now we're going to end the session," and I see the pc isn't coming out of session, I say, "Well, what's the matter? You – you having doubts about that item?" He'll say, "Kind of." Well, all right, you don't have to have that for your item, well go on listing on it next session." Pc brightens right up. And you say, "Good. All right. Got that now? End of session!" Pow! And he's out of session. See, that missing item can hold him from coming out of session.
And then you're through. Now, when I say an altered aspect... You've been an auditor and so forth, and you've been willing to listen to him, you're still willing to listen to him, you're not going to ARC break him, you're not necessarily going to give him a wisecrack or invalidate their case or something like that, but look more cheerful and natural than usual. [laughter] Ask him something like, "Hey, you got a cigarette?" you know, something. It's an altered aspect, an altered tone of voice, and it helps them come a little further out of session. You got it?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, now, you say, "What's Model Session today?" Well, Model Session is still Model Session. And it's got all those rudiments and it's got everything else in it – that's Model Session. Now, we're talking about a very shortened Routine 2 session, see. This is a Routine 2. It isn't goal finder's Model Session. That was itself, too. This is Routine 2 session. It just fits for Routine 2. Honestly, if you use much more session than this, you'll get into trouble.

Now, you're trying to null, you're trying to null, the list is obviously complete and so forth, use this other trick – just to get back to it a little bit – of handing the pc the sheet, and saying, "What – what cooks on this sheet here? What... any – any big thoughts on this sheet, here?" or something like that.

Pc says, "Oh, well, yes, and I invalidated that and I did this and I did that, and so on. And kind of suppressed that and I didn't think that was it."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very, very much. Thank you."

Don't ask him any rudiment on it, just give him the sheet. You understand?

Oh, you don't know about this trick? Maybe it's not worked well for you.

Audience: Yeah. Yeah, it has.

Yeah, all right. It's a nice trick. It gets all the rudiments in, Brrrr! Bow!

Bring it back over, and go on going.

Now, but aside from that, I would assume, if a pc became agitated in a Routine 2 session – I would assume immediately that there was something wrong with the Routine 2, not something wrong with the auditing. That's the first thing I'd assume. I'd assume he was getting no auditing or something or he thought he wasn't and so forth.

A pc who starts to act very self-audit-ish in a session, I wouldn't pay any attention to it. You know, he's starting to get his own rudiments in and starting to fill everything in, I just give him a cheery "Yes. Okay. Fine. Thank you." And so the pc starts interrupting me while I'm nulling, and so forth, to getting his own rudiments in. I'd just stop and give him a cheery "Aye, aye," and go on again. See, I don't start snarling at him, and frowning, and...

I sometimes have been known to frown at a pc who scratches their head with the back of the can when they're listing – while giving me four items, you know? I very often say, "Well, that's four we don't know whether they rock slammed or not." [laughter, laughs] "Oh, oh!" says the pc. [laughs, laughter]
Well, that's the extent of the importances of session. I guess you could have called this lecture, "What you do in an auditing session these days and relative importance thereof." And of course, as you see, the manifestation of boil-off, and therefore pulling missed withholds, is paramount to everything else. Because you – of course he can't list while he's asleep. And you can't null, because he won't rock slam while he's asleep. So, there you are. That makes Routine 2 impossible. But within those limits, why, that's about as much sessioning as I would use these days.

Now, something very funny – I've got to tell you one little other piece of data and we'll end this lecture. You start on a list that is incomplete, or wrong way to, and you start nulling it – if you use the 2-10 type nulling, of just call, call, call, looking only for rock slams, you see, bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark and you get about halfway down the front page of that list and that needle starts getting dirty, you would normally assume that the pc's rudiments have gone out. I lately have begun to assume the correct answer: It's either wrong way to or the item isn't on the list.

You never saw anything as – quite as agitated as a needle goes on nulling on a list that's got something sour about it. Now, the faster you call off items, the more briskly you enunciate them, the less the pc thinks. So at the speed I've been nulling lately, the pc didn't have – no pc's had a chance to do any thinking. So I've managed to sort out this other datum. And that is, that I've taken some lists that are wrong way to and so forth and tested them. And your needle will dirty up. And it's an indicator – it's just an indicator – it isn't a rule, but you should always be leery that if you're calling down a list fairly rapidly, and you straighten out the list, give him the page, let him straighten it out, and you're calling this off again, and it goes dirty almost at once, you should be – get very alert, man. There is something wrong here. It isn't just the rudiments going out. The Routine 2 is wrong. Wrong source, wrong way to or item isn't on the list, and usually, all else being equal, it's the item isn't on the list! That's the only place that an auditor can foul up.

Now, you can also – somebody has done it here, in this unit – list endlessly, way beyond the point where the thing could be listed. Way, way, way, way beyond – thirty pages or so beyond the point where it ought to be nulled. That's a very extreme look, but it's a fact! And if it hadn't been for the vacation and the snow and so forth and another auditor taking over the case, we never would have found it out. The auditor – the pc to this day would still be listing. Because, of course, a needle starts going dirty on the protest. You overlist and overlist and overlist and overlist, the needle goes dirty on a protest.

But you know that an incomplete list, the needle doesn't go dirty on the protest. You know the person really never protests it. They snarl, they sound ARC broke, they sound this way and that. You can't find any protest! They go on listing, one way or the other, even though you've had to say, "If you don't list any further on this list ... You get the message?"

"Oh, well, you put it that way!" and so on. [laughter]

No rudiments in see, just list! Not recommended. But sometime when you know damn well the list is not complete, and the pc won't add any more to it, you know, and the pc's getting all ARC broke, and all this way and that, why, your rudiments fail to get him to list again,
why, "list!" you know? The only crime you can actually pull is not completing the list. You realize that?

All other crimes fall short of that crime.

And in essence, there's minimal sessioning. Oddly enough, it's going to take you more mid ruds on 3-21 than it does on Routine 2. You're going to use mid ruds a lot more on 3-21.

Now, as soon as you've got the PT problems out of the road – as soon as you got the PT problems out of the road – a case actually is ready for 3-21. You recognize that? You could overuse Routine 2 if you're a clearing auditor. You realize this? You can overuse it. It won't do the case any harm. He goes on, he gets Clear and so forth. But there's a point where you get the present time problems out of the road as far as this pc's concerned and so on, he's ready for 3-21. He'll go right down, find his goal, as nice as you please. All you'd actually have to do on him is a brief Prepcheck and he'd practically present you with his goal. You see where that borderline comes?

It is safer for an expert auditor to do goals on a case, than it is to do Routine 2. He will actually make less mistakes doing goals on a case, if he is an expert. But it is more catastrophic for an inexpert auditor to do 3-21 on a case, than it is Routine 2. Do you see how those two points add up?

Audience: Yes.

Now, in actual fact, an expert does 3-21 more smoothly than he does Routine 2, because Routine 2, after all, is not running on the pc's goal. What you want to do is get the pc's goal and run it against PT, if you want to get the rest of the problems out of the road – and you do all kinds of things. You can do more with his goal any day in the week than you can do with Routine 2, but you – of course, you can't get most people's goals without getting some packages out of the road.

I want to give you one change in Routine 2, just as one final remark here. That List 1A, "In present time, who or what are you upset about?" would probably run more easily on a pc, just as any version of, "In present time... or – who or what does present time consist of?" Let me give you that as the basic model. "Who or what does present time consist of?" You see? "Who are you in contact with in present time? Who or what are you in contact with in present time?" You understand? Any such version.

Now, one more remark, about missed withholds and this changed line. You realize that you can list the wrong universe. Remember there's the wrong universe ... There's the universe of the pc's life and livingness, his auditing universe and the parts of existence. And do you know that it'll constitute on some pcs a missed withhold if you don't list that one first which is ready to be listed. You got that? There's another way that you can miss an item: is choose the wrong sphere of interest for your first list. That's not a very fruitful one, but it can happen, so you should be advised of it. And that is pertinent to what I've been telling you tonight.

You insist on running auditing-type universe, see? And actually his present time universe has got him caved in. You know, his life and livingness universe got him caved in. You try to do parts of existence on him and his auditing universe is kicking his head in. And the pc
will act like he has an ARC break. He'll act like a missed item, by choosing the wrong one of these three universes to do first. So that has to be sorted out with the pc on a real expert action.

It's not common, but it can – it could actually louse up a case. Somebody screams like mad, running about auditing. Ah, he's about to be divorced or shot or President of the United States has heard his name and is therefore in a rage. See, something of that sort has happened. Then his attention is so stuck on that type of a universe that he can't even think about being audited, don't you see? And you can't get that one out of the road – if you don't get that one out of the road, he won't be able to get any of the auditing things out of the road. So there's another source of a missed item. Okay?

All right and that is it and I hope it does you some good.

Thank you very much and good night.
Thank you.

Sorry to keep you waiting. There's an operating climate of emergency these days. And sometimes the emergencies are great and sometimes they are small, but they're all emergencies. And that's because they weren't predicted. That's what makes an emergency. Did you ever know that? That's just a failure to predict. Everything else is life. [laughter] All right.

Well, this is what? The...

Audience: 15th.

...15th of January, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

All right. Well, you probably came in here tonight to hear something clever that'll resolve all of your cases very easily, and I regret to tell you that in the Washington raid tonight's lecture notes were seized. [laughter]

Well, this is – this is a lecture on the subject of Routine 2-12. And there are several things in this lecture, but amongst them is what to do about dead horses. I finally taped this one. Life now becomes very easy for you. If I make life much more easy for you, you'll collapse for lack of problems. I'd hate to do that to you.

Well, let me state the problem first. Very often you do a "represent" or a "present time consists of" or "what are you upset about" list. Those are all represent types of lists, don't you see. And the confounded thing behaves like a wrong way to list. They are very, very difficult to complete – very, very, very difficult to complete – and they cycle.

And when I first noticed this, why, I didn't know whether to send for aspirin or the auditor. How the devil could a represent list be wrong way to? How? It's not possible. So I've actually been worrying about this and trying to do something about this here, now for, oh, I guess about ten days or so. I've been studying this above all other things very, very hard, because this was a puzzler. I "was poozled."

Now, a wrong way to list cycles. Now, somebody's going to – somebody's going to see a right way to list, sometime, and it's going to sneak up on an R/S, you know, and before it gets to the R/S it's going to give a dirty read and then it'll rock slam and then they will see a couple of dirty reads or something like that and then they won't see the dirty read for a little while and then when they get up to the next rock slam, so they say, "Ah-ha! That list is cycling." No, the essence of a cycling list is that the needle periodically goes clean. It's the fact the needle goes clean. It isn't whether it R/Ses or DRs. It's the clean that you should concentrate on there. Needle goes clean, beautifully clean, very fine, very nice, very clean and you
do another half a page just to make sure that it's good and clean, and you've got a complete list and all of a sudden, it isn't clean.

So you roll up your thetan sleeves and you go on and you list further, and the next thing you know, you got maybe a DR. Maybe even an R/S. Then it cycles out and it goes clean again.

How long will it keep doing this? A long time, I'm afraid. Probably forever. The needle will never go clean and stay clean – always dirties up. Now, this is quite periodic. A list which is right way to runs a cycle as well, and that cycle goes... Probably you're sitting there, before you start to list you've probably got a clean needle. And it'll go into a dirty needle and then you get a dirty read on an item or two and then you get a rock slam and then maybe you get a dirty read, and then – then you... it's kind of a dirty needle that looks kind of messy, and then after a while you get another rock slam. And then after a while you get another rock slam. Never really goes clean. And it goes on and on and you finally find yourself with less rock slams.

Now, this is in an oppose list. And if you are listing wrong way to in an oppose list, you will find that the frequency of R/S is increasing. And if you're listing right way to, the frequency of R/S is decreasing.

Now, wrong... this is quite marked. On a wrong way to list on an opposition – this is an opposition list, wrong way to, every... I'm only talking about opposition lists at this moment. On a wrong way to list you'll have something like this: You'll have one R/S on page one and a couple of R/Ses on page two and about three R/Ses on page three. And as far as you can tell up to this moment, there is no right way to or wrong way to, because a right way to list looks exactly the same way. But let's go on and describe the right way to list now. You see, that's one rock slam on page one, two on page two, three on page three, see. That's either right way to or wrong way to. You can tell by the needle tightening with just a few items. But this isn't this type of test. I'm just talking about needle manifestation.

And if your list is wrong way to, along about page four you have four slams and page five you have five slams and page six you've got six slams – you get the idea? The incidence of rock slam is increasing.

Now, oddly enough, along with the increase of the incidence of rock slam, the periods of clean needle are increasing. See, you're liable to get a rock slam, dirty read and a clean needle, see? And a dirty read and a rock slam, and a dirty read and a clean needle, see? You've got clean needles starting to show up here and the incidence of clean needles starts increasing. But that's not an important test. The important test is... and you can tell this by looking at any pc's list. This is what is important. Because you think you are just going to be worrying about your auditing and you ain't.

I'm worrying about your auditing right now, see, and it's time for you to get it all down real good right now, because you won't have any time to worry about your auditing after you get out of here.

Every one of you is going to be worrying about other auditors' cases.
Now, your own worry about cases, that ends very soon up into the future. You'll have this bicycle so that you not only could ride it on pavement, you can ride it – ride it on a rutted street, you can ride it on a tightrope, you can ride it on a tightwire going between the poles of the two main top peaks. You could probably ride it backwards, you know, ride it standing on your head on the seat, peddling with your ears. [laughter] That you won't be worrying about anymore, because all of a sudden it'll all go straight and you will say, "Blithh, there it is, see."

One of the reasons is I'm finding you indicators, indicators, indicators, indicators, see. I'm taking all your bugs out of it so you get maximal gain all the time, see. And you're learning those, and you're very lucky, you've made a lot of boobs, you know, you've made a lot of goofs. You know how agonizing it can be. You know better than to let somebody else make all those goofs, see? I come along and tell you how not to do those goofs, boy, that's important information, see.

Well, you're going to be teaching somebody in Santa Ana County, something of the sort, or you've got a co-audit running down there and you're trying to take care of it over the telephone. They don't know these goofs are important. They don't know what important goof is being made. They have no idea of the importance of goofs. They don't know R2 bulls are more potent than auditing bulls, see. They don't know these things, see? They don't know these things, see? They haven't lived through this, see? And under your direction they've got to live through it – and somehow or other without losing any pcs. That's the important thing, because in the field, in R2-12, and in organizations with R2-12, unless you're very slippery and you're very quick and you don't let them go ...

You see, you guys, it didn't matter, you see – you couldn't get out of here. There was no transport. No transportation has left England since the Mayflower, you know? But – but somehow or another – somehow or another – you've got to keep it degooed and you've got to ungoof cases so that you don't lose any and so forth, because a case can get awful sick on 2-12.

You can put him awful well in a hurry, but he can also get awful sick, man. And he can feel like he's lost his last enemy. He can feel terrible. And it can just go out through the bottom of the floor, you see, just bong! He was coming along fine, then this person said, the Registrar said you had too many pcs, so they got somebody on the third week in the Academy. This is very illegal, but it happens every now and then. And this person in the third week in the Academy was put on this HGC pc, and the pc was doing fine and did fine up till Wednesday and then when they went down – didn't appear Wednesday, and somebody went down to the hotel to find the pc and the pc can't get out of bed. Two black eyes swollen up like baseballs.

Well, you're going to have some bad moments. And the questions you ask is, "Was it wrong source? Was it listed wrong way to? Or was the list incomplete?" See, those are the questions you ask – wrong source, wrong way to or list incomplete, see? And what I'm telling you just now about this frequency of R/S is your best friend. It isn't the length of the list, although you look at lists of forty, fifty pages, you say, "Oh, zut! Thlah! Horsefeathers!" – to use an archaic expression. "That's just a goof. That's just wrong source or something stupid."
No, no. You've got a list there and it's thirteen pages in this guy's folder, see. And it's a thirteen-page list, and because you have been on the ball, anybody you talk 2-12 to, you've practically hung them up by the ears for not putting down the data in the folder. The pc's name on each sheet. We don't care about each page, but certainly each sheet. And the date it was listed. See? And the question that was listed. And whenever he saw an R/S on the meter, put it down, get the meter up close to him someplace while he's listing, so he won't miss it!

I'll show you how... This'll probably be a favorite method of auditing. [demonstrates something – laughter] "No. No R/S." Oh, you've seen it yourself Marvelous. Meter completely out of the auditor's range. He can't see if the thing is R/Sing while he's writing, you know?

So anyway, you've already impressed on these characters – I don't care if they were in a co-audit or in the Academy or the HGC or it was a field auditor you were – you were briefing in and training; you've – we assume this – you've already impressed on them with branding irons, to keep the data, keep all the papers together, write legibly so somebody can read it, you see? You've already... because that's your only saving grace. If they haven't done that, cut your throat, boy. Oooh! You won't know nothing no place. Because they're going to goof. Just assume they're going to goof, see?

Don't go off on the happy idea that nobody's going to goof, because 90 percent of the time the first auditing on this is done with somebody who already R/Ses someplace where it'll do the most harm. And he, well... so let's say he has an item; it isn't an RI or anything, but he has an item which will come up someday, known as an amanuensis as an oppterm. It's a secretary. And the mere fact of sitting there writing restimulates this horrible oppterm, see, to him. And he somehow or another can't keep track of it all, see. And he starts to audit, it's sen. You look for it in auditing, you look here and you look there and eventually it turns up.

Anyhow, that's the kind of thing you're running into, see, so you impressed them on that.

Now, the only thing that'll save your bacon is that folder. And you get ahold of that folder and it's just about the first thing you look for – increasing incidence of R/S. Just look for a list where there are more R/Ses on the end of it than there are at the beginning of it. And when I say the very beginning of it, it takes the pc a little while to groove into it and there's very seldom very much R/S on the first page. So we're talking about the fourth page or fifth page in comparison to the second page, is what you want to look for. And you want to look at about the second page and along about the fifth page – let's say the fifth page was the end of the list.

"Oh," you say, "look at that. There's more R/Ses. Why don't you turn it around and list it the other way, the way you were supposed to?"

"Well, the terminal was 'a gruesome killer' and the pc said that couldn't be him. So of course, we had to say, 'Who or what would oppose a gruesome killer?' Otherwise it was too painful." [laughter]

Oh, you're going to hear some, man. I've heard some beaux. I started to collect them and then I was too busy writing up decent lists so I didn't bother to collect them. You'll hear
something like this. It isn't that I don't trust my fellow man. The funny part of it is, I wouldn't put them into their hands if I didn't think they could climb the hill. All I'm trying to tell you is, you got two hills to climb, see, just like I had two hills to climb. Get so I can do it and then get you to do it, see? You've got exactly the same hills to climb. Get so you can do it, and get so the other fellow can do it. Get the other fellow to do it. See, you've got the same hills to climb. We'll always be climbing these two hills, see, to some degree.

But the first one can be climbed and that's dusted off. You know you can do it, because there is a finite end to Routine 2-12. First time we've ever said that about a process. You realize that? There's a finite end to learning it. There isn't some new rule going to turn up in the card game. What I'm trying to give you now are indicators. Indicators. I'm looking for things to look for. I'm looking for things that explain certain oddities that you are running into.

All right. Now, this frequency of R/S, the needle that keeps going cyclically clean, is another part of this. All right, that's wrong way to. Now, you get what I mean about it? Of course, you've got it wrong way to – you list it right way to.

Actually, the easiest way to test a right way to or a wrong way to is simply to list a page or half a page each way and find out which one tightened the needle – and that's wrong. Take the one that loosened the needle, always. And the funny part of it is, that's a wonderful way to get accustomed to inspecting pcs' appearances for skin tone. That's marvelous. You see, it's all a trick of spotting then and now. So you've got to have a now to become a then, see. You've got to look at them, and say, "All right, this is the start of listing." How did they look? You know? And then list yourself a half a page and look at them again.

See, those are the two points of comparison. And you will very rapidly become accustomed to seeing what a pc looks like if he's listing in such a way as to cave in his bank. It isn't just wrong way to that caves in, you see, you can list the wrong item and cave it in, you can take the wrong source and cave it in. See, almost anything you do wrong in Routine 2-12 darkens the visage and skin tone of the pc, mucks up his eyes, does this, that and the other thing to him. It's all facial and it's very visible.

But it gives you good experience, listing right way to and wrong way to; you're picking out which one is which. You just take these two opposings and figure out which one is which, and inspect the pc very closely as you are doing that, and you will actually see the pc's skin darken.

Now, oddly enough, it won't lighten on the right way to list as fast as it darkened on the wrong way to. It's going to take maybe a couple of pages of listing to get his skin back to where it was before you wrong-way listed it. Nevertheless, it gives you a comparison, gives you a very good idea of it.

Now, you want to become an expert on this, on skin tone and eye and so forth. And the expertness is totally on selection of points of time, you see. You can't compare this piece of paper to this piece of paper. See, look at your axioms of knowledge. There must be data of comparable magnitude for comparison, one with another, before you can know something, you see. You can't say this is a big meter unless another meter exists to be smaller or bigger, see. You get this idea?
So you have no data of comparison on a case unless you mark a moment in time, zzzt, and you say, "Well, that's how he looked." You see, you do this several times. You do it for the overall process, you do it for the right way you're listing, you do it for this and that, but you keep in mind how he looked – you take a good look at him, you know; you take a photograph of him – and you say, "There he is." And now fifteen minutes later you compare that first "there he is" with how he is now, see. And you get a then-now comparison. Is he lighter or is he darker? Those are the only questions you ask. It's as simple as that.

This is the doggoneddest darkening mechanism you ever saw, but I didn't say that he went black. He actually doesn't go black. He just goes darker. Because some pcs go yellow, some go green, some go gray, some go black, and the lightening process could possibly sometimes be confused with – in gray. But you just have to get used to these things.

But frankly, they get whiter and whiter, which is a very interesting thing. You'd have to have a lot of sun lamps to keep up with it. They go lighter. And there's your best index.

And you should be able to get to be an expert on this, so that you're supervising five, six pcs in an HGC, or you've got fifteen or twenty of them in a co-audit ... Just get practiced on this kind of thing. It's not a very difficult trick. And you say, "This is the beginning of the session." Just look all around and see how they all look and... best way to do that is choose the one who looks worst, you know, and relate everything to him.

And you don't want these guys being listed backwards and upside down and out through the roof, so after everybody's been industriously listing or doing whatever they're supposed to be doing about a half an hour passes by or something like that, take a look through the room and compare it to that first look you took, see?

You see this guy over here: he actually is not much greener, but he's greener, see? So you take this bird and you know that it's wrong source, wrong way to or an incomplete list, and you immediately make it your business to find out what's wrong over there, see? Then you can keep everybody's head out of water.

This is terrific processing when done right. And the righter it's done, the more terrific it is. You can't oversell it, done right. See? But boy, you could sure shoot holes with it done wrong.

And you'll hear people saying, "Oh, God, so this is Scientology. Oh, no. Oh, God. Oh, jeez. Never felt so bad in my life." You know? It's a wonder they keep on getting processed at all. But you can do these things real wrong with 2-12 and you can really pull the rug out from underneath somebody. And let me make a little comment here as we go by this: Until you get to be an expert or until somebody is expert, don't let them process children. Why?

Well, actually, the kid's having a hard time concentrating his attention and you could put a kid off much quicker and the – his doggedness is not there. He won't keep plowing into it, he'll just know he felt bad, so he doesn't want anything more to do with it. It's just a snap adjudication, don't you see? So don't let anybody who doesn't know 2-12 backwards process children. Make it an absolute requisite that they get perfect results on adults before they are ever let near a child.
With that proviso, 2-12 works on children around five, six, seven, eight, nine, in that range. I don't know about the five, but we already know about the later. It works like a dream. They just sit there and they just saw wood and they work right away, and they'll list like mad and so forth. They're cute as a bug's ear on this stuff. Quite remarkable. They R/S perfectly and so forth. But don't goof them up, because they won't sit still long enough afterwards to be patched up. You see why? So don't let anybody be processing kids until they do very, very, very flawlessly well on adults.

All right, let's get back to this dead-horse proposition. I'm talking about all this opposition listing and frequency of R/S and frequency of clean and so forth just as a rundown of what I was up against in the represent list. Imagine my embarrassment to find a represent list doing the same thing as an opposing list – slightly less violent.

In other words, it wasn't with exclamation points that it was doing it, like it does it in an opposition list, but all the signs were there. Now, here was my question: How in the name of common sense can you have a wrong way to represent list? Well, the first thing you'd say, "Well, who or what would represent Scientology to you?" Then your wrong way could be, "What does Scientology represent to you?" I mean, that's the same thing. So that isn't contained in it.

"What does Scientology not represent to you?" The same thing. "What does Scientology represent to you?" See, I've just been going around in circles here for days. That's why you haven't seen very much of me; I've been wearing out a rug. I've been walking in small circles. How in the name of God ... ? I won't – I won't say what I really said. I'll tell you exactly what I said. It's this exactly: "Goddamit, how the hell can a represent list be backwards?"

You know? Pow!

And I'd go back at it again, you know, and I'd take a look at this thing, and so forth, and these lists can go on and on and on and on and on, because it was a hole in 2-12. You guys had discovered it. [laughter] You, too, have made discoveries.

Anyway, that's what I said, and even though it was profane, I don't want withholds from you. It's so preposterous it took me about ten days to wrap it up. And it's so simple. Heh-heh, it's so simple. It was very little to do with the wording-heh-heh-heh.

A flaw in man is that he does not know himself. You ask this guy, "Have you got any enemies? Name your enemies." And he says, "Oh! Joe, Bill, Pete, blah, bo, blah, zaaa, blah, blah, and thuhh, and thuhh, and zaaa, and zaaa, and zaaa, and da-da-da-da-da-dah." Automaticity, see. Always can name enemies.

You say, "All right, name yourself."

He says, "Name's Joe." End of list.

In other words, the person is much more capable of observing enemies than selves. So he gets on a stuck flow of listing terminals, and you've got to fix his represent list so he will list... He gets on a stuck flow of listing opposition terminals, don't you see? Stuck flow of
listing enemies because they're so easy to list and you've got to give him a list wording which permits him to list terminals. And that is the wrong way to represent list. I think somebody ought to take their hat off. It's taken me about ten days to figure this confounded thing out. That's what it is.

You say, "What is... what does Scientology represent to you?" And he right away figures in terms of enemies. So he lists oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm. Once in a while he accidentally puts a terminal on it – very accidentally. "Oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm," he lists. "Oppterm, oppterm, and oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, and oppterm, and I can't think of any more, really. That's the end of the list." And you didn't have any R/Ses. Where's the silly R/Ses? Furthermore, if you keep doing this you will see that the needle is going clean and then dirty, and then clean and then dirty. And every time you try to go down this silly represent list you find you can't make it. It goes too dirty to be nulled.

So you abandon that list and say, "Who or what does present time consist of?" or "In present time, who or what are you in contact with?" or anything like that.

So, he leans back and he says, "Oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, and oppterm, oppterm, oppterm."

And you say, "Where the hell are the R/Ses?" And you'll find once more the needle goes clean, and dirty.

Now, if you're lucky, you'll have some R/Ses on it and you'll find one. Once in a while it's almost impossible to get one backwards. He'll list a terminal every now and then and it R/Ses. Not just because it's a terminal, but he'll list an R/Sing terminal frequently enough to give you some R/Ses, see. But he'll give you an interminable list. And he's liable to get down to the end of it and feel rather badgered by the auditor and the process and because he's now on a stuck flow against his enemies.

And you watch those faces go black or green – in other words, they'll darken. He'll start to look older, faces will darken. See, going on a stuck flow. Dzuh, dzuh, dzuh. Eyeballs get big, red as fire. It's very visual. These manifestations are not really tiny, they're quite marked if you know what you're looking for.

And you say, "Well, we didn't get any list with that – uh – 'What does present time consist of?'" Let's – let's do one now – let's be very smart. Uh – uh – let's see. 'In present time, what have you been reasonable about?'" or something like this.

And he'll say, "Oh, yeah," and he'll list that. "Oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm."

Well, it's very simple: The case that gives you a wrong way to-looking represent list – even with rock slams on it; you know, it behaves like a wrong way to opposition list – or the case that gives you dead horses, (see, that's the same case actually) is merely somebody whose next item up is a terminal. Isn't this idiotic? The next available item on the case is a terminal. You've got nothing but lists of oppterms. Grim joke, huh? I think it's kind of lucky I figured this one out.
In other words, before you get the terminal off the stack, he hasn't got a prayer. And yet he's listing oppterms, so of course you're never going to get the terminal off the stack. You understand? So he'll just go on plowing himself in. And the more he lists oppterms, why, the more it plowed into the mass he gets and the unhappier he gets about the whole thing and the more MEST he feels, the more hopeless he feels. Because what's the bypassed item? It's the terminal he is being right this minute in the session. That's the bypassed item. You got this now?

You see the circumstances of the wrong way to list? Of how this thing looks like a cycling list; it takes forever; you can never get it cleaned up – the wrong way to list. Of course, you know the dead horse type of list. This also takes in the skunk list. You know, it keeps running out to no item. See? Those oddball lists are all under this same heading, on a represent basis, which is "present time consist of" or something like that. The pc is being asked questions which result in oppterms, whereas the pc, next item up, and his case isn't going to go anywhere past this item – the next item you've got to find on the case to make it whiz is a terminal. And you're not asking questions that give you any terminals. You only get opposition terminals.

Supposing his terminal was "a bad boy." You might as well be asking a... we don't know this terminal "bad boy," you see, because we haven't found it or anything. But we're busy listing a represent list. We're asking, in essence, "In present time, to a bad boy," see, "what does life consist of?" And he'll give you schoolteachers, masters, truant officers, police, juvenile delinquency squads, see, and he goes on and on and on.

And you want – just to make my point here, sometime – you – when you've patched up a pc where this is occurring, find the item, see, and go back and take a look at his two or three earlier dead horses; you'll find out he's done nothing but list the same item. They're all what a... whatever you found, see. You found "a rabid skunk employed by the government" or something like that, you see?

You know, he'd fallen low, man, and you'll find this one. You go back and look at those early dead-horse lists he was listing, they'll all be what this thing opposed. You actually have done its opposition list. But because he couldn't get a grip on it these things weren't R/Sing properly or anything else.

That doesn't mean you take the early lists now and compare them to the later lists, you just go on with 2-12. You oppose this thing; now he knows where he is. Obviously he knows where he's going. But of course, in view of the fact that he can't see from the terminal point of view what is the enemy of the terminal, he then just is giving you such randomness that it is fabulous.

This again is not an index of how you find this. But in actual fact he doesn't know from what point of view to look at the enemy. So then, of course, he can't give you the right enemies. He can just give you all of existence. And there are quite a few items in all of existence. Some of you may have found this out.

Well, that's how you can get a wrong way to represent list, which is the confoundedest thing I think I ever had anything to do with. It sounds impossible when you look at it, as a piece of Chinese puzzle work, it just sounds impossible. How could you possibly have a
wrong way to represent list? Well, you could say, "represent" and "not represent." That unfortunately does not solve it. It does to some degree, but it won't immediately give you a long stream of R/Ses. It'll make the pc feel better. "What does present time not consist of?" may not give you R/Ses, but it'll make the pc feel better, see. But you don't get your item and we're trying to do 2-12, see? We're not trying to make the pc feel better or worse. We're just trying to get our items and get the pc's bank in some kind of a condition to find goals on, actually.

What we're trying to do is clear away his PTPs, get out of the road his hidden standards and open the highball for 3-21. And most – most cases – in fact, practically all cases have got PTPs and hidden standards, and those that have been cleared, have been cleared in spite of these. And in at least one case I know of – after the case had gone Clear, couldn't quite stay Clear, you know, keep falling off of it about every two weeks. The PTP had never been gotten out of the road.

In other words, the technique was powerful enough, actually, to clear somebody without removing the PTP. And... but boy, it had really taken some doing. She slams on "LRH." And her... she's been getting less Clear and less Clear and less Clear. I'm a problem to her. She's committed some overts, you see? She deserted her post and intended to cave in the place down there, before she got Clear, and then she's never – never straightened this out. You see what's happened?

But this is pretty tricky. It's almost impossible, see, to clear or audit a pc sitting there with a PTP. 2-12, oddly enough, can be run on a person with another PTP than the one you're picking up and you can still get the item. I know I've had that as subjective reality lately. Suzie hadn't been bothering to clean up any PTPs on me to run the session. And just before the session, you see, I get fifteen, twenty telegrams – "Kennedy threatening to commit suicide unless you ..." [laughter] You know, that kind of thing.

And I come into session, you know – PTP. And I try to get them off and put my rudiments in; she pays no attention to it. And goes on and it all lists up and packages are perfectly all right. Although the pc gets a little dispersed at times.

In other words, you're auditing the central PTP so actually you can audit beyond and by and along with current PTPs, you see?

Well, man, you can't run 3-21 currently with a PTP, particularly a PTP of magnitude. To find a goal, the pc's attention has got to be all there. So you have to get the big, the big, the big PTP that is unknown to the pc, actually. He doesn't know what his present time problem is. He'll give you lots of present time problems, but he'll never tell you what it is.

That one's in his road, and then the hidden standard. You know what a hidden standard is. The individual's hidden standard is, if Scientology is answered by this, you can get a list of hidden standards, by the way. "What would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology really worked?" That is your – the perfect question. That gives you a whole list of hidden standards.

You'll be surprised. "My left ear would have to stop burning." Actually, every time this person has ever been processed, they look at their left ear, see, to see whether or not it is still burning. Now, if the left ear is still burning, then they know the process hasn't worked.
But if their left ear is burning a little less, then they know the process has worked slightly. And they give you all of their goals and gains straight off an index of the burning left ear. I'm not joking.

You'll find this in a vast majority of pcs, if you search for it. "What would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology really worked?" Just for fun sometime, and as an exercise to understand a hidden standard a little better, you ought to take somebody and have him list a few. But of course, if you don't complete the list, he's liable to have an ARC break.

But anyhow... He'll give you a whole bunch of these things, you know – his stomach would have to stop hurting, or something. Well, actually, this hidden standard is quite interesting. It is a circuit which is telling him what to think. And that's the 100 percent definition of what a hidden standard is. It's a circuit that is telling him what to think. And it's got some kind of a signal system rigged up. You know, it works if. That's actually a communication-type system. It's quite involved. It's like an automatic trainstopping-signal system put up by the Baltimore-Ohio or something, you know? Like a train stops at section 83, and the brakes – potential brake shoes and lights go on in all other sections in that particular zone and area. And a small man jumps up with a flag and waves it in the nose of the engineer and knocks his coffee cup out of his hand.

All kinds of super systems, you know, they're very complex. A hidden standard is not a simple system. It's a circuitry response. You see, that is an item, in other words, that he consults. And he says to this item, "Is it true?" And the item has a signal system by which it tells him whether it is true or false.

And most people you are expecting to leap up in the air and tell you, "Oh, yes, I understand Scientology works," have first had to ask one of these systems. Quite interesting. They don't think at all. They read the record on one of these systems. The FDA – give you a rather degraded example. They think the whole world is composed of two valences. There's two valences. The world is composed of victims and victimizers. There are no other items.

The fellow manufactures cars; he's a victimizer. Fellow buys a car; he's a victim. So of course, he's dead against industry. Because all industry or manufacturers or managers or something are baddies, and all consumers are victims. Everybody's a victim that isn't an emanator of some kind, see? And those guys are victimizers.

Lacking any other than these two terminals, of course, they themselves are victimizers and the only thing that they will ever create is a victim.

Those people will never create anything but a victim. And the more power they get the more victims they create. Nothing ever works out. You finally get communism, socialism, super-liberal-osis of some kind or another, where you've got all of the – the whole country, the population is a victim, see? They're all victims.

Now, a fellow who stands on his own two feet – this solves a lot of riddles, by the way – the fellow who stands on his own two feet in such a government is regarded as – there must be something very wrong with him. In other words, self-reliance, the worker who wants a job or likes his job or something – there's something wrong with him. So they just move him
aside. He... something wrong with him. They just get rid of that one quick, because there can be no such terminal. Life is a sort of a dreary game that goes on between all of these victimizers who have to be stopped, and all of these victims, and there's nothing else goes on in life. It's one of the weirdest looking pictures you ever wanted to take a look at.

That's a do-gooder in first, second, third, fourth and overdrive. [laughter] And that's all the tune he plays. And he's trying to protect everybody from himself. He gets down to a point where everybody is his own victim. That's all the – all the way anything categorizes. And this gets to be very, very, very upsetting to these boys, because they eventually can see no purpose in life except making more victims, you see, or holding off more victimizers or something.

Look at all the elements of life that are missing in this type of a combination, you see. Nobody ever likes to buy cars, nobody ever likes to make cars, you see. All those elements are missing. There might be billions, hundreds of billions of other types of valences, but they miss all these. So it gets down to this two-pole proposition. Of course, they're a pushover for anybody who comes along and says, "The poor worker."

"Oh, the workers are victims, huh? Oh. Oh, well, yes. Well, let's see if we can't cut their hours and raise their pay."

And that goes on, but it goes over a whole cycle, and as these boys pass into charge, they take away all the pay and give them twenty-four hours as their daily schedule. They've done it in Russia and all over the world. I'm just not talking through my hat.

I really got one into the Bantu down in South Africa. They were talking about "Communism! Communism! Oh, marvelous stuff, this communism! Oh, boy, ug-ug-ug-ug-ug!" you know.

And I said, "Do you realize that you don't get paid for working in a communism?"

And he says, "Is that so?"

I said, "Yeah." I said, "They don't give you any salary."

And they thought about this and they walked around in circles about it and that was the end of communism in South Africa. That's why it isn't down there now. [laughter, laughs]

The white man – he's not quite that smart. He doesn't grasp this that quick. He's not quick like that. He doesn't recognize that the end product of this sort of thing is no pay of any kind whatsoever. But the Bantu, he was plenty smart. He grabbed that in a hurry. Actually, you could just see them unload off the bandwagon in all directions. I'd get to talking to them on a street corner, you know, or the back lot or something like this, and they always bring up these burning questions. And I let them have a few data.

Well of course, that's a do-gooder gone mad. He's got nothing but victims left. The way to handle him, of course, is to sympathize with him. [giggles] You know, "You poor fellow!" You know, "Fate has not permitted you to get ahead the way you should've." And he'll go right from the victim-maker valence in which he is in, see – he'll go straight into the role of the victim. He's defeated instantly. That's a valuable datum for you to know.

Because you'll run into them plenty. The world just abounds with them. The UN practically consists of nothing else. They've made all the main Congo victims now. Now they've
got all of Katanga. Katanga was the victim maker, you see. They made victims out of the – out of Katanga. They fixed them but good. And now everybody can be a victim. And you watch it, the next boy that comes in there to take control will be a real victim maker. He'll be a honey.

This has nothing to do with whether or not you like humanity. If you like humanity you leave that kind of politics alone. You think I'm a rabid Tory if I talk like that. No, I'm just as rabid on the subject of Tories! I'm what's called indiscriminate and unspecialized in the number of oppterms I can list. [laughter]

Now, you've got to look this over and recognize that one – that the thing man is tuned up to see first is an enemy. And when they go completely potty, they can see nothing but enemies. Everything is an enemy.

I've seen a little beetle crawling across the floor and wondered whether or not he rock slammed on PT. See, that'd make everything was an enemy. You know, probably that's true. This probably is your last rung of case. You say, "Present time," and it rock slams like crazy. See? That immediately tells you that you've got nothing – you've got nothing you could list as a represent list. See, because they all depend on present time as an understood factor. That'd be pretty grim, wouldn't it? You – they could only oppose.

And here's the type of question you would ask: You see, your do-gooder never recognizes he's a victim maker. He loses that. That's out of sight, that's missing. He'd never put down a victim maker. You'd have to ask him a question... You haven't got victim to list from, don't you see, so you have to ask him a question – a simple question like this, is: "Who or what in present time would have your problems?" And he'll put terminals.

Now, you've got numerous variations of this. Nobody recognizes what he is being as easily as what he is facing. In other words, terminals are harder to pick up than oppterms at the entrance to a case. So you get wrong way to represent lists and you get dead horses and you get skunks. And that's the source of all of these. And you must ask a question which delivers into your hands, terminals.

You have somebody rock slamming on "reasonable people" and the list doesn't go anywhere or it cycles, there's something wrong with it. It's going to be an endless list, there isn't anything going to wind up on it, it doesn't R/S; if you did null it, it skunks. That kind of thing. You're going to ask him, "Who or what would object to 'reasonable people'?" In other words, you can swing – you understand that you can run a represent either way. See, you have... that's not an oppose. That's a rather oppose-type question. I wouldn't recommend it. But I'm just trying to give you the idea.

You say, "In present time, who or what would have your problems?" You've got to ask him, "Who or what in present time would live the life you are living?" "In present time, who do people... who or what do people think you are?" You... I'm trying to teach you the method of thinking, not give you a bunch of pat lines to list, see? You've got to ask him a question, see, by which he will list terminals.
It could be as simple as this: "Who's looking at me?" You wouldn't say, "What are you that is looking at me?" you know. You could ask him for something like this: you'd say, "Who's looking at me?" or "Who might be looking at me?" or something like this.

And this character that had laid dead horses like crazy, wrong way to represent lists, nothing could null, the thing always skunks and so forth, would lay you down probably a very nice rock slamming list, which would rapidly terminate in a reasonable number of pages, would have less rock slams on the last page than the first page, would be very nullable, and you would be able to take off from there.

It's just the accident. Some cases have an oppterm – probably the majority – have an oppterm as the first item up. In other words, all this is... you not only see the pc deal cards off the top of the deck – you know, he's just like he's dealing a deck of cards as his items. Pock-pock-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pock. He'll just deal them out. Well, that's actually just like a deck of cards. The first one comes first.

Pcs very often dramatize the next item to the one that you are calling. In other words, that card is ready to come up next, so it's being restimulated. All right. Similarly, packages come up the same way. And you can get a hold of a pc – the majority of pcs, the first item up is an oppterm. They're a bit overwhelmed, don't you see. So they're being an oppterm, and so forth, and they name an oppterm and it comes up very easily. That's the side of the package that's going to materialize. So you take it from there and you list it out and you oppose it and everything is fine.

Ha-ha, yeah, but these other characters that have been giving you a bad time – and they're not few – that list wrong way represents and cycling lists, you see, and skunks and dead horses and any one of these manifestations; endless lists that won't null on represent – these characters simply have a terminal as the next one up. And of course you're asking an oppterm-type list question. So you must ask a terminal-type list question.

The crudest rendition of it would be, "Who the hell are you, bud?" [laughter] That would be very crude, but is in essence what it is. You say, "What problems do you have in present time?" Remember that "You, you, you, you..." See, that... there's a "you" there, and that's an undifferentiated pronoun. So you have to back up back of it and differentiate that pronoun. You say, "Who or what are you?" in some way or another. "Who'd have your problems?"

You've listed a dead-horse list. Ask him, "Who or what would oppose all these things?" You'd get a valid list, see? Give him the list so he could hold them. You'll get a rock slamming list. You get the idea?

There's too many tricks in this, there's too many ways you could do this for me to overburden you with rote. I just want you to firmly get the idea of what this is all about. And that is that the majority of pcs can deal off an oppterm and go sailing, see? And you've got that as a rock slamming item, it's reliable, you oppose it, and 2-12 works gorgeously. That's the majority of them. The rest of them that you're going to have trouble with have got a terminal there as the next one up, and unless you ask for that type of list – bang!
So you more or less count on the fact that they're an oppterm-type case, until proven otherwise. And all of a sudden you find this case is *oaaugh-umba-rupp!* Dead horsing, haven't seen any big R/Ses, doesn't look good to you.

Do a flip. List something else.

Give you an example: One of them was, "Who or what would you hold off?" It's liable to get a terminal on it yet.

All right, let's reverse this list and do it the other way to. "Who or what would hold off things?" That'd be good enough, you see, to get a terminal on the list. They all don't that smoothly translate. But you do a type of list that gives the terminal, and you wont have any more dead horses and wrong way to lists. And that's how you can have a backwards represent list.

Okay?

Thank you.
R2-12 NEVERS
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Okay. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, January 15, AD 13. The planet Earth, as much of it as be... will be with us for awhile.

I don't know, I've told you everything I know. Haven't got anything else to tell you. I can punch up a few points for you, however.

There are a bunch of nevers arising. You're getting nevers in 2-12. And you avoid the nevers and you'll make somebody nervous. You've got "Never represent a rock slamming item." That is something you just never do. And that means anything you have ever seen rock slam. See, it might not be rock slamming now, but it might have rock slammed. And that makes you nervous.

All lists have a source. All lists have a source. The source is something. And that is an assumed arbitrary. And that is the most dangerous point of 2-12. There is the point where you need a little bit of luck. You say, "In present – what does present time consist of?" Something like that, you see. You get a nice list, it's perfectly nullable, it goes out to one rock slamming item seen during nulling, everything is fine. You oppose what you get, that all travels beautifully. No – no strain. You wind up with a nice rock slamming item and then you oppose it, because it's still rock slamming – the rule is, of course, that if the thing is still rock slamming you oppose it – and you get your perfect package. All that is fine.

But where does this list come from? In other words, all lists have a source. Now, we find out that an arbitrary source is pretty dangerous. It isn't somebody has interpreted this already, the misinterpretations will fly around like mad! But somebody's already interpreted this. You take an arbitrary list and if you see more than one R/S on it then you – it isn't complete and you complete it. That isn't what we did recently. That just came down on telex today as an interpretation. That's wrong. If you just don't use arbitrary lists! That's that. See, that just takes care of the whole question. So you never use an arbitrary list – just never do it.

Every now and then somebody sees an item, "waterbucks." Crash, crash, crash, crash, crash, crash, crash! "Oh, will you look at that beautiful, beautiful item! Oh-ho-ho! Oh, that's marvelous! This guy's got sen on it. Ho-ho." They just can't keep their paws off of it, you see. They've got to oppose it, right now. The pc's probably rock slamming on "auditor" at that moment, but that's beside the point.

So, they oppose "waterbucks" and this goes on endlessly and interminably and horribly, and the bank is collapsing on the pc and all is getting more and more ghastly and life looks worse and worse. And the main danger is the auditor says, "Well, just look." If he's very new, he says, "Well, 2-12 doesn't work." Now, I'm sure all of you, each one of you, some time
or another, since the advent of 2-12, has said, to himself or to somebody else, that it doesn't work. See, that includes me! See, I too have said, "Ha-ha." I've said, "Well, it can't be taught." You know, that was my adjudication, you see.

I've also said, "Boy, it just can't work, it doesn't work." You see? Well, what that is, is you're running into bug factors – bug factors of one kind or another – and either the answer hasn't come your way, or you have missed something someplace or another. Because actually nothing caves in a pc quicker than 2-12.

So we've got our next never. Never abandon 2-12! Because nothing else is going to patch up what 2-12 has mucked up. This is one of those – this is one of those gee-whizzers that only patches itself up. The reason why we know it is an ultimate-type process is because it repairs itself. And that, of course, by Definition, is an ultimate-type process. The ultimate process will repair itself. In other words, run right, it repairs what has been run wrong.

Now, the other never there is – never try to patch up 2-12 with something else. Because you won't ever make it. I'll give you an instance. Wrong list, wrong way to, pc ARC broke, the item picked out was not the final item on the list and then it was opposed wrong way to. You know, I mean it's just a good mess-up, see. And said, "Well, that's – that's fine, now the best thing to do is just to prepcheck this whole thing out. And just forget the whole thing." I proceeded to do so, got the needle clean as a whistle, pc smiling, cheerful, everything was fine and next day was four feet below bottom again. So I patched it all up again, got rid of all of the auditing, straightened it all out beautifully, and so forth. And within a few hours the pc was four feet below the bottom! In other words, it just kept going like this. I finally went back and completed the list and the pc was fine. You know, I fixed up the original list that had had an item grabbed too soon on it, got the right item for that list and opposed it properly and abandoned the list that was wrong way to. Everything's fine.

Actually, you inadvertently will make this test some day. You inadvertently will do so. You'll sweat it out, trying to patch up the pc at the end of the session. The pc seems all ARC broke and you just don't seem to be making the grade at all, you see. And you've found an item – you found an item, "a gut-shot bear," you see? And the pc's always complaining about his guts and he's always saying he "can't bear it." [laughter] So you say, "Well, it must be the item." What you've missed is all items have an influence on the pc, whether they're reliable items or not, you see? It isn't that a – the item you choose didn't have an influence on the pc.

Anyway, you took this thing and you're trying to do something with it and you gave it to the pc and then you tried to patch up the ARC breaks. You think they're coming from someplace else. And finally in desperation you say, "Well, that item, 'a gut-shot bear,' that is not your item. We're going to complete the list." And all of a sudden the pc's right up there, right up top, face clears up, goes white, everything! Magic! See? Just telling him it's not his item, when it wasn't – in other words, telling him the truth of the situation – accomplishes more in just that short breath, than, frankly, twenty-five hours of Prepchecking! I think it's quite remarkable, see?

And that's the degree that 2-12 only patches up 2-12. It's one of those self-resolving little miracle whizzers. It solves itself. And there's no other processes that completely do. Yes, they solve what they do but they don't also solve all cases. That's the slight difference. We've
had processes and all Scientology has solved itself. But in actual fact they don't... haven't solved rapidly all cases.

Now therefore, for that reason alone, it's worth taking these risks, it's worth knowing it, it's worth studying it, it's worth getting good on it, it's worth an awful lot of things, but you remember that there are a few nevers. I've given you the chief never – is, never let somebody lose their records or keep inaccurate records or fail to note down what happened on the auditor's report and on the lists. And never, never scamp the problem of records. Just don't do it. Because nobody will be able to patch up anything easily.

Now, there is a method of straightening up a case where the records are lost and that is of interest to you. It's an E-Meter job. And you go back and you carefully trace down to the minute and, you know, time-spot the time when the pc's case caved in and then go back and trace very carefully the session in which it occurred and then put your mid ruds in for that session. "That session on the 21st of December," you see, "1955, 63..." or something, whatever it is "...has anything been suppressed?" Well, by putting the mid ruds in, his memory returns and he can give you far more about it.

And then having patched this – it doesn't patch up the case, see. It just – he tells you more about it. And you'll recover the missing data, and the missing list, and it... you can deduce by some guesswork or another, synthesize if you have to, what the name of the list was and sometimes there wasn't a list – it just was a number of items. And there was no list title. And you have to synthesize what the list title would be in order to complete the list. You get the trick?

But this is pretty grim, this – but patching up 2-12 without the records is so arduous that you can just lay down a rule. That never lose and never miskeep records. Such a thing can happen, you see, as some utterly green auditor someplace is... he nulls the list and it had rock slams on it and he missed the thing. He missed the rock slamming item. It'll be missed from there on out. The pc'll be all upset, so on.

And here's another never. Never Attribute a violent ARC break to anything but a wrong item or a not-found item – which means a complete list. The ARC breaks are always attributable – whether they're demonstrated by despair or violence or anything else – but ARC breaks are always attributable to 2-12, not the auditing. Don't ever make the mistake of thinking it was because the pc had a missed withhold in the session that he finally blew up at you. The item is right but the pc had a missed withhold and therefore got an ARC break. Ha-ha! Don't make that mistake. Because when you don't complete the list ...

Oh, you get away with it often enough to make you foolish. You actually can get kind of foolish on this. Because you can make some of these mistakes, you see, and still get by. And then when you really run one into the brick wall, then you say, "Well, probably, that can't be it." But let me tell you, if a pc ARC breaks badly in doing 2-12, 2-10, any of this Routine 2, he ARC breaks badly, you attribute it to the Routine 2. Don't attribute it to the pc's current life and all that sort of thing. Never, never attribute a violent ARC break, a violent decay of case, which is the same thing, I mean, pc gets so apathetic, won't talk to you, something like that. Any manifestation of an ARC break of a violent nature, never attribute it to anything but the Routine 2.
Actually, that's a very sound rule. It sounds very extreme when you first take a look at it, but it's a very sound rule. You see an ARC breaky pc come – this applies to you not just as an auditor, you understand, this applies to you in the workaday world of Scientology – you see this character come out screaming out of the HGC, slam the door, you know, and "Oh, this is just terrible!" and so forth, everybody's robbed him and all that sort of thing and it's terrible and it's terrible and ...

Well, don't stand around flat-footed! See, just, what the hell? See, who didn't complete the list? Who missed the item? That's your – that's your immediate response, see. Don't attribute it to something else. Don't get reasonable about it, see. You'll find out you're true every time.

And – pc's feeling bad and upset and so forth. Well, they can have the most fantastic things. Well, they got in an automobile accident and wrapped the car around a cop's neck and they're going to have to go to... By the way, if anybody ever sends you to jail, by all means, go to Alcatraz. They're tearing it down. I'm just thinking of the Federal government. Even their prisons are going to pieces. Have you – did you know that? We've got to audit those people, that's all there is to it, you know, because they're in a violent ARC break. Somebody's missed an item on the US government.

I think, personally, they missed it with a no-auditing situation. We haven't had any plan for auditing the government. We got one president audited. That was Truman. We ain't had anybody else audited. Now, I just think they're suffering from no auditing. Course – so of course, that leaves all items missed. And that's another way of missing items. But it isn't to a violent state. Somebody must have missed a list or something on the FDA. They must have. They must have. "What crumb are you?" or something like that – something. [laughter] "What type of insect egg did you come out of?" You know?

When you see these violent – these violent manifestations or swift alterations of case, or if you think it's a slow alteration of case, go back and find where it was swift. Never consider that an – case altered slowly. It didn't. It didn't deteriorate slowly on 2-12. It deteriorated fast! And you've got to go back and find the earliest item missed. Doesn't much matter how the item was missed, it got missed, that's for sure! There are several ways of missing an item.

Listing wrong way to, oddly enough, doesn't so much miss an item. You list right way to and don't complete the list, well, you'll get your biggest picnics when all of 2-12 is absolutely right. And then the list got extended. In other words, they had two rock slamming items on the original list, so they extended the list, found one rock slamming item and said that was it because they didn't have another rock slamming item, did they? And nothing else was now rock slamming, was it? In other words, that one rock slam seen on nulling is very valid, used the first time. But on further study here, it is of very poor validity the second time it's used. That's sad but true.

In other words, you had two rock slamming items on the list, as you nulled it. You're nulling the list, get two rock slamming items. Oh! Of course. Obviously the list isn't complete! Obvious! Now, going on nulling – pardon me ... By the way, going on nulling is senseless by the time you reach the second rock slamming item. You've got to continue that list.
And then go back and check those two items to find out if there's anything left on them. They can DR or something like that, but must be very slight indeed.

Now, you go on down and you get your final rock slamming item, and you say triumphantly, "Well, no one of these others – rock slams that went on are anything, nothing else – I didn't see anything else rock slam, so therefore that is the item and therefore, there you are, there is your item. And we now have your item and we've checked it all out and it is gorgeous." And the pc, makes sense to him and he looks brighter and he looks lighter and everything – and everything is fine, but we're checking the thing out – and let's say it's the first list, which is your – sort of your source list. This was in opposition to it or something – and the rock slam vanishes off the thing. It goes down to a DR suddenly.

This is rather typical. You haven't opposed it, but it suddenly dropped down to DR. The thing you got it from went out. But it still had a rock slam on it, but then all of a sudden, as the pc cognited, that disappeared. You'll find out right after that as long as it rock slams the pc is happy with it. But the second it ceases to rock slam he's unhappy with it. I mean the interest is accompanying the rock slam, don't you see? And the pc will all of a sudden find out something you're doing wrong with your meter, or something about you. Pc gets unhappy with the auditor, the auditing session, he never attributes it to the wrong item. He'll go on and hang onto the item. But there's a tone curve here. There's a shift. Well, don't ever attribute it to anything but the Routine 2. There's something wrong with the Routine 2.

You got to continue that list. Now, once in a blue moon you'll get yourself in the serious situation of having a list you can't continue, "In present time who or what are you upset about?" Now, you continue and the pc's upset. Well, you can go on and continue it and you eventually don't find a rock slamming item. Well, don't make the foolish mistake of going on and list fifty-five pages on it to find your next rock slamming item! Because it isn't there! You already got a pc that's overstrained on listing oppterms. List something like, "Who or what'd be upset about these problems that you've listed here on this list?" Something of that sort, but get it over on the other side of the picture here. You'll come back and find the item that was going to be there anyway. Pc couldn't confront it, didn't put it on the list.

Now, there's your main danger as you train auditors. One, that they don't learn that mild ARC breaks and upsets stem immediately – and little ones – stem immediately for just corny auditing. You know, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A. Pc a half an hour later is still trying to tell the auditor, "I thought you said 'express,' not 'suppress'!"

"But I didn't say 'express,' I said 'suppress'!"

"I know, but I'm trying to tell you... "

"Well, but I didn't, you know. I-I know. Awfully sorry if I did, but I-I really didn't, you see? I really huh, ha-ha, oh..."

Now, I'm talking about those things that don't pass away with the session. You know, these things that are – this guy is, "I-I don't know whether I'm going to live or not, you know? Huh-huh-huh. Life looks pretty hopeless to me, now." You know? You see somebody walking around that's been run on Routine 2, man, don't assign it to auditing skill, lack of, see? Just assign it to Routine 2. And you'll always be right.
You start to go into the end of the session, the pc was happy with the item and it rock slammed and the pc had some cognitions. And all of a sudden, the pc has an ARC break because you didn't have the meter plugged in for the can squeeze. Say the item again. It isn't rock slamming. Well, you just grabbed one too quick off the list, that's all. Isn't the pc's item. Check to find out a lot of things.

Now, never run a pc darker and darker and darker and more compressed and more and more caved in, and so forth. Just – when you notice that this is occurring, come off of it! There is no cycle, they don't get darker and lighter.

Just come right off of it. Second you notice something like that. When you... Now, here's another never. Never give a pc an item and do something else. Oh, I see somebody's had that happen to them! That is about the most distracting thing that can happen. Your chances of giving him a wrong item are great even though you can really ride the bicycle down the middle of the road. The reason why is, you see, you've got this five-page list and it had two rock slamming items on it and you extended it to seven pages, you got a beautiful rock slamming item. There it is, it matched the same thing that it came from, everything is fine and it's just fine and we say to the pc, "All right," we say, "Okay, now, there's your item, 'tiger.'"

Pc is going to have some things happen that are right or he's going to have some things happen that are wrong. And it's up to you to make that test of observation. And let me give you the never. You see, never do something else. Never give a pc an item and do something else, even when you think it's conditional. And never make the pc think that you're giving him an item when you aren't. That also you will... may goof with someday. Pc understood that you were giving him his item. And you were simply tiger drilling out a little DR that you had found, to make sure.

The pc has glommed onto this thing as his item. He didn't understand. Because pcs are not in a good state of comprehension when they're in the midst of a long list and all that sort of thing. You know, you can get into the most asinine windups and foul-ups that you ever wanted to get into. Make sure the pc knows what you're doing, see? Give him his reality factor. Tell him lists rock slam, tell him they don't rock slam, don't tell him what rock slammed, though. See, he'll fixate on it.

Don't – because this is this other never, see? Never give a pc an item, whether it is the item or other item that is going to be the pc's item or that the pc is going to think is his item and then do something else. This is a very serious thing for you to do. I'll give you an example: "Well, we found your item here, now. It's 'tiger.' Okay. All right. On this item 'tiger' has anything been suppressed? Okay. Oh-ho, that was clean. Anything on this item, 'tiger' – anything been invalidated?" and so forth. Don't be surprised if a chair hits you over the head!

Honest, this is just not a safe thing to do. I'm talking now about personal safety as far as the auditor's... *It's just not safe!* In the first place you've already put him in a state of shock! [laughter] Now you've given him, "On this item has anything been suppressed?" "Huhh, duh, huhh, huhh." It's, "Who are you?" you know? Even if it is his item or isn't his item. If it is his item you can get away with it once in a while. And brother, if it isn't his item you're liable to get his chair around your head. You really are.
See, you haven't allowed that minute or so there of good observation. What effect did this have on the pc? Your eyes must not be on the meter and you mustn't be doing something else when you give a pc an item like that. You've had this final R/S, nice thing, it seems to be a reliable item, and so forth, you've gone down the list, you've checked two or three of them. You say, "I'm just checking over some items here to see what they are." Put in the R-factor and "Everything's coming along all right." A little H-factor. And you know now, you know, pc doesn't know yet.

You make that a bit of a ceremony, see? And you pull that E-Meter up to you and then you look at the pc. You don't look at another thing. And you say, "All right. Apparently here your item is 'a tiger.' You got that? 'A tiger." And you watch that pc. And you watch him like a hawk. Because the wrong item, in those first few seconds, his face is going to darken. His eyes are going to go back in his head. His certainty level is going to alter. He may be in a comm lag for quite a little while before he has a certainty. And then it very well might be the item.

But you got to know some things. Did sudden mass appear? When you said it did he get a sudden mass? Sudden... does anything else appear in his perimeter? He'll say, well, yes, he's seen something, but it always seems to have been there. Well, take that with a grain of salt. That doesn't disprove the item but it's an indicator that it's wrong. Face gets dark after you've said it – uh-uh, that ain't it.

Another thing, pc may look sort of stunned – they usually do. Because you've hit them with something that they haven't been aware of for ages. The – actually the shock of getting one of these items delivered into your paws as a statement by the auditor. You can go over them on lists. Even then sometimes they get a shock from it. Sometimes a pc says, "aghh" And you say, "What's the matter?"

"Well, I don't know, you read 'a cat whisker' there and a horrible shot went up my spine!"

Well, that again savors of some of this other stuff I'm giving you. Don't let the auditor go on down the list to the next item and the next item and the next item. Let the pc tell you about this cat whisker, because, by God, there may be a cognition on it which has got it held up, see? Just say, "Well, how about this – well you – you got something to say about that item?" So forth.

"No, it's just this terrible spine, you know, it went up my back, and went zzzupp and wuff!"

And you say, "All right. You okay now?"

"Yeah. Oh yeah, it's all right." Go on down with your list. You understand?

But you can do a sudden shift of attention on a pc and put him into a hell of a state of tension. You hit this thing "cat whisker," see? It's followed by – it's followed by "waterbuck tiger," see. All right. "Cat whisker" and the pc says, "Ulp-eeep!" And you see the needle go off the dial – frown at him for the needle having gone off the dial, you know – and say, "Tiger. Waterbuck." You want to see a pc go right on in a cave, see? He's... you've fixated his attention and then slapped him, see, by shifting his attention.
So, the strongest item, even though it doesn’t produce bad effects on him, the strongest item you can give him, the one most calculated to stun him, is an RI. So you just don’t dish this thing out, you see, like an old plate of soup, you see. You really serve him up this one on a silver salver, you know. Take your... don’t take your eyes off the pc, you hear me now! Don’t take your eyes off the pc. Don’t go into a lot of chatter.

Sometime he will wonder, he will ask you, "Why are you sitting there so quietly."

"Just thought you might have something to say about it."

This gets him into thinking about it, you know. And he says, "Oh well, yes, a tiger." He's looking doubtful. You really can't tell what's going on yet or not. You haven't really been able to ascertain if he was getting darker or lighter, you're still in a little state of doubt yourself with regard to this thing, you know. He'll go on, "Huh! Wonder if that's why I've got fur on my ears! You suppose so?" Then recognize what you're looking at, see?

Now your next test: Does the rock slam continue as he talks about it or does it suddenly vanish? Ware shoal, if it suddenly vanishes. Now, get that meter so that while you're – while he start – after he starts cognition, you see, that's the second period. You've already got your period of inspection, then you've got your cognition period, if you want to get real technical, following that. You'll see that thing R/S, as long as he has cognitions on it.

And actually, if it's a real RI his cognitions on it are endless. It just goes on R/Sing. That's perfectly safe.

But you can get an item which is not the last item on the list – there's one still on the list to get, which R/Ses for a moment, the pc cognites for a moment, everything seems to go along beautifully, all tests are in. And then you sit back all ready to shape it up or find out whether it's a term or an oppterm, getting ready to list something to it, and the pc says, "Well, there've been quite a few times I've suppressed things in this session."

Oh, yeah? Here we go! Ha-ha-ha-ha! That was not the last item on the list. That was not the item. You didn't have your paws on the item. And that there is this funny condition where everything... there is one – this can happen – that the inspection is all right. He doesn't seem to get more mass. He seems to be cogniting. His skin tone is lighter. Don't you see? All this seems to be fine. And the R/S was there. And he gives you this cognition. And you look down and get ready to drill the doggone thing, you know – to find out whether or not it's this way or that or commit overts, you know – and he just ran out of R/S!

In other words, it blew as a lock on the right item. And at that moment it will follow the whole chain of sequence of a wrong item. Mass will show up, he will get darker, the R/S vanishes down to a DR. It's interesting. So that period of inspection is very important – very, very important. And never shift the pc's attention during a period of inspection. Just never shift his attention onto something else or doing anything else. Never do anything during this. It's quite important. And that way you'll save a lot of heartbreak on the thing. He won't get all tangled up and very ARC broke, then, if it's the wrong item. And you say, "Well, did any – any mass show up there?" Of course, this is not shifting his attention – he's right on it, you know?

"Oh, well, yes, this big, big round sphere showed up on the end of my nose."
"Yeah. Well, all right. Seem like your item all right?"

"I guess so. I-I-I guess, possibly."

His face is getting darker, just as you watch him, see. Thing to do at that moment – thing to do at that moment is just don't let it go any further. Say, "Well, all right. Now, I myself would like to make just a little bit further test on this if it's all right with you. I would like to list the list a little further."

He brightens up. You can add the fatal words, "That's not your item," and he'll brighten all the way up. You understand? But boy, you have to be pretty good. Because if it is his item and you tell him it's not, you also got an ARC break.

You get – you get how this little period goes? This is – this period of the presentation of the item to the pc can be the difference between a case that runs smoothly in spite of goofs and a case that compounds the goofs into a real – a real upside-down, backwards-and-forwards God-elp-us, see. The longer you let a pc keep a wrong item, the longer you list a wrong item, the more collapsed the pc is going to get. So in all patch-ups, when you decide to patch something up, patch it up accurately and patch it up now! Don't ever let your heels drag on patching a case up. Do it straight away.

The longer you let that case go, with everything wrong way to and so forth – in other words, you're not quite sure so you – I... this is the way it is. This is another never, is just never persist with a wrong action because you don't know what to do to correct it. Just never persist with a wrong action.

Lot of your difficulty comes from the fact that you persist occasionally with a list when you don't know what else to do. Well, you've got to do something. Actually, it'd be far better off... Somebody was telling me the other day he didn't have time to study the pc's case. Well, I don't know. I... you can take a pc's folder and look it over. It doesn't require any vast amount of time.

But in actual fact, rather than persist with a wrong action it is far, far better for you to say, "Well, put your cans down on the table there. I want to take a look at your line plot and go over this with you, right now." And it's far better, if the case is running wrong, to straighten out the case on session time. I'm not recommending this. But you would be far better off to straighten it out on session time than to persist with some kind of a wrong action just to put in auditing time! You understand?

You... it's a good – it's good sense to find out what you're doing before you do it! And it's very, very necessary to come off an evident wrong action the moment you discover it is wrong. Now, I'll give you an example. We say list the list both way to. "All right," you say, "Well, how much is a list – how much of a list do you have to list?" So I say to you a page. All right. That is actually one of these "dumb-ox" type responses, see? How do you ask a pc if he's tired, you know? So you say, well, you say – ask him, "Are you tired?" You know?

Now, let's look at this thing sensibly. You list it wrong way to, when do you come off of wrong way to list, in actual fact? Keep your eye on a pc. You'll see him getting darker. He starts to get – his skin tone and so forth starts to darken, well, his needle starts to tighten up, it's less loose than it was and so forth. This is only four items deep on this list. Oh, hell, get
out of there like a scalded cat! You say, "Well, that's fine. Thank you!" He's still listing, you know. "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you!" And he manages to get the brakes on and he stops.

You say, "Well, that's all of that. We're going to list this list the other way, apparently it is the other way." And you start listing that and you say aw... or tell him the truth, you know, "I'll have to confirm it the other way," if you haven't listed that yet – "And we'll go on with this."

In other words, don't persist with an action which is obviously worsening the case, hoping for the best. Now, there's an example here... This does not mean somatics. Brother, somatics have nothing to do with worsening a case. Cases improve up through somatics. Something that's wrong with some of the cases you will audit from time to time, is that they don't -- aren't getting any somatics. No pain. They don't get any sen. Well, it's a happy win, when all of a sudden they start to get pain or sen, don't you see? Somatics turn on, so you're winning. So, just because a case is getting somatics don't think it's getting worse.

I only would add that if I'd -- had not -- on occasions been remarked to me: "I had to stop the process because it was giving the pc so much pain." And I think of this poor pc sitting out in North Umbrella, California – ha-ha-ha! Who somebody stopped a list on because they were -- you know. Ho-ho-ho! It makes me feel bad.

So somatics aren't this. These are these other signs. Mass is obviously closing in on him. He's obviously getting darker. His eyes are going way out of gear. There's something going on here. The pc is looking older, and so forth. You'd better make damn sure what you're doing. Now, on occasion, a pc has gotten quite sick at his stomach. But actually, this has only been from a questionable source. There's something a bit wrong with the source or a wrong way to. There's been something wrong with that, when they get very violently sick at their stomach and start throwing up or something like that, or diarrhea or something. There's something wrong with the source. In other words, some -- usually it was an item which was picked out of the middle of an arbitrary list. You wouldn't expect that normally as a reaction.

But if it did happen as a reaction and I was absolutely sure of why I was doing it, I sure would go on with it. But don't ever persist with a wrongness. Now that you know that thing is wrong, knock it off now! See, just skip it! Pc is turning a bright green, don't keep on until he's a brighter green. Don't consider that you're always flawless and that you never make mistakes. You're going back, patching up neglected items, bypassed items. You're looking at this line plot and you're patching them all up and you're -- you're opposing all the bypassed items on this case. Getting it all up to present time. Everything is fine. And the case is coming along right. And you're listing and the case starts to look slightly yellow. And you list another -- this, if you didn't follow this rule would be what would happen, see -- you list another ten, fifteen, twenty items, the pc is now pretty yellow!

Now, you list another thirty, forty items and the pc is just... now got much yellower and starts to turn black around the mouth. "Oh," you say, "well, we really haven't proved the point yet, so we will list another seventy or eighty items on this thing." Pc's tongue starts to swell up and he can't get it out because he can't get his mouth closed over his tongue, so forth. You say, "Well, that doesn't prove very much, everything..." [laughter] "This list ran it in and
therefore will run it out." [laughs] No, it won't! Oddly enough it'll only run out when you take the source and complete the list the source came from, you know? You've got to complete the source list. That's what's wrong.

You're doing something wrong with an item. You can also do this with a wrong way to from a right item. There aren't too many things here that go wrong. You're working with a finite number of things, but they can add up to several combinations.

Anyway, you go back and you take a look at this to find out where this doggone source came from. And by God! A represent of a rock slamming item has gotten by you! Somebody at, well, some time or another had done 3D Criss Cross on this character and had left this item sitting there and it wasn't identified immediately to your view as having come from a rock slamming item. Or maybe you did it yourself at some time or another and you hadn't noticed this interesting fact – wrong source. So everything is going into the soup in a grand fashion.

No, when you see something going wrong, don't be nervous about it, you're not going to kill anybody if you know your business. It is only the amateur surgeon that leaves his tools inside and joins the AMA or BMA. You know? It's only the amateur. You know, something is wrong with the fellow's knee, so they cut off his foot, you know. And then they find out they've cut off the foot of the wrong leg! [laughter] So they cut off his arm because he irritates his knee by scratching it. [laughter] And a low-toned government, of course, gives him medals for doing it.

But the main point is here, they get into some wild thing of really not knowing what the hell is wrong, but trying to look good and trying to go on and not try to go back and understand what the hell they're doing that makes it go wrong. So therefore, you want to develop a very bright eye on the subject of the pc's appearance. And you can get it down to where actually you can tell a pc's difference of appearance, the then-now, you can tell it in any given ten minutes. It starts to worsen in any given ten minutes, let's find out what's going on. It's not – nothing to be nervous about. Nothing to be nervous about, but it just picks a pc up, it saves auditing time like mad, See?

Actually, a pc can take an awful lot before he kicks the bucket. He can. He can take a terrific amount. He can take an awful beating. You'd be amazed. And recover from it. If you remember the earlier never, is don't try to heal it up with something else. If he got bad on Routine 2, then he'll get better on Routine 2. Providing it's patched up properly.

Now, you can start compounding a felony by the case has had three case errors on it so you add a fourth. Now, that's wrong, so you add a fifth. Now, you find that's wrong, so you add a sixth. Well, the never here is to never let case errors accumulate or multiply. Don't let case errors accumulate or multiply. It's all right to have had two or three errors on a case, so what? But the second that you're aware of the fact that there is an error on the case, why, put it together. Remembering that one of the errors on the case is to fail to complete a cycle of action.

You're going down the list "pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, it's a right way to list, it's going beautifully, it's "Who or what does present time consist of?" Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, you're going right down the line, everything is fine, rock slamming, you're going to
get an item. And halfway down that list you happen to get – halfway through the list, you happen to discover that the pc is – "My God! This pc has been upset and rather ARC broke, ever since we found 'Valhalla.' I hadn't noticed that before. And 'Valhalla' has never been opposed, and it probably came from an incomplete list. Ulp!"

Well, the way you multiply the error is abandon the list that is now running all right and leave that as an incomplete cycle of action and go back and patch up this earlier action, you see, because that's liable to lead you to another earlier action and then you abandon the patch-up of the first one you found and you go back to the second one, the earlier one and patch that, and you're just multiplying errors, don't you see?

Now, it is a toss-up. Let's say the... it's the whole question is answered by, "Is the case running all right?" And it's a toss-up. It's a toss-up. Apparently the pc seems to be interested in the list we're doing. We're all of a sudden aware of the fact the pc's apathy is probably coming from something a bit earlier. And we look this up.

Well, in that case the pc isn't running all right, is the pc? See, there's your point of judgment. And there's a rule that can go along with this, is before starting a new action make sure that all of your earlier actions are correct and complete. And you'll always avoid having to make that gruesome decision. Now that we know why represent lists look so funny sometimes and now that we know we must never take an arbitrary list – and I mean never.

You know, all lists stem from an arbitrary source. They all do. And you can be slightly unlucky. Well, you take an arbitrary list. Just like the List One we're using, the Scientology List One. That's an arbitrary list. And you assess that thing and it's not a complete list. The reason we got away with it to the degree we did is because the pc had never listed it and therefore was not complete or incomplete. But the pc very rapidly restimulates on that list and you get more than one R/Sing item on it or something like this and of course, it's obviously an incomplete list, because it follows – whether the pc listed it or not – the rules of a complete list. So therefore, we have to find out what it came from and complete it.

But look, what it came from is an arbitrary point. See, although we're abandoning arbitrary lists or precanned lists and aren't doing them – see, good training, and so forth. In desperation sometime you're just going to get tired of this pc and you're going to say, "Well, I'm just going to oppose 'auditor' and see what happens." And you're going to get away with it and that's all right. Auditing's always been what you could get away with.

But remember the point you depart from to get his first List One listed by the pc is also an arbitrary point. You had to select it. Now, to reduce this, clearing the auditing command is always good sense. There are three universes for listing. There's the present time physical universe, right up in PT, that the pc is cheek by jowl with in his life and liveliness. There is the second universe which is the universe of auditing. And that's the auditor and the meter and that sort of thing, and now the reason that has to be separated out as a separate universe is, you know, some pcs will sit there rock slamming like mad and never realize they... there's anything wrong between them and an auditing session, and making no gains at all. You'll run across this phenomenon often enough to make this an important division.

And then you've got your third universe of the parts of existence. That's slightly less than whole track. Then in view of the fact that we've got positive and negative on all these
things, here are six potential lists. The three basic universes, positive and negative on each one, six potential lists. I've just given you another variation tonight. List each one of them as a terminal list or each one of them as an oppterminal list, and of course, you have a brand-new series on the thing, and you have a total of twelve. You get why the variations are, because you can have an oppterminal negative and an oppterminal positive, and a terminal negative and a terminal positive.

Now, you can also make an error – there are two errors you can make here – one is failure to clear the auditing command from which you're getting this arbitrary source point. You're already using an arbitrary source point, see. And to fail to test it and clear it – let me put it that way – to fail to test it and to clear it. Now, what do you test it for? Well, you're going to test it for R/S, because you're just never going to list a... represent a rock slamming item. Never. So the first thing you're going to do is test for R/S. I don't care what it is! Test it for R/S!

Now, you can segment it and test the segments. Sooner or later somebody's going to – going to rock slam on, "Who or what..." You read him the question and see a – see a vit! of a rock slam and read him sections of it and you're all of a sudden going to find some section of that thing R/Ses. Well, if it's a represent list you better omit that section, man! See, that's a never represent a rock slamming item. So therefore, that continues over into never represent a rock slamming question. And beyond that point you rather takes your chance.

But here's a way of narrowing the number of chances you take. Clear the auditing command with the pc and vary it around until it gets real to him. "In present time who or what are you associated with?" He can't make it. But "In present time what is he in contact with?" That makes good sense to him. He seems to be able to list that. You got this?

So, as far as the list is concerned, is never try to list a list question that the pc cannot answer. That sounds awfully elementary, but it's already happened. In other words, clear it with the pc and get it squared away so the pc knows what he is supposed to answer here. Get his agreement to answer this thing. And you can have an ARC break or an upset or a wrong list and so forth, just on that crazy little point.

You just make up your mind carelessly someday, you just carelessly, bang! – or you'll see some auditors do it that you're supervising – carelessly bing! He'll say, "All right, what's present time consist of?" He just audited a pc a short time ago, you see or you have, and he had very good luck with this list. So you know it's... And case is going no place. The guy can't list and he's obviously having trouble, and so forth. This is – this is an auditing error, not an R2 error, more than anything else, because "clear the auditing command" has always been part of auditing. Although we haven't been doing it or stressing it very hard lately, I'm stressing it hard here, because it goes right over into a Routine 2 error.

And you get some little boy or something and he can't answer this, it's just too many words and too much this and that for him. And he cant list it. He doesn't understand it. And you finally say, "What's here?" or "What's life?" You know? And he lists it like a bomb. "What life are you living?" you know, or something. You know, you clear it around until it's something he can answer.
All right. Now, you can get a missed withhold effect – this is quite important – you can get a missed withhold effect by listing in the wrong universe of these three universes. And as I told you in the earlier lecture, you can get various dead horses, skunks, cycling lists, and so forth, by taking a wrong way to. You know, you're listing a terminals – you're listing an oppterm list, you should be listing a terminals list. You get the idea. The "Who or what would have these problems?" is what you should be listing. "Who or what would have these problems?"

Now, you can get a similar mess by choosing the wrong universe. You should be listing the auditing session and you're listing the present time environment, the life and livingness universe, you see, of the pc, or you're trying to list the parts – the wheel of life type of thing, you know, the dynamics list, and so on, when you damn well ought to be running his life and livingness. And he'll actually ARC break – this is an important point to you – he'll ARC break just as though you'd missed an item. That's worth knowing.

He won't ARC break the same way just by reason of not clearing the command or something. He'll go on and try and he won't ARC break. But you should be listing the auditing session and you go and list the parts of the universe, you know, or the parts of the dynamics. The guy's acting just like you missed an item. And you can't quite figure out what the hell's wrong. Well, the thing is, is you missed the whole universe. See, the next item ready to come up was an auditing item and you didn't ask for it. So that is a danger. It won't be regular and routine and you won't always be doing it.

So there's always a little bit of luck and a little bit of thought goes into choosing what type of a list to list on this pc. So it's got to be the right universe and it's got to be the right terminal or oppterm – whatever's going to come up next. Don't feel too bad if you occasionally hit a dead horse or something like that.

But, the final never on this whole list of nevers – I don't pretend that this is a complete list of nevers – well, they haven't all been invented, you know? But these are some principal ones that are quite interesting – is never in your anxiety to clear somebody or pacify somebody who demands auditing, never fail to get out of the road his hidden standards and gross unseen present time problems before you try to clear him. That is what Routine 2 is designed for.

Actually, it's designed only to get out of the road his PTPs, only to get out of the road his hidden standards, clear the way, open up the track and get the fellow so that you can find his goal and clear him. Well, never omit that step. Because the only thing that's been chancy about clearing and the only thing that's been sour with clearing, general, on a broad basis, have been wrong goals. And the source of wrong goals are the existence of present time problems and hidden standards.

On a very few pcs, no goal at all could be found, it was so serious. No goal at all could be found. Endless, endless, endless, endless, endless lists! Well, those endless, endless lists are not caused by a charged up goal list. You're listing on by a present time problem and you are listing straight on by, all goofed up, a hidden standard and that is squarely in the road of everything you're trying to do.
Because it is: goals go out hard, cases messing up, pcs sort of ARC broke, you can't quite... your liability of getting a wrong goal is very great. Now, you get such a good clean, clean goal, when you've done your 2-12 real well on a pc, that it's very well worth knowing. It's just happened, I just got a despatch just before I came over here. It was rather remarkable, but they'd run this pc on 2-12 and they'd gotten something on the order of about six items, three packages. And they did a goals list and the goal is right there! See? I mean, you know, practically number one or two on the list. Rocket read every time! No suppresses, noth... every time you say the goal – beautiful rocket read.

Now, as you know in your experience with 3-12, I mean with 3-21, the number of times you find a virgin goal, when just found, it reads and then it flicks and then it reads, you know? That kind of behavior. You almost never can get one of the confounded things to read, pow, pow, pow! Every time, you know, rocket read, rocket read, you know? And then you don't have to worry about suppresses or fight with the pc at all, you just keep reading it and it keeps reading.

Well, they've just found a goal like that and it's the first one that's come up the line. It's got reported in here from California. And I think it is quite, quite interesting, because it's in actual fact, the first Central Organization goal that's been reported after the fact of having run 2-12 on somebody. Interesting.

Well, most of the troubles you are having – you go back and review lectures and notes and so forth from 1961, 1960. The troubles which were recounted are centered around PTP and hidden standards. And that's talked about and talked about. There were innumerable methods used to get by these things – nothing got by them. Now, that we can get by them, with Routine 2 – it is not a simple process, it is one which is – requires precision, but it also doesn't have endless bugs in it.

It's got plenty of indicators, and I'm grooving it down to where the indicators are better and better, and more and more noticeable. That's my job right now. And to cut down the amount of work done before you hit the nail on the head.

So happens, that this process – Routine 2-12 – also does more for a case than anything we've had before. But understand the relationship here. See, that it does more for a case, that's just dandy. We're very happy with that. That isn't what we expect of it. But it just so happens it does more for a case. So it's a natural to run on almost anybody. Raw meat or anything else. You're not telling them, "I'm going to run this to get your goal." You tell them, "I'm going to run this."" When in actual fact, you're trying to sweep enough items aside so as to pave the way toward the goal. Therefore, it is up to you to run very smooth 2-12 and very rapid 2-12 – very smooth, very rapid. Because the more you goof it the harder it will be to get a pc's goal. The more wrong items you find, the more garbage you're leaving in PT, see? You're really strewing the track. Fortunately 2-12 takes it apart. So the final never turns up and that is: Just never mistake the purpose of 2-12.

Thank you very much.

Good night.
A TR demonstration given on 16 January 1963

LRH: This is Ron and we're going to do a series of demonstrations tonight of TR 0. And these demonstrations are made with the coach, who is a senior student, and a student in the thing is the newcomer.

Now, your attention is put on this because the teaching of TR 0 is quite important. It's the number of TR 1, 2, 3 and 4 that a person does, actually, which makes his auditing presence. And it's the best way we've ever found to make auditing presence and so this is the way we make auditing presence. And you should get used to these because you will be taking back to your area a good concept of what the TRs are all about.

We'll – probably at a later date we'll work hard on the CCHs so that we can give you those as well.

The essence of TR 0 is to teach a natural confrontingness. You go into an Academy where new students are first beginning to audit and you will see a tremendous stiffness, a fantastic stiffness. Now, actually, it goes this way: They go into the co-audit and they are not so stiff, they don't seem to be so stiff. They seem to be more relaxed. But, nevertheless, you will see them sort of lose their grip on their confront because it isn't indoctrinated into them.

And it's like golf. Very often a brand-new golfer goes out, picks up some golf clubs and away he goes and he starts making holes in one and so forth. And then he, all of a sudden, cracks up and he's totally incapable of striking a single stroke; it's not possible. And from that point on he has to be taught. And for quite a little time then he's a complete duffer. He's become self-conscious about his grip, he's become, oh, all kinds of mechanisms he's learned and all this sort of thing.

Well, actually, our present TRs are calculated to bring a person up through this with the greatest possible rapidity.

Now, the basis of the TR is simply to get the person to sit there and confront. You ordinarily find out he confronts with something. He's confronting with his belly, he's confronting with his nose, he's confronting with his hands, he's doing everything else.
A little bit later stage, why, you've got him confronting with a professional attitude and an interested attitude and, other things of this character.

And the best way to do is to have him put these things on. Just hour after hour of sitting there confronting the coach and the coach doing nothing is not going to do very much TR for anybody. No, the coach has got to be good.

Now, the TRs are actually as good as the coach. If a coach gives too many flunks and too many loses, of course, the quality of the TR goes down. And if the coach gives the pc, or gives the student, rather, some wins, why, the TRs goes up.

All right. Well, we're all set now. And we have Gordon who is a very senior student here and he is going to give TRs. And here we go. Start!

Coach: Okay. All right. Ian, this is TR 0. Confronting TR. Right? You're familiar with it, I assume.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. I'm giving an echo back here from myself. All right, now, I want you to relax and just confront me. Just straight TR 0. I won't be doing any bullbaiting on this. I'll just be here for you to confront.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. Just relax and confront me. Just you do that. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Now, we haven't started yet. When I give you a start, you can start. When I say, "That's it," that's the end of the drill for a while. Okay?

Student: Yes.

Coach: All right. Now, are you read? All right. Start.

Okay, that's it a minute. Now, just relax. Relax.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Don't ...

LRH: This is an interesting case, this student here. He actually is doing a not-confront with several parts of his body. Quite interesting.

Coach: Okay, just be here. Okay? Relax and just be here. That's all you've got to do, and confront me. I'm not going anywhere. Okay?

Student: Yes.

Coach: All right. Start.

Okay, flunk. That's it. All right, you're not really being here. Get here a little better. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Okay, flunk. You're staring at me. Start.

Okay, that's it. Relax. You're sitting there and your shoulders aren't straight. You're... Okay, just relax. Okay? What? To hell with the television, just confront me. This is a TR. All right.

Student: Yeah.

Coach: Okay. Restart.

That's better. Get here some more. Just relax and get here and confront me.

Flunk. You moved your mouth. Start.

LRH: Now, here's a trick. Let's find out from this particular student – he's sitting there with his chest sunk in withdrawn, his throat withdrawn, and so forth – let's talk about not confronting. Let's get this student to find out what he's not confronting the pc with there.

Coach: Okay. All right. That's it a minute, Ian. Now, are you aware of not confronting me with anything? Any part of your body?

Student: Yes.

Coach: Is there an actual effort not to confront me with something?

Student: No. Not an effort not to, no.

Coach: Uh-huh. Okay. Any part of your body you're aware of doing this with?

Student: No, not ...

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: ...nothing I'm deliberately not confronting with. No.

Coach: Okay. Now, I want you to confront me, you know, not without anything and not with anything. Just you confront me. Now, you seem to be using – actually holding back parts of your body, all right, chest, throat

Student: It just feels like something...


Okay, that's a bit better. Now, relax some more. All right, relax. Okay. Get your whole body here; you get here. All right? Okay.

Student: Um.

Coach: Start.

That's better. That's better. Okay. Just be here. Okay?

Don't hold things back from me.

Okay. That's it a minute. I feel like you're still holding back from me. It's getting better. I can feel you better over here.

Student: Mm.
Coach: But you're still holding back from me. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Just be here and relax. That's all. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

Okay. That's it a minute. All right. Relax in here. Okay? Relax all that. I feel like you're drawing away in that vicinity. Okay, start.


LRH: And Ian is sitting there with his chest very badly sunk in and sort of going to retreat through the wall. And actually looks a little bit more like an hypnotized subject than he does an auditor. So I think we'd better walk him over here on the subject of a professional attitude.

Coach: Okay. That's it. All right, now, what is your definition of a professional attitude? Yours.

Student: Of my professional attitude?

Coach: Yes, your definition of a professional attitude.

Student: An interested attitude.

Coach: Okay. Now, what I want you to do is confront me with a professional attitude. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Let's really be professional about this. Okay? Give them a good show. All right. Okay, now what are you going to do?

Student: Uh…

Coach: Okay. Well, how would you confront me with a professional attitude?

Student: Just look as though I'm interested in you.

Coach: Okay. Now, I want you to really do this.

Student: Yes.

Coach: Not just act it, you know, or pretend. I want you to really be interested. That's your definition, right?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. Really – really be professional. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: None of this, you know, holding back from me. You know, you've got to have command over me if you're going to audit me. Okay?
Student: Yeah.

Coach: All right. When you audit a preclear, you actually confront them. Okay. Now, I'm not here to – to overwhelm you. I'm here to help you get better TR 0. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right now, I want you to confront me with a professional attitude. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

Okay, that's it a minute. Relax while you do this. Okay?

Student: I find myself sort of suddenly jump that way.

Coach: I could see your body jerking back and forth then virtually …

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Relax and be professional. You know? Know what you're going to do here.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. And be interested here. Okay. Start.

LRH: Well, this student has a pattern here which is quite interesting. He's been made to sit very, very quietly for TR and he's obviously been flunked for batting his eyes so that he sits there with a very glassy stare and so forth. It's very funny – amusing watching Gordon there, because it's no doubt who the auditor is: Gordon obviously is. And yet Gordon's TRs are very good. He's sitting there in the chair all slopped over and that sort of thing, but he's really all over that student. You see? And the student is sitting there about ready to back through the wall and he's just got a complete, unwinking stare. And it'd drive any pc around the bend very fast.

All right, let's find an interesting attitude here. A more interesting attitude. Let's get him to do that several times until he himself starts laughing at this interesting attitude. Because he's really – we got to pick this to pieces. He's really got some kind of a notion there as to what he's doing, you see? He's all gimmicked up like mad: you don't wink your eyes, you sink in your chest, you withdraw, you're self-effacive. He's got a lot of things there if you could just get him to talk about them. Okay?


Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right, now, you've got, I've noticed and Ron has also – you know, I can hear him through these, he comes through occasionally – got mechanics to the way you're confronting. You're really staring a good hole through me that time. You know?

Student: I guess…
Coach: It's confronting. You know? And I want you to confront me with an interested attitude. Are you afraid I'm going to flunk you, here? Are you sitting here scared to death I'm going to flunk you?

Student: No, I'm – no.

Coach: Okay. Well, don't worry about it. If you flunk, you flunk. You flunk a million times, why you flunk a million times. And you have to have more, well, power than I do in this situation. You're confronting me. I'm the pc here. Okay?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: You know? You've got to be controlling me here, not me controlling you. When I say start, I want you to confront me with an interested attitude. And be aware of what you're doing.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

Okay. That's it a minute. Okay, want to get comfortable?

Student: Yes.

Coach: Okay. You comfortable?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Now, I want you to confront me, not stare at me.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right? I've got a whole body here.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. You can confront the whole thing, if you want. Okay? All right. You don't have to just stare at me. All right. And be interested. I want you to assume an interested attitude and confront me from that viewpoint. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

Come on, man, relax. Relax.

LRH: The pc actually here has a look of just pure horror on his face. In some way he just looks completely fixated. Now, if we could get him to give us a dissertation on what he ought to be doing, it might be very interesting.

Coach: Okay, Ian, that's it. Okay. What should you be doing in this drill, to be doing TR 0?

Student: Just being aware of you.

Coach: Okay. But then, are you aware of any mechanics of how you should be doing this?
Student: No, as – as soon as I start being aware of you I sort of lose awareness of my own body …

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: …as a property, you know.

Coach: Okay. Well, what do you do over there when you start confronting me? What do you really do?

Student: Just look at you.

Coach: At me?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: Okay. Are you aware of confronting me when you do that?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. Are you aware of anything else going on, of using things to confront me with or trying to look like you're confronting me, anything like this?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. Now. Good. Now, I want you to confront me now and be interested. And, I want you to be aware of what you're doing also. But I don't want you to introvert here on this.

Student: All right.

Coach: And I'm going to ask you in a few minutes what have you been doing? Okay? To confront me.

Student: Mm-hm.


That's a bit better.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Flunk. You've got something going on with your eyes. You know, you're trying to do something there. Start.

Okay. That's it. All right. Now, what did you do then to confront me with an interested attitude.

Student: Looked at you, tried to look alive.


Student: Not very.

Coach: Not very. Okay. All right. Now, I want you to really be interested. Okay? Now, do you think you can get better at doing TR 0 here tonight?

Student: Yes.
Coach: Good enough. All right. You know, I really want you to get some good out of this. All right. Now, I want you to really be. No acting. Really.

Student: Yeah.


Student: I looked at you.

Coach: Okay. Did you do anything else to confront me? How about this interesting part?

Student: Yeah, I tried to outflow interest.

Coach: Mm-hm. Okay. Good enough. Can you find anything over here in which you can get interested, anything about me?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. All right. Well, really be interested. Okay? And you find something interesting over here, you'll be interested. Okay?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: All right. Okay. Start.

LRH: All right, this is the last one. We'll end this demonstration in just a moment.

Coach: Very good. You're looking a bit more relaxed there. Flunk. I didn't tell you you could move your head. Start. Flunk, you didn't start. Start. Okay. That's it. Okay, now what did you do then to confront me?

Student: Looked at you.

Coach: Okay. Did you do anything else? Good enough. Okay. How was the interest that time?

Student: A lot better.

Coach: Okay. Do you feel that we got anything out of this drill?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: Good. All right. Well, that's the end of the drill. Okay?

Student: Thank you.

Coach: That's it! Good! Well, there you go.

LRH: All right. That demonstration there was quite interesting because, frankly, this student is pretty badly gimmicked up. Finally figured out the – what this was all about. The mark of a good coach here, and Gordon did very well there, but the mark of a
good coach is a... his ability to find out. The mark of a good coach is the ability to find out what the – what the student is doing. And to poke it full of holes so that the student will come off these special things. And that last preclear, the last student, actually, was in the attitude of a pc to a marked degree, but was confronting with an idea. He was confronting with an idea. And that idea was what he was confronting with. Somebody told him at some time or another that all he had to do to confront was be aware of the pc and ever since that time he's had "be aware of the pc" sticking out in front of him. He himself has not been doing anything with the pc. Well, we'll cure him of that here at Saint Hill. All right.

Well, now, we've got another demonstration. Now, you just carry on. Start.

Coach: All right. Okay. What we'll be doing here is just simple TR 0 to start with.

Student: Yes.

Coach: And all I'm going to do is ask you to sit there, be comfortable and erect posture and simply confront me there. Confront me over here. You be here and be aware of me.

Student: Fair enough.

Coach: Okay. Is there anything you'd like to say before we start?

Student: No.


LRH: They're moving on into this. I noticed that Ann has the – some of the same tricks of her husband.

Student: Sorry.

Coach: Okay. Flunk for talking. Start. Is it okay if we start?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. That's it. Are you aware of not doing something in order to confront me here, you know? You know, something that you should – that you are avoiding doing here?

Student: Yes, fidgeting.

Coach: Okay. Is there anything else here that you're avoiding doing?

Student: Yeah, it's uh-uh – crossing my legs and, you know, just to, you know, shift them.

Coach: All right. Good enough. All right. Just put your attention over here on me.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: And be aware of me – of me, don't too much care about that. Just confront me. Start.

LRH: Apparently both of these students have been trained on a "You don't confront, you suppress." And I never saw such a suppressed auditor valence there in my life. And
well, let's give her the works on a professional attitude, an auditing attitude. Let's give her the works on that.

Coach: All right. That's it.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Let's move on over here to the professional attitude portion of this.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Now, what – what to you is a professional auditing attitude? Tell me about it. What's a professional auditing attitude?

Student: Well, having your attention on the pc.

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: Uh – and uh-uh just looking like an auditor, I suppose.

Coach: Oh, very good. All right, what would – what would looking like an auditor consist of?

Student: Uh …

Coach: Well, just tell – just tell me what looking like an auditor would consist of to you.

Student: I don't know, I sort of think of um – well, I don't want to use Ian's term, but it is being interested in a pc…

Coach: All right.

Student: I don't know, I sort of think of um – well, I don't want to use Ian's term, but it is being interested in a pc…

Coach: That's true.

Student: Uh …

Coach: Well, not having attention on yourself.

Student: Well, not having attention on yourself.

Coach: Mm-hm. Good. Anything else a professional auditing attitude would consist of?

Student: Well, not sloppy.

Coach: Just how do you mean that, not sloppy?

Student: Um – not slouchy. Uh – I don't quite get that, sort of, I would say, to be relaxed.

Coach: Okay.

Student: And without looking sloppy. That's all.

Coach: Well, good. Perfectly all right.

Student: Relaxed and interested is about …

Coach: All right. Fine. Then I'd like you to confront me with a professional auditing attitude here. All right. Start. A professional auditing attitude.

Student: Uh …

Coach: Confront me with a professional auditing attitude.
Flunk for laughing.

Student: Huh-uh.

Coach: All right. That's it. What did you do to confront me with that professional auditing attitude there?

Student: Uh, I put more effort into it, which I sort of, you know, realize isn't what I'm supposed to be doing.

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: It was – it was an effort. Yeah, very much so.

Coach: Mm-hm. Okay. Tell me a little more about that. I'm not quite sure what you mean.

Student: I think of my face, it sort of tends to fidget and moves around here and uh – I try not to have, well, my attention on me rather than on you.

Coach: Uh-huh. All right. Now, tell me again just what a professional auditing attitude would be.

Student: Having your attention on your pc.

Coach: Mm-hm. Good. Anything else would be – anything more that would be a part of a professional auditing attitude?

Student: Just looking smart.

Coach: All right. What was that again?

Student: Looking smart.

Coach: Oh all right. Fine. Okay. Confront me with a professional auditing attitude. Start.

All right. That's it. What did you do to confront me with a professional auditing attitude?

Student: Looked at you.

Coach: Very good. Did you do anything else?

Student: Yeah, I do seem to be aware of doing extra things.

Coach: Such as?

Student: Uh – well, having quite an effort to just sort of put my body there.

Coach: Mm-hm. Okay. Is there anything you're aware of not doing, you know, just avoiding doing to have a professional auditing attitude?

Student: Uh – yeah, having attention on my face.

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: That sort of, does tend to, well, I don't have a great deal of control over it. And often …
LRH: We've got a student here, by the way, who has buttons. And you would ordinarily have a button-punching approach here to this type of pc. Because this type of pc's a liability in an auditing session.

Student: I'm trying not to have my attention on my face or on this.

Coach: All right.

Student: That's one thing.

Coach: All right. Thank you. Now, what, again, is a professional auditing attitude?

Student: Having your attention on the pc.

Coach: Very good. Anything more on that? A real professional auditing attitude, you know, just a real pro.

LRH: The student is breaking up a little bit on this professional auditing attitude. I mean she can make it.

Student: I'm not totally certain on it, you know …

Coach: All right.

Student: It's just sort of having all your attention on your pc …

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: … and not any on yourself.

Coach: All right. Fine. Then confront me with a professional auditing attitude. All right? Start.

All right, that's it. What did you do to confront me with that professional auditing attitude? What did you do?

Student: More attention on you.

Coach: Very good. Anything else you did there, to have a real professional attitude?

Student: No.

Coach: Okay. Anything that you didn't do there in order to have a professional auditing attitude? Avoided.

Student: Yeah.

Coach: Mm-hm. What?

Student: Avoided having as much attention on myself as I did have.

Coach: Ahh.

Student: I want to try it again, on that thing.

Coach: All right. Thank you. Okay. How is that different than simple TRs?

LRH: This student, by the way, is getting someplace under this coaching. Now, let's pull an interested attitude.
Coach: Okay.

Student: Ah …

Coach: Do you notice any difference in how you are doing this than sim... than confronting? Anything – this is above confronting and beyond.

Student: Yeah. A bit more relaxed.

Coach: All right. Very good. All right, we're going to move on to an interested auditing attitude. Now, just that, you know.

Student: Interested?

Coach: Yeah. Interested auditing attitude.

Student: You mean the auditor being interested and sort of being an interested auditor.

Coach: Yeah, that's – that's the idea.

Student: Interesting or just interested?

Coach: No, interested.

Student: Ah.

Coach: Interested auditing attitude. Could you sort of describe to me an interested auditing attitude?

Student: Well, I get the idea of a pc, you know, cockeyed listening with one ear. But you know, just listening to the pc, with your attention on him.

Coach: Very good.

Student: Mm.

Coach: Good. All right. Is there anything else that you – that an auditor would do to have a real interested attitude now? You know, interested attitude there.

Student: We'll just make sure he listens, that's all. To have his attention put there and not sort of all around the jazz around the room.

Coach: Uh-huh. All right. Very good. Then confront me with an interested auditing attitude. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.


All right. That's it. What did you do to confront me with an interested auditing attitude?

Student: I moved forward a little.

Coach: Mm-hm. All right. Anything else you did to uh – to have a real interested auditing attitude?

Student: No.
Coach: All right. Very good.

Student: Not anything else I can think of.

Coach: Okay. That's fine. Now, tell me again, what is – what is an interested auditing attitude? You know, just…

Student: Well, a person who looks as if they're interested in the fellow at the other end of it.

Coach: All right. Very good. Is there anything special you'd do to look as though you were interested there?

Student: I don't think so.

Coach: All right. Fine.

Student: There's a…

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: I think, no, there shouldn't be, but I think – suspect that, yes, I do. Uh – I get the idea I cock my eyebrow, I think.

Coach: Hmm. Very good. All right, we'll see how this goes then.

Student: I didn't get that.

Coach: We'll see how this goes and we'll do it again here, go back and see if there's anything else that comes up.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. I'd like you to confront me with a – just – a – you're the auditor here, you know?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Very interested attitude. Okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

Student: Uh – I'm not doing it. Sorry.

Coach: All right. That's it. What happened?

LRH: Of course, it cracked her up and she gets flunked of course, she gets flunked for grinning.

Coach: Hm.

Student: Hm.

Coach: All right. Thank you. Now can I have a confront with an interested auditing attitude. Start.

I'm the pc, you know. Just be interested.

Student: All right.
Coach: All right. Just confront me. Interested auditing attitude.
   All right. That's it. What did you do to confront with an interested auditing attitude there? To be – be an interested auditor?

Student: Um – looked at you, yeah.

Coach: Okay.

Student: Well, I was sure I put more attention on you than other things.

Coach: Uh-huh. Okay. Is there anything you didn't do or avoided doing, you stopped yourself from doing, you know, that you held down yourself from doing – held yourself down from doing something?

Student: Shifting.

Coach: Uh-huh.

Student: And uh – being aware of the rest of my body.

Coach: Uh-huh.

Student: This is sort of hard for me to have to sit here.

Coach: Very good. All right. Is there anything that you shouldn't do beyond this to have an interested auditing attitude? That you really shouldn't do?

Student: Keep busy shifting.

Coach: All right. Fine. Is there anything that you shouldn't do to have an interested auditing attitude?

Student: Um, yes…

LRH: As soon as you get her flattened off on that a little bit, why, give her a "That's it, end of demonstration."

Coach: All right. I didn't quite hear that.

Student: Have your attention on yourself; you haven't got your attention on your pc.

Coach: Well, very good. All right. I'd like to do this again now. Interested auditing attitude – could you tell me again just briefly what it is.

Student: Having your attention on your pc and not on yourself.

Coach: All right. Fine. All right, confront with an interested auditing attitude. Start.
   All right. Very good. That's it.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay? Did you notice anything there that you did in order to confront with an interested auditing attitude?

Student: No, I thought it was a bit – a little bit better perhaps. I sort of got more interest on you than – than I have had.
Coach: Very good. All right. We're going to end this off in a couple of seconds. What was that again? I cut you off.

Student: I seem to have more attention on you now than I had on you before.

Coach: Very good. Okay. Is there anything different, anything more to having an interested auditing attitude than simply to confronting? You know, anything – anything you noticed there that's additional to an interested auditing attitude?

Student: That I'm doing as an additional auditing attitude?

Coach: No. I'm sorry, I'm not getting that across to you. Is there anything that is more to an interested auditing attitude, you know…

Student: Than just sitting there.

Coach: … than just – and confronting – is there anything more to it?

Student: Listening.

Coach: Okay. Anything more to an interested auditing attitude than confronting?

Student: Oh, yeah, being willing to duplicate the pc, sort of willing to have him as he is.

Coach: All right.

Student: Without alter-is-ing him all the time.

Coach: Okay. Fine. All right, I'd like to end this off here.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Thank you. All right. That's it.

Student: Thank you.

Coach: End of demonstration.

LRH: All right. This was a very interesting demonstration in view of the fact of tremendous difference between the advanced student doing the coaching and the person being the student, because the last two students have only been here since Monday, just three, four days. And we've got a big deal here of some kind or another of – there's a lot of systematized confrontings. And you understand that this idea of telling them to be interesting and telling them this and telling them that and so forth is simply to run out the buttons so they just don't keep on confronting by a system. And really, this can be stepped up to where you can break up almost anybody's confront. All right. Now, we've got another one going here. All right. Start.

Coach: All right, Ian, what we're going to do is some TR 0.

Student: Norman.

Coach: Sorry. Norman, what we're going to do is some TR 0. And I'd like you to tell me what you understand about TR 0.

Student: Just to be here and confront you.
Coach: All right. Very good. Now, I'm going to give you a "Start" and a "That's it" when I want to tell you something. All right? And I want you to just relax – just relax your body. All right. Fine. And just sit there and confront me. All right. Start.

All right. That's it. Now, how do you feel about the space. You know, how big...

Student: Fine.

Coach: All right. Well, how big is your space?

Student: The room.

Coach: Good. Well, am I included in your space?

Student: Of course.

Coach: All right, very good. Now, just relax your body, a bit more. Terribly tense over here. Just relax, okay?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Just let go. Just let your body flop a bit. Go on, just relax your body. All right?

Student: I feel relaxed.

Coach: Okay. Very good. Now, I want you to be there and confront me. Start.

All right, I'm going to flunk you. Uh – you're staring at me. I want you to confront me. All right?

Student: Okay.

Coach: Start.

LRH: She's got him into pretty good shape there. Actually, he's a caved-in chest sort of a confront. He's not confronting with a lot of things. And it's a similar case: He's got a lot of not-confront going on here. He's probably confronting with an idea and not confronting with the chest, with the body at all. So, it might be of benefit to find out what idea he is confronting with.

Coach: Okay. That's it. Now, Norman, I'd like you to tell me what, you know, you're confronting me with? What do you feel you're confronting me with?

Student: Fine, just confronting you. But I was sort of trying to listen to what he was talking about.

Coach: I get it.

Student: Okay.

Coach: All right. Well, just – just relax a bit more, get your body you know, in the chair…

Student: Yeah, I think it's the word "relax" that might have a hypnotic command. You know?

Coach: I see. All right, well if I used "easy" would that be better?

Student: That's fine, I know what you really mean; it just bugs me because I used to use it.

That's much better. All right.

All right. That's it. Now, you're sort of tipping over to the side there. Can you feel that?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: All right. Just get your body relaxed…

Student: I'm confronting you more with one side of my backside. You know?

Coach: I see. All right. Very good. Well, just, you know, just get your body easy, nice. You be there and you confront me. Start.

That's it. You're still tipping over to the side there. Can you feel it?

Student: I always sit like this.

Coach: Oh, I see. All right. Well, just – just straighten up, you know, prop yourself up a bit. That's much better.

Student: Am I okay now?

Coach: Yeah, that's much better.

Student: I can't always tell when I'm doing it.

Coach: All right. Now, just relax.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Okay. Start.

LRH: This student's confront, actually, is pretty grim. He's got some kind of a glee, g-l-e-e, going on there. You could very easily break him up, and so forth. And actually, the coach ought to walk forward to shattering the false composure he is sitting there in.

Coach: All right. That's it. Now, I sort of feel there's something real solid sitting there in front of me.

Student: It could be my bank.

Coach: All right. Fine. Well, just, you know, just get your body relaxed. Okay?

Student: Yeah.

Coach: All right, some more.

Student: I need to …


Student: I wouldn't be comfortable.
Coach: Just try it.
Student: I don't know how.
Student: I don't understand – let what go?
Coach: Forget about the people.
Student: No, I'm not interested in them.
Coach: All right.
Student: I'd like to know how to do it.
Coach: All right, just let your body relax. You know? That's much better. All right. Now, I want you to be there. All right? Just you be there and confront me. Now – now …
Student: Okay. Yeah.
Coach: ...I was – just before I was going to give you the start, I just felt you building this up again. Now, just let it relax. You know, just you relax, sorry.
Student: Yeah.
Coach: And you confront me. All right? Okay. All right, start.

Now, that's very much better.
All right. I'm going to flunk you for thinking, now, uhh …
Student: I am. I didn't feel as comfortable as when I started.
Coach: I see. All right.
Student: I felt I was very here when I started. But I don't feel like that. I feel like I'm trying to do something.
Coach: Mmm.
Student: You know, I'm trying to confront. And I – I don't want to try to do it. I – I was comfortable, sat up straight …
Coach: Mmm.
Student: ...and comfortable just sitting here, like when I started.
Coach: All right.
Student: I did – to try to collapse, I'm trying to do something and I don't like it.
Coach: Well, how are you trying to do this?
Student: Well I'm trying to sit the way you want me to.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: And I'm trying to sit the way you expect me to, you know the way you're telling me.
Coach: I get it.
Student: Uh – I – I sit up. When I sit down anywhere I sit up. I sit erect. I'm comfortable.
Coach: All right.
Student: I'm very comfortable.
Coach: All right. Well, are you sitting relaxed now?
Student: Yeah.
Coach: All right. Very good. Now, I just want you to be there now …
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: … and you confront me.
Student: Yeah.
Coach: All right. Start.
LRH: He's having quite a time here. I said he could be rattled. And you heard how rattled he was starting to get. Now, he'd rattle the same way under a pc that started to fall to pieces. So it's much to his advantage as an auditor to get this broken up as early as possible. And, actually, he ought to be wracked up even more than he is being wracked up there by Mazie.
Coach: All right. That's it. Now, which way are you sort of aware of holding your body?
Student: This way.
Coach: That way. All right. Uh – you're tilting it which way, which side?
Student: I'm intentionally tilting it uh – so that this lowers because this shoulder is lower than this one.
Coach: I see.
Student: Normally. And I know in TR 0…
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: …I'm going to get flunked for it. So I purposely push myself forward like this and raise this shoulder. I'm intentionally doing that, but when I'm auditing I just sit with this shoulder lower than the other one.
Coach: I see. All right. Well, let's see if the body can relax, let it relax …
Student: Yeah.
Coach: …so that you are there and you communicate across to me. All right?
Student: Okay.
Coach: Okay. Are you feeling more relaxed now?
Student: Yeah, I feel fine.
Coach: All right. Fine. Now, you be there and you confront me. Start.
All right. I'm going to flunk you. You've still got your body tilted over to the side.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: So I'm going to correct that for you. All right?

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Well, how does that feel?

Student: Feels fine.

Coach: All right. Are you aware of any change from before?

Student: No. Not much.

Coach: Okay. Just going to get this straight over there. All right. Now, just relax. Okay. That's fine. I feel you're much more here than when we started. All right?

Student: Fine. Yeah.

Coach: Good. Now, you communicate across to me and you confront me. Start.

LRH: I think we ought to ask this student for an amused auditing attitude. How would he look if he were amused. Because he actually looks like he's on the verge of laughing. And actually, it'd be murderous for a pc to be audited with that expression.

Coach: All right. That's it. Now, Norman, I want you to show me an amused auditing attitude.

Student: Oh!

Coach: All right?

Student: Christ! Really?

Coach: Mm-hm. Well before you...

Student: What do you mean amused?

Coach: Oh, well, you tell me what you understand by an amused auditing attitude.

Student: Well, immediately I thought of a joke I have with somebody, about an acknowledgment. It goes: Yeah, okay, yeah, all right, I heard what you said. And I sound somewhat amused, I mean, for me to be amused I'd have to sit with my legs crossed like this and just sneering.

Coach: All right. Very good. Well, you show me an amused auditing attitude. Okay. When I say "start," you can do anything you like to show me an amused auditing attitude. All right. Start.

Student: Well, that's ridiculous.

Coach: Go on. Very good. Carry on.

Student: Just take my frowning off.

Coach: All right. Good. Fine.
Student: Okay.

Coach: Just give it a go, you know. Just show me an amused auditing attitude. Let yourself go.

Student: This twitch is purposeful.

Coach: Mm-hm. All right. And some more. Let it go.

Student: I think this is better than the way I confront the other way, you know.


Student: I don't think I can do that now.

Coach: Uh-huh.

Student: I'm not really amused.

Coach: I see. All right.

Student: I don't know what an amused auditing attitude is.

Coach: Mm.

Student: I really don't.

Coach: All right. Well, that's it. Okay. Well, that was very good. Okay? How did you feel doing that?

Student: I was acting. Because I don't know what an amused auditing attitude is.

Coach: I see.

Student: I really don't. When I think of an amused auditing attitude, I think of my – me being amused, at an auditor, who has some type of sarcastic attitude. You know?

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: But I don't see one.

Coach: And as an auditor, what do you understand by amused auditing attitude?

Student: Well, if the preclear told me something funny I'd laugh. I'd be amused.

Coach: All right. Very good.

Student: I think it would be all right, you know, if the preclear thought it was funny and uh – when we're in session and I felt like laughing, I'd laugh. I'd be amused.

Coach: All right. Very good. Well, how about showing me that.

Student: I can't laugh now, you haven't said anything funny.

Coach: All right. Well, I'd like you to put that on for me. Okay? I'll give you a start and I'd like for you to do that.

Student: Oh, boy.

Coach: All right? Start.
Student: That's very funny, you know.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: Well, that's it. I would always smile and be amused.
Coach: All right. That's it. That was very good. Okay? All right. How are you doing?
Student: Okay. That attitude that I just showed you is closer to my normal attitude when I'm auditing than when I first walked in.
Coach: All right. Very good. I'd like you to relax and let's get back to TR 0…
Student: Okay.
Coach: …and see how you do now. Okay?
Student: Yeah. Mm-hm.
Coach: All right. Now, you be there and you confront me. Start.
That's very much better.
All right. That's it. How do you feel about your body now, you know …
Student: Well, I'm feeling more comfortable.
Coach: All right.
Student: And I feel better. Uh …
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: I did what I was normally expected to do for TR 0 – is to sit erect. Well, I always sit erect anyway as I said.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: But, um – I have to try to please the – the coach.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: Now, that was what I was trying to do.
Coach: I see.
Student: This way I feel much more relaxed. I'm doing it – I'm confronting you.
Coach: Okay. Very good. All right. Now, I don't want you to try…
Student: No.
Coach: …or try to impress me or anything like that.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: I just want you to be there and you confront me. All right?
Student: Yeah. Sure.
Coach: And you just get your body relaxed again. There's still a tendency to…
Student: Sometimes I can't tell which way my head goes.
Coach: Uh-huh.

Student: Uh, I – I can't always tell when it's tilted.

Coach: I see. All right. Very good. Well, now you just relax and you confront me. Okay?

Student: Uh-huh.

Coach: Start.

You break up.

All right. That's it. Well, that was very much better. Now, I want you to relax even more. You know? This tenseness is coming across to me terribly. Okay?

Student: Okay.

Coach: All right. Now, just relax your body. Even more. You know? Just get there real easy. That's good. That's much better. How do you feel?

Student: Fine.

Coach: Good. All right. Now, I want you to communicate across to me. All right. Start.

LRH: All right. Get him to do something there. And find out if he's had any gains from the session. And then close it off.

Coach: Okay. All right. That's it. Okay. Now, what I want you to do this time is be even more here. All right? More relaxed.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Can you do that?

Student: I'll try. Now, the thing that bugs me is you keep saying communicate to you and...

Coach: Uh-huh.

Student: ... and I've always considered that – should uh – my willing... commun.... uh – my confront is the willingness to see what I'm looking at and to receive communication. And you're sort of twisting that around a little bit; I never thought of it – that isn't to say I haven't communicated to...

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: ... a preclear, but ...

Coach: I understand.

Student: ... you know, the idea is that – the willingness to receive communication.

Coach: All right. Very good. Well, as the auditor ...

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Um – who really sets the session up?

Student: Do I get a pass if I answer?

The auditor.
Coach: All right.

Student: Okay.

Coach: Well, very good. Okay. Now, let's just have this once more for a few minutes…

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: …and I want, you know, real good TR 0 here. And I really want to feel that you're there, you know, confronting me.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Start.

All right. That's it. Okay. That was very much better. Okay. Now, how did you find this coaching?

Student: Very good.

Coach: All right.

Student: Very good. Yeah. I'm glad you didn't ask me for a professional attitude, I'd have charged you a professional fee.

Coach: Okay. Anything else about the coaching?

Student: No, it was very good. I felt much better towards the end than when I started. I was a little nervous, but other than that I'm still better at the end. I felt more relaxed at the end than the beginning.

Coach: All right. Very good.

Student: Thank you.

Coach: All right. Well, it's the end of the coaching now, all right?

Student: Fine, yeah.

Coach: That's it.

Student: Thank you.

LRH: Okay. He had quite a difficulty there of one sort or another. This – he's very easily broken up. And in actual fact, why, in a tense situation, and so forth, he would tend to shatter, he would tend to go all to pieces on a pc. Now, he'd have to be gotten out of that. Of course, these are very short demonstrations, you understand, very, very short demonstrations. All right. And we're just going to do TR 0. Uh, go right ahead, Tony.

Coach: Okay. Well, I've just been given the go – ahead. And what we're going to do is, for a short time, some TR 0.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Now, do you know what the purpose of this is?

Student: The purpose of the drill?
Coach: Yes.
Student: Yeah. It's just to confront you.
Coach: Very good. Now, that's all I want you to do.
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: All right. You ready?
Student: Yeah.
Coach: Good. You relaxed?
Student: Yeah, I think so.
Coach: Okay.
    Start.
    That's it.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: All right. Now, I said "start"...
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: it took you a little time to get there.
Student: Yeah. That's right.
Coach: Okay. And you're still doing that.
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: All right. Now, really be there…
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: …and confront me.
Student: All right.
Coach: Start.
    That's better.
    That's it. You've gone off again.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Now, be there and confront me.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: All right. Start.
    That's it.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Flunk for moving. Also, you had gone off again.
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: Now, you get there.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Is it all right to be there?
Student: Yeah. Sure.
Coach: Good. All right.
Student: All right.
Coach: Start. That's it. You didn't start. You didn't confront me immediately when I said "start."
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: When I say "start," you confront me immediately.
Student: Good.
Coach: All right. Are you feeling pretty comfortable with all this…
Student: Yeah. Sure.
Coach: …jazz and so on.
Student: Yeah.
Coach: All right. Start.
That's good.
Flunk. You're going off again. Start.
LRH: The difference here watching coaches who have been here for a long time at Saint Hill and watching these students who have just come recently is quite remarkable. Because, of course, the coach is doing a fabulous job of confronting and makes the student look awfully bad. Actually, Joy isn't doing too bad a job here, but she's confronting quite woodenly and she'd be very easy to break up. Now, let's find an auditing attitude on her, or a professional auditing attitude, or an interested auditing attitude. Let's break up that graven-in-marble.
Coach: That's it. All right now.
Student: It is?
Coach: All right now. Did you hear that?
Student: No, I didn't.
Coach: Okay.
Student: I was all agog to hear, but I didn't.
Coach: All right.
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: Well, now, we want, first of all, what is a professional attitude?
Student: Well to me, a professional attitude is knowing your onions.
Coach: Very good.
Student: Uh-huh.
Coach: All right, well can you show me that?
Student: Uh – yeah., I guess so. It would include feeling fairly confident…
Coach: Yes.
Student: …and I realize it's a via, but I think that if you try to put across – in an endeavor to put across confidence, that would be a via of being professional.
Coach: All right. Very good.
Student: All right.
Coach: Now, I want you to show me…
Student: Yeah.
Coach: …a professional attitude.
Student: All right.
Coach: Start.
That's it. How did you do?
Student: How did I do?
Coach: Yes.
Student: Well, I felt there that I was actually putting the idea across, "Well, but I know what I'm doing, I know my onions. Can you see it?"
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: Uh – that was the via I was using.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: Uh – confronting with an idea there. And trying to make the idea solid that there was this professional quality around.
Coach: Mm-hm. All right. Now, I want to point out something to you here – I got what you said there –
Student: Yeah.
Coach: When you're talking to me…
Student: Yes.
Coach: …there's something different going on to when you're just sitting there. Now, what is it?
Student: Something different going on?

Coach: As far as your confronting is concerned. Now, what's the difference?

Student: Oh, well, the difference when I'm talking to you is that I'm just totally relaxed and just being myself, just being quite willing to be here and talk to you.

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: Uh – when I – when I put on this confronting attitude for you I'm actually taking the via and putting it there, well, to put the apparency there.

Coach: Okay. I get that.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Now, what you're – what you're doing here or – or not doing when you're talking to me…

Student: Yeah?

Coach: …can you just sit there and do that? Or not do it?

Student: Well, then I wouldn't be uh – laying on the professional attitude.

Coach: Well, let's just say…

Student: This confuses me a little.

Coach: All right.

Student: Uh-huh.

Coach: Well, let's just – are you getting what I'm getting at here?

Student: Well, I don't think I am actually, uh, Tony. Because when I'm not laying on the professional attitude for you, I'm just, you know just being.

Coach: Hm.

Student: And, what I – what I understand here is the idea of actually putting across the professional attitude…

Coach: Mm-hm.

Student: … uh – to show up the via.

Coach: Mm-hm. All right. Well, I just want to try this for a minute. I want you to just…

Student: I see.

Coach: The difference I see is when you're talking to me you're with me.

Student: That's right. Yes.

Coach: Now, I want you to just sit there and be with me.

Student: All right. Very good.

Coach: Just see how this goes for a minute.
Student: Okay.
Coach: Start.
    That's it.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: How did that seem to you?
Student: Well, that seemed more relaxed. It didn't seem particularly professional. It just, you
    know, just seemed me.
Coach: All right. Very good. All right, now, let's get back to this professional attitude.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Just once again define what is a professional attitude.
Student: Well, a professional attitude could be the idea of putting across that you know your
    onions and you're very confident and uh, well, dressing yourself up in fine feathers, I guess.
Coach: All right. Good. Well, show me a professional attitude.
Student: All right.
Coach: Start.
    That's it. That was good.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Did you notice the difference then?
Student: Yes, I felt the difference.
Coach: Yes. That's the best you've done.
Student: Well, the point is that I felt like I was getting across what – uh – the idea or the via.
Coach: Mm-hm.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Very good. All right. Now, let's take a couple more of these, here. What is an in-
    teresting attitude? Define it.
Student: Interesting or interested?
Coach: I'm sorry, I flubbed it.
Student: Yeah.
Coach: What's an interested attitude?
Student: Um – well I feel an interested attitude, uh... well, it's just – just putting across being
    interested. But I feel that if you have to put it across, you're not really interested.
Coach: All right.
Student: Anyway, an interested attitude is trying to emanate interest or emanating interest to the person in front of you. Trying to put across the idea that you are very interested in — uh — in him or her.

Coach: Very good. All right. You show me an interested attitude.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Start.

LRH: We've got an awful lot of gimmicks and tricks here mixed up in this confront. It's got to be worked over pretty hard, actually. Pc — I mean the student there is sitting there looking alluring at the present moment.

Coach: All right. That's it.

Student: I felt an absolute fraud, Tony.

Coach: All right.

Student: I felt I was pulling all sorts of things out of the bag.

Coach: All right. Well, have you got any different idea here on what an interesting attitude is?

Student: Um, uh — well, um — as I said I just felt an absolute fraud when I was laying that on. I felt I was pulling tricks out of the bag and, uh…

Coach: Yes.

Student: …you know, I felt that I was putting across using my eyes in order to convey interest and, um, using a slight facial expression in order to convey interest.

Coach: All right.

Student: The whole thing just felt like a total fraud to me.

Coach: All right. Fine. Very good. All right. Now, you observed that.

Student: Oh, yeah, sure I did.

Coach: Now, now, you did tell me a little while ago about the difference between real attitude of some sort and something that's laid on.

Student: Uh-huh.

Coach: What's a real interested attitude? What is that?

Student: Well, a real interested — well it — well it would just be an interested attitude, just being there.

Coach: All right. Can you show me that?

Student: I'll try to.

Coach: All right, well, don't try, just show me. All right.

Student: Very good.
Coach: Show me that…
Student: All right.
Coach: …an interested attitude. Start.
That's it. Flunk, you're moving.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Start.
That's it. All right.
Student: I felt I was using exactly the same vias again. I don't seem to be able to get away from them.
Coach: All right. Well, I'll tell you what I'll do here.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Um – we'll do this again.
Student: Yeah.
Coach: And any vias that I see you using, I'm going to flunk you for them.
Student: All right. Very good.
Coach: Let's see how we go with that.
Student: All right.
Coach: All right. Now, show me an interested attitude. Start.
That's it.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: Flunk. Your eyes are moving around.
Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: And – uh – actually you were confronting me with movement there.
Student: I see.
Coach: All right. Now, from now on I won't say, "That's it," I'll just say "Flunk." You keep on doing it.
Student: Very good.
Coach: All right.
Student: All right.
Coach: There something you wanted to say to me?
Student: Uh – no. But, uh – you're just going to flunk me and not tell me what you're flunking me for.
Coach: No, I'll tell you what I'm flunking you for.
Student: Oh, all right.

Coach: But I won't say, "That's it." I want you to keep doing it.

Student: Good. I'll do that.

Coach: All right. Confront me. Start.

   Flunk. You're moving your head.
   Flunk. You're blinking your eyes; fluttering your eyelids.
   Flunk. You're confronting me with movement.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. That's it.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: Now, around your neck here, all around here, it's turning red.

Student: Yeah.

Coach: Now, you're confronting me with that part of your body.

Student: Actually, I'm not surprised at that. I've got terrific masses around here. I have had all day. I've been totally aware of them.

Coach: All right. Well, now, uh – are you aware of doing anything with that part of your body?

Student: Yes, I am.

Coach: Good.

Student: I – I'm actually aware of – uh – tremendous mass around here, uh – tremendous heaviness. I'm actually aware of using this part of my body here.

Coach: Hm.

Student: Pushing it out. You know? I'm holding out and pushing up all around here. I'm totally aware of that.

Coach: Mm. All right. Well, let's see if you can confront me now …

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: … without doing that.

Student: Very good.

Coach: All right. Start.

   Flunk. You're pushing the side of your face out.

Student: Mm.

Coach: Start. All right. Now, be here. Confront me.

Student: Mm-hm.
Coach: You're going off.

LRH: All right. Finish that up and find out if she's had any gains and end it off.

Coach: That's it.

Student: Mm-hm.

Coach: All right. Now, how did you do then?

Student: Uh, well I came off the actual laying on of interest. But – um – I feel that I've actually – um – I've got something out of this.

Coach: Very good.

Student: I do feel that I've come through quite a bit. And it's – it's real to me how even a short period of – of this confronting drill can actually get you through and help you to be there.

Coach: All right.

Student: I feel very much more here than when we came in.

Coach: Very good. All right. Well, is it all right with you if we end off the drill now?

Student: Uh-huh.

Coach: Good. All right. Thank you. End of drill.

Student: All right. Thank you, Tony.

LRH: All right. Take a ten-minute break and I'll give you a talk on this.
TR 0 Lecture

A lecture given on 16 January 1963

Okay, this is a few words on TR 0. This is the 16th of January, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, let's give all those coaches some applause, huh? [applause] And let's give the students some applause. [applause]

Thank you.

I don't know if you noticed it, but the upper unit student confront comparison with the newer student confront, well, was quite marked, wasn't it?

Audience: Yes.

I thought it would be something like that. That's why I chose them up that way.

Now, you know the rules about TV. You know, if you've been on TV, you know, it's popularly believed, if you've been on TV, then you're not on TV again. [laughter] That's – that's normally believed. But actually that's only if you're cancelled before the program. You probably didn't know that part of the rule. A lot of rules about it. They change from week to week. [laughter, laughs]

You might as well get used to it because TV-type training is going into Central Orgs and you'll find out it's very beneficial. TR 0, the original TR 0, was simply to be there and be aware, and that was all there was to it. And in actual fact, apparently people have begun to confront with that definition. See, if you don't let them confront with their noses or their big toes or stomachs or something like that, they can always confront with that definition.

These are – nevertheless, the definition is still valid and the original TR 0 is still valid, but there's some other things that have been added in on top of it. The – you can make somebody confront with a professional attitude. And usually, you find every here and there that some student's got a real professional attitude that he is confronting with and see, it's a confront with – that's the trouble with it. And an auditing attitude and an interested attitude and so forth, these things are all fine, as long as they're run out.

And the trick in coaching TR 0 – it all depends on a good coach – is spotting something the student is doing, getting him to be aware of it and run it out. That's in actual fact, the system – all there is to the system of coaching. But, of course, you can give a student so many flunks that he just caves in. He – "So what, you can't win anyhow," and goes into apathy.

Now, you can give a student so many wins that he never learns how to confront. I mean, you can do this both ways, too. Takes a little wisdom in the matter.
But what you're actually trying to get him to do is to stand up to the duress of auditing. Let's get off of our basic definitions and let's get into a little bit of the whys and wheres of TR 0.

I well recall one of the Upper Indoc TRs that somebody was trying to teach somebody in an ACC, and it was the one that teaches 8-C with violence – you remember that old one – you know. And all of a sudden the student quit. The student quit and walked out and an Instructor stopped the student and said, "Why, what's the matter?" And very, very grimly and primly the student said, "Pcs never act like that."

See, she... the coach had actually been giving this student a bad time, you know. And, well, just – people just don't act like that. Well, a couple of years went by and this student showed up for a retreat in the Academy or something of this sort, but – or it was for some auditing – and came around and had an apology to make on the subject. She had audited an actual pc who had acted much worse. [laughter] So, pcs did act like that.

Well, in actual fact, in actual fact, one of the things that is most disturbing to a pc is to have an auditor whose confront is cornered up in some way – is a very unnatural confront – and who shatters under an upset in the session. Well, normally these upsets are assignable to TR 4 and nearly everybody gives TR 4 the medal for auditor upset, don't you see? I mean, the auditor Qs-and-As and Qs-and-As. Every time you Q-and-A, you see, you make the student miss a withhold – I mean, make the pc miss a withhold, see. One Q and A – one missed withhold, see.

So, therefore an ARC break gets worse and worse and worse when an auditor Qs-and-As. Very, very simple mechanism goes on there. The pc says – in answer to some question or in origin – "Well, I thought a moment ago that you were nulling too fast."

And the auditor says, "All right. I'll null more slowly."

Now, you see it isn't the actual fact that the auditor has followed the order of the pc, in TR 4, that's not what is important. What is important is that he's failed to acknowledge an answer to an origin or an auditing command, you see. He's failed to acknowledge that answer.

And with some auditors, you work and work and work and work and work to stop them from Q-and-Aing. It's so bad that the auditor says, "In this session is there anything you suppressed?"

And the student says, "Well, I suppressed thinking that you were a bit untidy with your paper."

And the auditor says, "Okay, I'll straighten it up."

Well, of course, that's a missed withhold at once. Now, the student is... I mean the pc can't get this off because every time the pc tries to repeat this answer, the auditor starts arguing that he's perfectly willing to tidy up his papers, you get the idea?

Now, let's look at – let's look at why an auditor very often – and some auditors do – take a long time to get up to a point where they never Q-and-A. And it isn't in actual fact the TR 4. It's the TR 0 that is shot.
This auditor can't stand up to an auditing session with TR 0 and is so, in that fashion, on a sort of an inflow or something, you see, and isn't really there and being aware, but retreats any time anything looks like it's a little bit odd in the session – the auditor retreats and that's the basic sin.

Well, you can see these Upper Indoc drills they – somebody knocks the student all over the place. The coach knocks the student around and the student has to stand up to it and retain control of the situation if he can. You know, we can see that. That's all very visible. But those same mechanisms are present in TR 0. Exactly those same mechanisms are present.

Now, what we've seen in demonstration here is a rather smoothly polished TR 0. Two people who have had quite a bit of TR 0 run already can be polished further. But there's this additional element which isn't on those demonstrations – is pushing buttons. And finally a person will harden into it and then lose the hardening and then find out he can do it, you know. And he'll be able, actually, to sit there with an auditing presence and have a pc blowing up without getting rattled.

Pc starts to have an ARC break, the auditor doesn't go into an instant lost TR 0, see. TR 0 doesn't go up the spout.

Now, therefore, TR 0 can also – after you've led a person forward to getting rid of all the junk – can be stepped up, can be stepped up. You can start to rough it up. And this is particularly what I wanted to add to this, not talk more about the demonstrations but to show you that there's an additional step you can use.

Now, it requires a considerable perception on the part of the coach in order to step this up accurately. And you had one example of a step-up. Now, I was actually stepping it up on Norman's dander when he was the student there. He was blowing up. See, but he settled back down into it and it was okay. But in actual fact, do you see there – do you see, he was breaking his confront. Do you see that?

Now, you can lead on that type of a gradient to higher and higher step-ups. You get him just fine so he can stand up to that and then you'd uncork something else. But let's look at something they're doing or something that they are incipiently doing and start punching the button and get the person to explain it – explain how he's doing it and then he starts to as-is it, don't you see? He becomes aware of it and in essence takes over the automaticity of it.

And you can keep leading out that way further and further and further, well, until it'd be a matter of the coach jumping up and poking the chair, you see, at the student to get him to break his confront. Do you see how – to the degree that that could be stepped up?

I've noticed that in the presence of an ARC break, Q and A becomes very, very grim. This auditor never Qs-and-As but in the presence of an ARC break, Qs-and-As. And I'm pointing this out to you: the reason he Qs-and-As is not that his TR 4 goes to pieces but his TR 0 goes to pieces.

So therefore, there is a great deal that can be said for stepping up what there is there to be confronted. Now, anybody can confront a completely motionless pc. See, anybody can confront a motionless pc. But how about confronting a pc in motion? Well, the first thing you would think of is somebody shaking his hand in front of the student's eyes. The coach shaking
his hand in front of the student's eye and get the student to stop flinching. See, that would be a very easy gradient on the thing, you know.

But how about dodging E-Meter cans? [laughter] Hm? Do you realize that in general practice, particularly due to the ARC breaks which can sometimes come up under Routine 2-12, that I would say if you went six months without having a pc throw the cans down, why, you – you must be either very, very lucky or have very apathetic pcs. [laughs] And I'd say once a year, an auditor can certainly expect to get the cans in his chest.

Now, you don't want to train an auditor to a point where he doesn't dodge the cans, [laughter] but you certainly want him trained to the point where the cans do not interrupt his command of the session. See, that his action of dodging doesn't interrupt the command of the session.

Now, this gets pretty grim after a while. You see, it's just – the sky's the limit. It gets up to one of these Tom and Jerry cartoons, you know – buildings falling down and holes going through the center of the Earth. But the main thing I'm trying to put across is that your gradient is what there is there to confront. See, you could add more things to confront and get him to analyze what he was doing. You could actually take an old E-Meter can and throw it into his chest, you know, and get him so he would take care of the E-Meter can, you see, and still be able to confront the pc.

Auditors do very interesting things. Not good auditors – but I've seen very interesting things happen in auditing sessions. I have seen a person go into total silence. This is more common than you would think.

Pc all of a sudden seems to be in trouble and the auditor goes into total silence. That is about the grimmest thing that can happen to a pc. That's no auditing with an exclamation point. It's actually worse than Q and A. The pc has just lost his auditor. That is it.

Well, now, it normally happens on a freeze. In other words, the auditor freezes; becomes incapable of confronting and just goes into wood. Now, this is a much more insidious type of thing to break than action. See, you wouldn't want to specialize in your coaching your TR 0 in the fellow blinking, the fellow twitching, the fellow moving, so forth. Don't specialize in that. Let's give at least 50 percent of our coaching to the fellow going into wood. You see what I mean there?

Audience: Yeah.

As you go up in upper drills, if he's liable to clam up on a pc, you can also make him do it on TR 1.

Now, that... it's an odd mechanism – this one of just freezing – just goes into wood. Now, a good coach can recognize the fact that he hasn't got a confronting pc, that he's just got a solid piece of granite in front of him. And remember, that person who thinks that confrontingness is just becoming a solid piece of granite may some day merely stop auditing in the auditing session and just say nothing. And that's just about the grimmest thing that can happen.
All right. Now, your next action on this is an actual flee by the auditor. That's not as bad as a total clam up, but it amounts to the same thing. You see, the worst... Frankly, the more motionless or inactive a person is, the worse off he is, but that doesn't mean that the more active he is the better off he is. You see that. You – you take uh – you take the "p-sy-atrist," the "p-sy-atrist" – he hasn't got the faintest grip on this. He hasn't a clue about this. This has totally escaped him. He's always trying to put people into apathy so they will look all right.

Now, he's totally sold on the idea of insanity is motion. Where, as a matter of fact, it's far more often no action at all, see. It's much harder, now, hear me now, it's much harder to do something for a very apathetic case than it is an angry one, see. Your Tone Scale tells you that, of course, and you've known that for a long time. But I'm pointing that out in TR 0 that you can very easily, very easily slip a cogwheel here. And just because the guy is sitting there in a total apathy, think that he's doing TR 0. And let only the very apathetic and the very granitesque student get by, see. That's not the case at all.

So you might as well add something to it: look alive. Does he look alive? You can add that, you know, be there and be aware, but that awareness, let's color that with a definition of – let's have him be alive, too, you know. Have the blood flowing in his veins. That's an important thing. And actually that one little point is the one which would be most often missed by a coach. He can spot the fellow who goes dzzzzu-u-u-uh, see. He can spot the fellow who's going, "Huh, huh, huh," you know. He can spot that dead easy. But the guy who's going [demonstrates something, laughter] – doesn't spot that, see.

Well, it's all right, he's sitting there quietly, see. He's made a "p-sy-chiatric" mistake. And this is a mistake that he's made. And you got to keep pointing that little point up when you're training people because it's a natural thing, apparently, to think that something is quiet is safe.

Now, of course, the "p-sy-atrist" is simply trying to make his patient safe. See, he's operating totally on the third dynamic and he's trying to protect the third dynamic, you see, from the first. What's bad is the first dynamic, see. That's why you don't easily understand this "p-sy-atrist," because he's not trying to make anybody any better. See, he's trying to make the third dynamic safe. So therefore, his (quote) "cures" are all cures which apparently are supposed to benefit the third dynamic. None of his (quote) "cures" are ever supposed to benefit the patient. He doesn't even think so!

You ask him, "Have you ever cured anybody?" and he will say immediately, "Yes." But you've never asked him probably, "What have you cured him of?" And if he doesn't give you some long imaginary name that was dreamed up by Kraepelin over in Germany and you get him down to it, he's cured somebody of being in motion. That's what he's cured somebody of, and that's all.

So, this is very important to point up. This is very important to point up because you'll find as you look down a whole row of people who are doing TR 0 that a certain number of them have gone to granite and dropped out the bottom and something like this. You want to know what their auditing responses are at that particular time, and so forth, and of course, they're zero.
They get into a session auditing somebody, something happens, they go into inaction because they're not confronting. They can't confront. This idea of the total withdraw, see. [demonstrates something, laughter] Watch it. You could actually put some kind of a meter on the back of the chair to find how hard the student was pressing the back of the chair and you would get an accurate measurement of how little he was confronting, because the more weight that goes against the back of the chair, the more he's trying to get out of there, man.

Now, this will go into a total apathy of "can't get away" and "can't speak" in a situation of duress. It'll go to... actually that's very lowsacle. Upperscale is, the auditor will actually run away. Flee. Flee the session. Get out of there.

Now, where good auditing shows up as different than bad auditing is in moments of duress. And somebody will get along beautifully auditing some chipper lady that isn't causing any trouble, at all and he luckily got on the right lines and he hasn't made any mistakes and so forth. And you look at him and you say, "Well, he can really audit. He's just doing fine," see.

Well, to really know this auditor, you have to see him in a moment of duress. What happens in that moment of duress to his TR 0? That's the first thing to go – TR 0. He'll start making mistakes and of course that's the one thing you mustn't make. Whether he makes the mistake of shutting up or the mistake of running away or simply the mistake of bungling the auditing commands or the mistake of suddenly transferring over to a new list, you got that one? Pc ARC broke so must be the wrong list, so well abandon it. And then we wonder why day after day thereafter the pc makes no recovery. Well, of course, he's ARC broke because the list was not finished, see. List was abandoned.

But he'll make a wrong judgment, no matter how well he's taught. If his TR 0 is terribly bad under duress, he'll make a wrong judgment. So you might say there are two or three TR 0s.

There's the TR 0 of the fellow doing the drill. Let's take that one as the first one. He isn't – hasn't anything to do with auditing, hasn't anything to do with anything else, it's something that the Instructor or the coach told him to do, so he's doing it. You got that? It's not associated with anything.

All right, your next one is the person who clams up and actively can't act.

And your next grade up the line is somebody who goes into an obsessive motion as a sort of a Q and A.

Take that as three grades of things which you have to cure when you're coaching TR 0. And if you're going to do a thorough job, cure all of them. Just take them in sections.

Now, he's – this first one that we're doing which is just sitting there and confronting, when you add to that confronting in certain ways, you're clearing up the first one. Well, you're curing up the second one, too, when you're doing that. But, no, very few drills go into a cure-up of this dispersal in action. But those drills are very easy for a coach to figure out.

One of the things is, you know that there are some auditors around who will obsessively laugh. Something goes off the rails, or something like that, they will actually laugh. They'll laugh in the wrong places in the session, too, I guarantee you. They've got an incipient
laugh and you can break them up. Well, you just go ahead breaking them up until they don't have to. It's all a system of taking over the automaticity. And you might practice someday just throwing E-Meter cans at their chest, see. And see if they can't keep on confronting while ducking. I don't care how you do this. I'm just giving you an action level, you see.

Now, one of the ways of doing this is a talking confront. You never heard of this before because it's normally TR 1 and 2, but TR 1 and 2 are, in actual fact, simply actions which get a command across to the pc and acknowledge what the pc said. Those are the purposes of those two.

So you can have a counting confront. Can the fellow go on counting while you're throwing E-Meter cans at his chest or does he lose track of his numbers? You see how he could do it? You could actually have a talking confront. He isn't trying to reach anybody with this. You're just using this as an index.

Now, there are various things then that you could do, but I've given you the three zones that you actually have to cure if you're really going to cure up an auditor of doing something weird because the session goes awry.

Now, today it would be to our great interest to beef up this one point. To make it stronger, to strengthen it up and hit it harder, because let me assure you that auditors are going to get more ARC breaks than ever before. At the same time they're going to get more rewards than ever before, but they're also going to get more ARC breaks than ever before. So, you're going to have to train people to expect ARC breaks and to keep on going.

Now, I recently had an ARC break in an auditing session that had me very puzzled. I went on and handled the situation, of course, but I was very interested afterwards that the ARC break had made me think less fast. I was aware of having thought less fast in that ARC break than I ordinarily would have. It was, basically, just get out of the habit of having ARC breaks.

Now, oh, I picked up the ball and kept it rolling, but I was – I was aware of thinking less swiftly, and realized that the mechanism involved was – is I didn't want to confront this, because you see it was not my intention to make this pc splatter over the ceiling. And this particular pc was splattering over the ceiling. Wasn't my intention. So, it was counter to what I was trying to do in the session.

So, there was a small impulse there not to confront it. Do you see? So I myself got a good subjective reality on what this is all about. It was a good subjective reality. And I said, now, all I have to do is multiply that subjective reality up to a point where I just stopped thinking, you see, and one would have goofed at that point. I didn't goof, but I was aware of the fact that, you know, what the hell am I doing, you know. What's the thing to tell this pc? All that just slowed right on down. What do I do now? It was rather rough because three lists were in question. I was simply trying to straighten out a pc on lists, see. And three lists were in question. I couldn't tell which one of them the pc was ARC breaking on. Because the ARC break suddenly distributed over all three lists and it just got worse. Oh, I wasn't trying to make the pc worse, so my confrontingness dropped.
So, actually keeping the thing going, I mentally sat back and confronted the situation and picked it up and kept it rolling. But I could see exactly what happens. I see somebody who's – who's got a pc, everything has been... Because these R2-12 ARC breaks are sudden, man. They can be sudden and catastrophic when you run into them. And apparently inexplicable.

And you're running along and everything's fine and in the best of all possible worlds you are nulling the best of all possible lists and you look up and you say to the pc, "All right, we got your item now. Ha-ha. It is 'willow wand,'" and watch the pc carefully and everything seems to be all right, you know. And the pc even has a bit of a cognition, we're being very smug about everything, and aren't we good, and we pick up our pencil to finish off our auditor's report and there come the E-Meter cans.

What the hell, you know. What happened? Well, you just picked the wrong item. You should go on listing a little bit further; that's the motto. And the faster you say, "All right, that's not your item, thank you very much. Now we're going to list a little bit further," and push the auditor's report out from underneath your paw and push the list under it and start listing, your pc will start listing instantly.

All right, that, or for other reasons, these ARC breaks rather take you aback, because they're quite violent. The slow-burning ARC break, the corroding type of all of this would hit somebody who tended to go numb in a most horrible way. The corroding type of ARC break is that you have successfully listed something, everything was fine and the next session you have trouble getting the pc into session and the pc is full of despair and it's all just despair and hopelessness and you try to spot where this began, you know, and you can't quite spot where it began, but there is the pc being rather critically hopeless, if you get the idea. And you didn't intend to do this, so your intention is off. Your confront then, bow, there it goes, right there.

So, TR 0 should get a lot of attention from us in Academies. If we're going to take HPA students and get them to do R2-12, then we've got to beef up TR 0, that's the conclusion I've come to on it. And we treat these people as though they fall into all three of these grades, you see. We treat them as though they'll go into a total wooden nowhere and that they'll flee and that they will go into violent motion. Treat them in all three grades, see where they break up and keep cracking the buttons until they – all of a sudden they're able to pull through it. It's a sort of an Upper Indoc TR 0.

I don't care what you do with the pc as long as you give him enough wins – I mean a student – as long as you give him enough wins to keep him going. That's how many wins you give one. You don't ever give them as many as they earn; that would be too reasonable. Just give them enough to keep them going and don't give them so many that they think they can do it. Because the actual fact is, they have to come to the independent opinion that they can do it.

How much and how long should you run TR 0? Well, actually until the person, while doing all other actions and TRs, can keep up his TR 0. And where he can keep it up under things going wrong and duress – keep up his TR 0 with Kipling's "If," you know, "If you can keep your head when all pcs about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you..." [laughs, laughter]
So, we actually are moving up into a higher grade requirement, and I think it would be greatly to our interests in all courses that you teach, to the interest of pcs and protection of things, to give a higher level of expectancy. Now, we know what 2-12 is liable to uncork in our faces, well, all right, let's beef up the training drills to match it. And we'll lose less pcs that way. They won't be going out and dropping off the Bridge before somebody hears about it, you know.

Funny part of it is the pc usually doesn't fall off the Bridge. We had an interesting… He usually comes back for more auditing even when he's so ARC broke. But the funny part of it is I had a – had a pc today – I had a pc today that was in an ARC break that was just doing a total suppress – was doing a big suppress and was in violent argument with a wrong item and so forth. Little Diana, she's ten. Very amusing. Suzie brought her down to get the item checked mainly so that I could see that a pc at ten would ARC break just as hard on a wrong item as a pc of fifty. I tried to get her to treat it as an opp term and tried to get the rock slam to turn on and that sort of thing and… For her, she had some pretty nasty things to say about the item and the whole thing. She didn't want that item, see. It was a wrong item on the list. Rock slamming item.

It was very interesting to watch this. And also to watch the complete brighten-up that occurred the moment I said, "Well, all right, that's not your item." She brightened right up and was very pleased and went right back upstairs and went on listing and so forth. That was it. It was interesting that you get this same pattern response. The list was not quite long enough to have the right item on it.

Well now, if this is going to happen invariably and inevitably, all you've got to do is flub a little bit or be auditing a pc who already has PT problems from some other quarter or is under a little stress or duress, make an accidental Q and A right at the exact moment, they blow their skulls all over the ceiling. It's very interesting then, TR 0 ought to be pretty good. Because bad TR 0 will lead to immediate Q and A, it leads to a lack of comprehension of what is going on – main thing it leads to – and it leads to a pc who is getting no auditing. And it might even lead to an auditor flying down the hall.

Now, actually, it's a big win for an auditor sometimes when they confront an ARC break and a lot of insults from the pc and all that sort of thing, to find out they have gotten through it, even though the tears were coming out of their own eyes and they were terribly upset, they were misemotional about the whole thing, but they somehow or other brought it off. They do one or two of those and they get lots of confidence on it.

Well, why, should they have to gain all that confidence in the session? Now, it actually takes a certain amount of time to get R2-12 down – actually takes a certain amount of time. The experience of delivery of Routine 2-12 is considerably desirable. You get so that you know more and more about it and feel more and more confident of what you're doing and so forth. But it takes a while.

Now, if a person, while learning 2-12, is also learning his TRs, you're liable to have quite a mess on your hands. Now, you can have somebody under guidance auditing 2-10 in the co-audit unit, something like that, but they're under such stringent guidance, that somebody's there to pick them up if they drop the ball. They're actually auditing with very little
responsibility and frankly they learn only that the technique works or is violent. But before they can independently run 2-12 and so forth, why they ought to have their TRs. And those TRs ought to be matched up to running such a process. And that means that what's expected of TR 0 has to be upgraded.

Now, I suppose that part of the training is you get a tape recorder – we're talking about TR 1 now – you see, and you go down to the zoo and throw rocks at the lion until he gets real mad or something like that; or go down on Sunday when he's just seen too many people and get a darn good recording of all of this, don't you see, and then put it on a high volume hi-fi system and have the student stand there putting intention into the middle of the speaker. You see, that would be... You get so that you could insert the auditing command into the pc's skull and get him to comply with it regardless of the volume of sound you were being greeted with. You see, that's another barrier that you'll find necessary. But if you don't handle 2-12, if you don't handle the ARC break, if you don't keep on doing the right action, if you don't carry on with it, boy you got somebody who's splattered all over the room and it just isn't necessary for a pc to get that splattered.

Actually, the splattering is in direct proportion to the confront of the auditor. It wouldn't be a very bad ARC break if it hadn't been accompanied by a no confront of the situation, a Q and A, don't you see, a drop the ball all over the place. Well, each one of these auditor flubs throws an actual auditing reason for an ARC break in on top of the basic reason for the ARC break and they don't just wrap it around the telephone pole once, you see. They practically put it in around the Telephone pole braided. There it goes.

And the degree then of the ARC break the pc will have on Routine 2-12 is directly proportional to the TRs of the auditor. Do you see that? You'll see it borne out if you haven't noticed it up to this time, why, you'll probably see it around. You'll certainly see it around training somebody in an Academy with this or something like that. You'll notice that somebody's TRs are very bad and they have much worse ARC breaks, their pcs ARC break worse. Any pc will ARC break on wrong items and that sort of thing.

But of course, the swiftness with which the cause of the ARC break is being handled is only part of it. In actual fact a Q and A on top of the bad Routine 2 flub, blarr, see, and then a mistake on top of that, you see, and blarrrr, and then a decision on the part of the auditor to go back and relist "Where do cats come from?" which was eight years ago that it was run, you see. Blaaaaaaa! All it is is an incomplete list and it needed another page or something like this, don't you see? Easily remediable, but the auditor is liable to run all the way down to the earliest beginnings of the case, you see, rather than simply complete the list that was right in front of him. His judgment goes.

So, the judgment of the auditor must be good in this particular spot and if his TRs are bad, his judgment is going to be bad. Do you see what you're dealing with here?

I've often noticed that I... a perfect "auditor" as long as everything was all right. Somebody is a perfect auditor as long as everything was all right. But the moment the least little thing went wrong, that auditor suddenly became one of the world's worst auditors to a point of just sitting there, uhhhhh. Finally the pc, you know, shake him, you know, tell him he needs a session.
Well, now those are the modern purposes of TR 0 and I think that all of your training in this direction couldn't be better than matched up against the necessities of Routine 2 at this particular time, because it will make Routine 2 that much easier on one and all, including the auditor. If his TRs are almost perfect, you know, he'll never have to use them. It's something like the fellow who walks out every night, he's got a gun and he never runs into any trouble. And one night he doesn't have a gun and everybody jumps him. See, this kind of an action. If his TRs are weak, why, he's got no gun.

But he'll get very severe ARC breaks and you can trace back the pc – the severely ARC breaking pc – to the non-confront and the Q and A and the out-TRs in general of the auditor. The worse these TRs are, the harder the pc will ARC break, and the first that goes out is TR 0.

Okay?
Thank you very much. Good night.
Thank you.
Okay. Now this is what? This is the 6th of…

Female voice: 5th, 6th – 6th of February.

It's the 6th of February 1963. And this is an Instructors' Conference, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Okay.

Now, you're into the middle of some of the most rewarding and some of the most dangerous processes which have ever been originated. And the reason I've called this conference is I just wanted to tell you that this is not the time for any private theories or anything else. These things go according to a set of very furiously fixed rules. And unless those rules get followed, pcs wind up in the soup.

Now, I don't want to minimize this with you because for the first time we are really (exclamation point) dealing with a complete reversal of the first statement made in Book Three of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, which is that any auditing is better than no auditing. Lousy R2-12A auditing is much worse than no auditing. You see? We're dealing with something here which is violently dangerous, used wrong.

That's an astonishing thing to tell you. It isn't something that we particularly want bruited about from the housetops to the public and all that sort of thing. But it is our responsibility to make auditors who don't goof. Because, look, there isn't anything else cracks these cases. All right, let's just look it straight in the face.

All right. So you have to go off a high dive – high tower a hundred feet in the air to dive into an eight foot tank that is covered with flaming gasoline and that is the only way to do it, then, you have to learn how to do this. Don't you see?

Oddly enough in Scientology, there isn't any other way out: we're the only way out. You can size this up anyway you want to. So somebody comes along and he doesn't get results from processing so he goes to Subud. Well, look, that isn't going to take him anywhere. See? I mean, we're the only door there. See? There's a lot of phony doors. The FDA passes them everyday: pills and all this kind of thing. And the psychiatrists with their electric shock machines and all this sort of thing. Man, those are traps.

All right. So I've done everything I could possibly… That's the status of Routine 2 as of today. And I have done everything I could possibly do now and will continue to look for indicators and that sort of thing; but these indicators are very, very precise; they're terribly precise; they actually do not admit of any argument. List right way to: well, it's going to loosen the needle. That's all. It's going to give you some TA action.
List wrong way to and in the first few items you're going to see that TA tighten up and the needle tighten up. First you'll see the needle and then the TA. There's practically no TA action on a wrong way to. See? And we don't take 15 or 20 pages to find out it's wrong way to, you see, that's just a goof. And it's that kind of a goof that puts the pc in mortal danger. It's that kind of a goof, see.

We specialize in wide R/Ses. Big, wide R/Ses. Third-of-a-dial stuff. Don't go mucking around with any sixth-of-an-inch wide R/S! You see? Anything smaller than a third of a dial: you're too deep in the bank. And I don't care how good it looks as having been a complete list: if it isn't giving... if you haven't got that in your RI or didn't have it in your RI, why, you're listing too deep. And your pc's going to pull in a lot of mass; the pc's going to get in trouble. And so forth.

All right. Your next point here is that the whole house of cards can fall in if you grabbed a first list, RI, and listed the thing and then abandoned it. You got a nice wide R/S, you see, let's say it was "parts of existence" and you had a third-of-a-dial R/S. And now you go on and you're going to complete that list to find out if you get another one and you get a sixth-of-a-dial R/S: you damn well better take the third-of-a-dial R/S you had in the first place and you'd better list it right and you'd better keep it going. You understand? Because you're not going to get any more R/Ses on the case. The case is going to fold up. There's where the R/Ses disappear to.

So the rule here is a good, big, wide R/S. But that doesn't mean something that is taken from representing a rock slamming or a rocket reading item. You can get big R/Ses if you represent or... a rock slamming item.

Now, on a source list you're liable to get the appearance of the RI anywhere on the list. Your guess is as good as mine. I just had one turn up as item number one. The first item put on the list R/Sed. And it was the item although it was continued. See? There it was. So a source list – this is your first source list, see – that appears anyplace under the sun, moon and stars.

But within reason all other lists, each list taken from an RI, follow a very precise thing: it's always the last R/S.

Of course you can goof this. You can goof this. You can overlist and overlist and overlist and go 775 items, you see, beyond the last one and sooner or later it'll go. And there's another bug shows up that was inherent in something we were doing here. When we told the pc that something R/Sed, we were goofing. Because the pc now represented whatever R/Sed hoping to get his item on the list. You must tell the pc quite something else. Pc says, "But that R/Sed." You say, "Good, then your item probably won't have anything to do with it." You sow him with that propaganda, otherwise he will goof your list. The way he goes your list is he – let's say you tried and didn't find the R/S, you didn't find the RI. See, you listed it down and then you didn't find the RI. You understand? For some reason or other it didn't appear. But he now knows two R/Sing items, one of them fixes in his mind and he tries to do a repre-sent of that item in order to complete his list and get an R/S on the list. See? That is a goof.

So we disabuse him of the idea that this is of any use to him whatsoever. Actually, just educationally that we tell him so as an auditor. He's got "John Jones" now. Well we just warn...
him, "Your item probably won't have anything to do with 'John Jones.' Let's – let's get busy now, we obviously are nowhere near it. Now let's get some new ideas here." Make him list some more. Otherwise he represents a rock slamming item and you'll get an increased incidence of R/S and you will get all sorts of goofy looking things. But that – that's a piece of auditing, that's an error that has been entered by the auditing. Don't you see?

Well, the rule in 2-12A is that you come to your last R/S, still TA, and, you go 50 items beyond your last R/S with a still TA. See? Fifty items beyond. If you exceed that rule you're liable to start tightening the bank. And it'll start looking like a wrong list. It won't increase the number of R/Ses. But it'll start tightening up on the pc; that needle starts going tight, after 50. That's an interesting datum, isn't it? In other words, that 50 is a pretty absolute fact.

Once in a blue moon because banks are banks, you'll have to go more than 50 and suddenly find yourself there. You didn't have an RI on the list so you go back to it and you list a bit more and you find yourself staring into the teeth of an R/S that appeared from no place. Sometimes if you're unlucky and got out of bed that morning, didn't put your shoes on right and that sort of thing, it'll be item 51. I have seen it happen. It's the very next item the pc put on the list right after the auditor stopped listing. Very next one. Everybody tearing his hair out by the roots and the pc says, "a compounded felony," you know, is the next item he gives. It R/Ses like mad. The auditor tries to list further, goes on; the bank starts beefing up, everything starts going to hell in a balloon, you see. He now tries to put another 50 on top of it, he can't make it; so he finally goes back to test a compounded felony and it is the RI and there aren't two R/Sing items on the list and all is well. Don't you see? Goofy things like this can be expected to occur.

But in the final analysis, if a list is taken from a proper item, you know, a proper source list and you got the right RI: it goes on around just like clockwork, pang, pang, pang. You start having trouble and these rules start going astray when you've got an improper source list or you didn't get the right RI off the first list or you got the wrong RI on the next list so you start having trouble and these rules start going by the boards: go back one. See? This is the third RI you're trying for and it occurs as item number 3 on the new list and your lists uniformly here have been about 15 page lists for this particular gruesome package, one of these long listing packages. And all of a sudden on item number 3 on a checkover, of trying to find it and so forth – matter of fact you find it's on the first page. It's item number – what the hell! Well, don't consider that it's fortuitous, man: you scrub what you just found. See? Because you're off the wrong RI. Scrub it right then, you see: go back and continue that list a little bit further and you'll all of a sudden will find you didn't have the RI. See, it's the wrong source list or the wrong RI that causes this 2-12A thing to go awry. And every time it goes awry it piles up mass on the pc and gums up the pc. And that's all you have to be wary of, is, don't go gumming up the pc. Don't keep running things that pile in mass.

Who was it? Yesterday, apparently pulled a piece of screaming genius – which is why he's still here after all these God-endless months: because he pulls them. He has an RR (this is 3MX now, but it's the same rules), he has an RR that appears on page 12 and it's his last RR and he lists to page 17! Well, where did he think he was going? Were his brakes busted? See?
Couldn't be stopped? Because, oddly enough, this rule of 50, in 3MX becomes 25. In other words, 2-12A's 50 items – you use 50, you see. As soon as you get onto 3MX it's 25.

Now, all of your errors and difficulties associated in the vicinity of R2-12A come under these headings: complete asinine stupidity, just unbelievable stupidity. Guy is doing it; he doesn't know what he's doing and so forth. It – but when you look it over and try to find it, you look for something clever and you're going to find something that is just incalculably stupid. That's always nice and gross.

I had one I should have saved from Perth. This is an absolute classic, this is the most marvelous thing you ever saw. And I think I sent it back. Yes, I did. Well, I ought to have kept it. It's an actual quote found running in a session in Perth. "Well, now I'm going to read your item to you, uh – (whatever it was) a catfish. Uh – all right."

Then the pc said, "Oh, well, yes, catfish. That's very interesting. Did you get anything out of that?"

The pc brightly, finally says, "Well, did you get a nice R/S on it?"

"Oh, no, it didn't R/S."

Female voice: That happened here.

You see? How the hell do you think yourself around mistakes like this?

The auditor hasn't got the fantastic essential that you have to have an R/S! He never got that. You see, that's the stupidity that you run into.

Your next one – your next one is an actual or inadvertent failure to grab this one point: That it is the Routine 2, it is not the auditing that helps the pc. And you'll get this kind of a cycle going. When an auditor first starts in on this, Christ, he has mid ruds and "since the last time I audited you..." mid ruds and every page he turns over he gets in the big mid ruds and every time he gets an item he tiger drills it and, he tiger drills endlessly, Big Tiger, the item that he reads before and then he endlessly Big Tigers the other, and he never tells the pc anything but just keeps on auditing, auditing, auditing, auditing. And you find out 90 percent of your session is consumed in all of this motion. Now, is this auditor – this is to be expected, see, I – this we see. We've seen this continually so it will go on this way.

All right then, gradually as he gets a grip on the fact that it's Routine 2, well, you get a diminishment of the auditing and an increase, see, but he goes down to about 50 percent. He gets in his rudiments every – at the bottom of every page, don't you see, or something like this. And he has a tendency to cut them short here and there, you see. And he doesn't interrupt the pc from listing just so he can get his rudiments in, you know. He's learned these facts. Then, by God, he gets smooth enough in his presence as an auditor and holding the pc in session and so forth so you hear a drill of an item before it is listed. You know? And you listen in vain and you won't hear any beginning ruds, you won't hear any end ruds; you'll hear some Havingness. You know? And the thing has suddenly gone to 98 percent of the session – has become Routine 2. You can expect that evolution.

So don't try, particularly, to prevent it. But just put out the rather snide propaganda that, when they finally know their business, why, they won't be doing this. You see? That's
the best way to handle it. Oh, go ahead, put all the rudiments in you think you should. You'll eventually find out that most of your trouble is coming from your auditing, it isn't coming from that. So it's smoothness of presence. It's also the smoothness that they can put the rudiment in. The rapidity with which they can put these things in and that sort of thing. Get the idea?

It's the goodness of their TRs. This all keeps the session running and eventually you aren't occupied in patching up the lousy auditing the guy is doing. He's auditing very self-consciously so he knows he's goofing, so he expresses it in getting in mid ruds all the time. You see? He knows he's made a mistake so his first thing is, "Well I get – I'd better get in the mid ruds here to get that mistake off." See? He's called the item three times, each time differently. See, he's mispronounced it some different way each of the three... "Well," he says, "the best thing to do is get in all of my mid ruds." You know, just its – you just get this endless confusion. That's because the guy hasn't got the technology as a stable datum.

Now, you could expect such an evolution. Now, further, you can expect the diminishment of error, unless the student is permitted to disperse off lists. This is a golden opportunity, an absolute golden opportunity to audit wrong.

A student can audit so wrong that he never learns how to audit right. You see what I mean? It's such a narrow catwalk that he never does learn how to audit right because he can do so much dispersal on it. See? Oh, he sees the first R/S on the list and he calls it again, immediately, to the pc and he says, "Well, that's your reliable item," and he tries to represent it; but then that gets no place and it beefs up the bank and, so forth. So he decides he'd better invent something new, to go along with this and, actually, he just goes on a dispersal and he'll get worse and worse and worse as an auditor; and not only the pcs will get destroyed, but he'll be destroyed as an auditor. Don't you see?

So it is of great interest to us in our instruction here to get all these rules packaged up so they don't drift around in the air someplace. And then never theorize with a student. Just lay these things into him with an ax. Actually, they exist now. See, we've got these things. I can go back over all of these things and pull them all together into packages, and that sort of thing. We still, in the addition to what I've been giving you here, we know these things; these things, let me put it this way, are known so we can therefore embark on this kind of an action. But when you learn how: deviate. Until so: toe the mark. And, of course, the guy after he learns how and toes the mark, he sees there's no reason at all to deviate. You see, in his anxiety to get a result he will do something else, or wonderful and strange. Don't you see? Actually, it runs off very smoothly if it's done right.

Now your next thing, the next point here I'd like to make with you is: the things that bring in mass or beef up the bank and that sort of thing normally can be counted on as wrong; something is going wrong here. But it's not necessarily the source. You don't just keep picking on source and abandoning lists to correct this mechanism.

Well, I've just given you one way this can happen. And one of the ways this can happen is the pc is representing an R/Sing item: you'll get increased incidence of R/S and everything else towards the end of the list; you'll get a beef-up of bank; he'll start looking abso-
lutely haggard. And the list is from a perfectly good source. See? Well, it can be from a perfectly good source and listed wrong way to.

Now, one of the ways you detect a bad source is you can't tell which way to list it. There's no marked difference. You test it, "What would it oppose?" And you list a dozen items. And then you test, "What would oppose it?" and you list a dozen items. And you just can't tell any difference between them. That's your best test, by the way, for a wrong source. You can't tell the difference between these things, well, don't go beyond that. Say, to hell with it. Let's look it over – let's look the case over earlier than this point. In other words, let's look at this source and see if we didn't have a wrong source. That's when you get a wrong source, that's when the thing won't list. Don't go 45 pages to find out it's wrong way to. And don't go 45 pages "both ways to" to find out it can't be listed. See, the time to find that out is very early.

But watch this mass characteristic. Watch this mass characteristic. You can always expect a little mass to show up because he's listing. But, boy, when he starts getting dark it's these areas, these pouches under the eyes, that tell you the whole story. And when he starts getting dark under there something is going wrong. Well, don't make up your mind what's going wrong before you see what's going wrong, because, as I've just given you, there can be wild auditing goofs in progress. There can be fantastic quantities of auditing and nothing but total suppress and protest on the part of the – of the pc. Don't you see? There can be an auditor who never does anything but Q-and-A, for instance; everything the pc says, the auditor does something, see. And it can be something mechanically wrong; it probably is something mechanically wrong. However that's the one I would pick on. I'd look over and see what the devil is happening here. Look – look – let's see what is happening here.

And one of the first things, very important thing to check, is in any way at all this pc representing a rock slamming item? That's about the first thing to check. Because he isn't answering the auditing command. The way you check that is just – how is he answering the auditing command? And then you prod him a little bit on the subject of, "Are you representing any rock slamming item here?" or something. See? "Has the auditor given you an item and you're now trying to get that on the list?" See? What's going on here? And you'll find out that's out of gear more often than not.

But when they can't list and when it won't run right, believe me, it doesn't run right. It doesn't go on this cycle: pc pretty good; pc worse, worse, worse – you know, we're used to this in old-time auditing – and then it gets better and better and better and the pc comes out of it. That's going through something. Well, R2-12A doesn't go that way. It doesn't go that way. It can stay on a non-improvement, see; it can remain on a plateau. But once it starts over the edge of that plateau and the pc starts getting worse, there is something wrong.

Any darkening of the eye pouch, don't you see? Catch it early. Don't list five pages with him getting lower and lower in the chair and mass crushing in further and further in without investigating this thing.

Now, it's an interesting thing about the abandonment of lists. You abandon too many lists, you're really going to get the pc upset. But, let me tell you something about list sources. List sources is not anywhere near as critical as you think it is. The sources for a list are not
critical. You start in on a raw meat pc, you can make all kinds of errors and get packages. That's not a critical point. That is a point and it has bearing on it, but it's not that critical.

Now, if you find out suddenly that this list source that you're taking comes from a rock slamming item, an old – some old 3GA – get off of that, man, because the pc is going to list into a discolored skin tone and all of this kind of thing is going to happen. But I'm talking now about – let's say you went into the Scientology list and he found Scientology rock slamming like mad. How the hell are you going to correct a Scientology list? How can you increase and finish the auditing, the – how can you complete a Scientology list with Scientology rock slamming?

Male voice: Never tried it.

Well, you can – you can think of all kinds of dodges by which you hope you're doing it; but in actual fact you're not doing anything but representing a rock slamming item. You understand? So, what the hell? Buck into it head-on. So it doesn't list well. So the pc has a hell of a time. So the lists are all 22 pages long. Do it! Gave you a nice big R/S, third of a dial, what the hell, man.

And you'll find out that you'll more often come out right without being so damned gingery [gingerly] about that first list.

Sometimes a case folds up just because, on the first list, there were five R/Ses and the auditor finally grabbed one and then that got abandoned. You have to go back and finish that list. Parts of existence, anything like that. He had – he had "sex" rock slamming a third of a dial. You tried to complete the list and you came up with a rock slam which was a quarter of an inch wide. You'd be so much better off to take sex, see, and carry it on if it had ever been carried on, than to try to correct or rectify. Don't you see? If there's any way you can get a rock slamming item that is an RI from that first list or first approach that the person had in case repair: do it! And expect it to be fluky. It will – it will not quite follow the rules here and there and that sort of thing. So then's when you have to be smart; there's where you get your variations. Don't you see?

Something was done wrong in the first place and when you go back to correct it you find out that you've got to complete what you did. So this puts completing a cycle of action actually senior to avoiding something because it's wrong. See, completing a cycle of action is a bit senior to correcting the situation. You've got something that will list, God help us it lists horribly, but it will list: well, complete it and carry it all around four ways.

But if you're not going to, and this is a brand-new case, and you see that this thing is just going no place: don't try to pick an item off of it. Look, you've got to make up your mind, you see. If you're going to pick up an item off of it, you'd better carry it on. But if you're not going to pick up an item off of it, if he – if you – it's just going no place, you see – all the rock slams were only about three-eighths of an inch, that sort of thing, just tap the pc cheerily on the back and say, "That's fine, now we're going to take another list." You see?

But supposing this thing, all the way, had been delivering great big rock slams. Well, you'd better try to get something. Because it may be that you will never counter another rock
slam of that magnitude. Cherish those big, rock slamming lists. And do them even if they're a little bit wrong.

You see, the idea is simply this: Routine 3 has got to be as precise as though it's laid out with a carpenter's square. And it is. But what are you handling? You're handling the goal, man. And that handles all the mechanics of the GPM and everything will run off just like clockwork.

Not Routine 2. Routine 2, you're on the outskirts of all this and you're trying to cut yourself a channel through. See? And it's fluky and it'll go right on being fluky. And Routine 2-12A follows rules that are quite precise. But the rules only go astray when something is done wrong. See, the rules go astray when the rules aren't followed. You got the idea? But sometimes because you're on the outside of the GPM anyhow and tickling its edges, you've got to take something just because it is rock slamming like crazy and bear through with it because you can't get anything else. And you'll find out that's superior to leaving it alone. You see? There's a point of judgment involved in the thing.

But 2-12A because of the very nature of the thing, that it's only handling lock items on top of RR items, see, but an R/Sing item is only a lock on a – an RR item. Because you're only handling these locks... Well, with all the lousy auditing, you see, with all the goofs, with auditors reading the super-significance – and, by the way, never let an auditor monkey with a significance of anything. Particularly in R3. Because in R3, let's say the pc's goal was to be a dog, and the auditor will inevitably take the first RR that he gets, which is barking, and say, "Obviously, it's the pc's terminal." It never is! Never! It's always the oppterm. Because this goal has passed into the hands of the enemy. That goal is only resident in oppterms now. Isn't that an interesting point?

And the next item up the auditor of significance, you see: "to eat bones." Oh, goody, goody, goody, goody! See? Goody, goody! That's fine. That's a terminal. Don't even have to test it! Bull! See? So just the rule is significance. Never pay any attention to the significance of an item; just never do. Just neglect it utterly. Just do it by mechanical test.

But expect 2-12A to be random. And grab what you can get or grab what has been listed wide. Take allowances for the pc listing rock slamming items and that sort of thing. You can get something on that list to R/S widely when read again. And there aren't two things on the list that are... Grab it, man. I don't care if it came from item one, see. If you get something there or if something was taken off that list that R/Sed well and then was listed: somehow make that list come out to something. Because that pc will never be right until you have. Go all the way around, in other words. You understand?

*Male Voice*: Yes.

You can find the R/S, neglect it, list it, bury it, goof it and then get a nice, complete list with a little, tiny R/S that won't list, that tears the pc to ribbons. You got – get the idea?

So just specialize on that big R/S. Just make sure that it didn't come from a representing rock slamming item or a rocket reading item. Just go on! You can't miss. In other words, old 2-10 and 2-12 when they were originally put out are correct. You can just take the mostest
read that you found on List One and represent it all the way around and the person will be a much happier auditor. You see that? I mean, it's simple.

But with great precision, what is the perfect way to do it? Is to complete the List One.

You see that 2-10 and 2-12 were actually not totally invalidated by 2-12A. Just some new indicators and data came along. You can still take 2-12 and get someplace with it.

Now, we got to get results without knocking people in the head. That's – that's what we got to do. Now, we got to teach them to get results without knocking people in the head at these original stages. And the liability of the Routine 2 is that it will knock people in the head. But usually knocks people in the head when done goofily. You get to figuring too hard, you think too hard, you try to figure yourself to death on the thing, you try to get yourself into some kind of a weird state, of what the waw and if it woo and then it wrr. No, just settle it all down. "Did anything R/S here?" "Oh yeah." "And did we ever have an R/S here? Was it ever listed?" You know, this kind of thing. Well, did – well, God almighty, get something off that new list. We don't care if it's cycled. Get something off of it; find out if it's terminal or oppterm. Chase this guy around the block into a four-package of it and he'll be happy as a clam. This is actually how you settle it down.

See, it's actually a crude settle down. It's not a very precise settle down. Because it's not a very precise process. See? Because you're... you couldn't be – but if... that it has rules at all and that 2-12A could be evolved is fantastic. Because you're handling locks on the goal. Always has a liability. Always is slippy. But find a great big R/S and run with it. That's fine. If you can do it, do it. And you'll come out right and the pc will be better every time.

Find a great big R/S and do something else and try to be perfect with something else and find something else and try to find something else: you're going to wind up with a 3/8th of an inch R/S which when you try to do it pulls the whole bank in on the pc.

So we're trying to get the maximum gain with the least bank pulled in on the pc. And that is the rule you are trying to follow. See? And that rule is accomplished by finding the widest R/S and making a package out of it. We don't care how we got the R/S as long as it isn't from a representable rock slamming item. And you'll find out you'll have wonderful success with this if you follow it.

Now in 2MX... in the Routine 3MX we got an absolute doll, which is as – which is as different from 2-12, Routine 2 approaches as you ever heard of And it's an absolute doll. That thing is just a carpenter's square. It's just exactly on. The lists are shorter; they run more rapidly. It is very swift. It's always the last rocket reading item on the list. You know. If you overlist it tightens the bank, that's by the rule of 25. And the only variety which you'll find is if you haven't prepchecked the goal and the goal is slugged up like crazy and it won't rocket read well but it's persistent in its rocket reading, you know, it's tested Tuesday and it got one rocket read out of it and it's tested Friday and it got one rocket read – oh, to hell with it: list it. See? That kind of thing.

[This tape ends abruptly as did the original master recording.]
R3MX, PART I

A lecture given on 7 February 1963

We've – have a lecture here from my office. And this is the 7th of February 1963 and Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. Lecturing here in my office in front of the TV camera, and we've got a lot to cover here in 3MX.

All right. As you realize, now that we've gotten our materials pretty well lined up, the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course is going to be specializing in Routine 3. We're going to do a minimum of Routine 2. And therefore it's very much to our point to have a decent understanding of Routine 3MX, and that's what this lecture is all about. This is the first lecture on Routine 3MX and gives us our first fundamentals.

All right. If Routine 3 never went any further, and there was nothing else ever done, and nobody ever heard again of Routine 2-12A, it has served its purpose – because it has piloted the way in listing. All the rules of Routine 12A are – in listing and so forth – are followed in 3MX and it gives us a very good look at what a goal is, and what it's all about, and how it should be listed out. So that a brand-new method here of listing out goals has been developed, and it is evidently tremendously successful.

Now, of course, I have a subjective reality on what I'm talking about here. I also have a subjective reality on Routine 2-12A.

Probably one of the most spectacular sessions I've ever seen conducted, completely aside from the fact that it was conducted on me, was the session done by Mary Sue on, what was that, the beginning in the evening of 5th February.

Now, that was a tremendous session in terms of results. In that session we found the R/Sing item which began the goals entrance into 3MX, and just before that, completed a 2-12 package. So that the total score on that, in actual fact, the number of items found in that five-and-a-half-hour session, consisted of four 2-12A packages – that is four items – making one complete package, and four Routine 3MX items – making eight items in all in just that one session.

Now, that at once gives you an erroneous idea of how fast you ought to audit, and is of course an open invitation for you to just grab items all over the place to make a record; and it is very bad publicity. In the first place I'm very easy to audit, and the second place, Mary Sue can audit, and in the third place this was pretty well set up. To give you some of the more gruesome details of this might be very instructive to you. In actual fact the path was not as smooth as it might have looked at first glance.
I had a goal found back in August – the goal "to find" – and this goal failed to check out consistently, and folded up sometime in September. It was listed a bit under the old methods of listing and it didn't get too far. In fact, today the goal – that is not today, but last week – the goal wasn't even firing. It had collapsed completely. Nobody had seen any reads on it or anything of the sort for a long while.

Well now, having done quite a bit of 2-12A on me in the past month or so, why, Mary Sue and I decided that we had better take a crack at listing this goal properly, and we did some goals research. I very often am used as a guinea pig in this particular lineup. And we did some goals research by trying to list this goal one way, and the other way, and some other way in order to make the thing spark. And that was on Sunday night, the 3rd of February, and we listed this 3MX method amongst the other methods. But no rocket reads showed up of any kind whatsoever. And Mary Sue was quite disappointed about the thing and didn't do anything further with it.

And on the 4th of February, Mary Sue started out on a long, arduous, hammer-and-tongs pound, trying to locate something with Routine 2-12A. But in actual fact that didn't go anyplace in that particular session; we didn't do anything with it.

On the contrary, I had worked out a new theoretical process which goes as follows: that if you run out the overts on people's goals, your own goal will pop up. Sounds awfully good, doesn't it? It almost killed me.

The truth of the matter is that as you're listing goals you have overts on, the overts, themselves – not being given to the auditor of course, you're just telling him what goals you have overts on – anything like that gives you nothing but missed withholds, left and right. So there were something on the order – I think – I think she listed about five hundred items – that is five hundred goals or purposes I had overts on. And to give you something very amusing, it ran about twelve missed withholds per goal. So that was five hundred times twelve, or about six thousand missed withholds – that's in one session. That's pretty good, isn't it?

Well, that caved in masses, and an electronic mass that I got into in Dublin keyed in, and it keyed back in thoroughly and I was frying as though I – well, I was frying as well as the dream citizen of Kennedy's administration, you know. Totally fried, atomic fission – I was bright red, I was in terrible shape. So that was – that was really a cave-in.

So in the next session which occurred on the 5th of February, we tried to get back on the run again with 2-12A, and if you've ever seen nervous pcs, that was the one. I had more or less been steering this to a marked degree, but I was a very nervous pc. I didn't want anything overlister even one item, because the second we overlistered something just one item, in would come this fry-electronic, atomic mass, and it was really quite painful.

When I first ran into it, by the way, I became completely speechless, couldn't talk, and the auditor went on asking the auditing question. You see, Mary Sue has been demanding a fee on this, so I – I don't want you to think that all auditors are perfect. She's pretty good though.

Anyway, that thing really, really fried me, and I was very dangerously minded on the 5th, trying to keep this atomic mass off of me, and trying to keep the thing running on the
rails somehow or another – and she was listing various variety of beginning lists. You see we'd already run out of all of the old lists, all the old source lists. And here's a datum for you by the way, that we found out in all this: is you can't go further than the four, not – not with 2-12. You can go further on 3MX than four consecutive RIs, but you can only go four RIs with 2-12A. Don't try for that fifth one.

While we're on it, any RI that only rocket reads that much, you see that, only about that much, tiny, little, little RI; that's about a third of a dial, something like that. Well, this one only about so much. Anything less than a third of a dial is very dangerous. It pulls in mass like mad. Actually if you find one like that on a pc, it's only R/Sing that much, just pat the pc on the head and say, "That's dandy," and don't have anything more to do with it. Now, just skip it, just bail out. You want to go back and find something that did R/S decently.

Now, in 2-12A we managed to work around a first list, and I was listing "What isn't part of existence," I think "What isn't part of existence." By the way, there was another test list in there I just remembered, "What aren't you now?" Don't try that either, that – that's just dynamite. But 2-12A we managed to list on, and "Isn't part of existence" some such list, and we wound up with an item that had a good third-of-a-dial R/S, and so forth. And at the end of the session why, on the 5th, everything was very happy, and so forth.

She sailed into this on the 6th, and decided she was going to complete this package on 2-12A. Well, this was a very interestingly brief package. A source list on 2-12A, you must realize, can have its item occur anyplace. The source list does not follow the rules. Now, that's hard to cope with. That is to say, any of the R/Ses on the source list can be the R/S. You've got a problem here in where does it occur, because the pc's mind is not well channeled on present time lists, and what is part of exist... what isn't part of existence, and so forth. And in actual fact, the source list item that we got was the first item on the list. It R/Sed and she couldn't even separate the list question out from the item for a moment or two, and then I managed to suppress it and she got that out. And she ran about a page and a half of that.

I'm looking at these lists here. I'm not tremendously familiar with them.

Yes – here it is, "What isn't part of existence?" And in doing "What isn't part of existence," this – can you see this now? It – it's this list right here at the top. That's number one, that's number one item. You notice that R/S? All right, the list question was "What isn't part of your existence?" Now, that's fine, but it, the first item, "unlimited wealth" was there, and there – there it is. It was the item, it turned out.

But if you will notice, looking this over, you would list it normally, and you come down here and about eight or nine items from the top, tone arm 2, you have here an R/S and an R/S and a DR, and an R/S. And then you have on the reverse side of the sheet here, again you have the same one – the first one put back on the list again. This is back on the list again, and this time it gave pain. In other words, I put it back on the list. So that of course R/Sed, and then you notice here there is another R/S and an R/S – and by this time she didn't continue on over because the mass was pulling in so tight that there was just no continuing.

And she took that, on the 4th is when she did that, and on the 5th she took this as an item, and she ran it on around the clock, and so that we got a, a package out of this.
There's a lot of test, experimental and research lists here, one kind or another that I'm pawing through, and apparently the list I am looking for just... oh, here we are.

Now – now we come down to a test for pain or sen which is greatly superior to any test which you happen to be using. And instead of determining by pn or sen, you determine by mass. And you say to the pc, "Consider unlimited wealth committing overts," two or three times, and you ask him "Did it turn on any more mass?" And he doesn't know because he hasn't been looking. So you say it two or three more times, "Would unlimited..." or "Consider unlimited wealth committing overts." And then you say, "Consider committing overts against unlimited wealth. Consider committing overts against unlimited wealth." You say, "Did that turn on more mass?"

He says, "Well, yeah, there's something out here and it started to go out from my body," and – and so forth. And that's of course wrong.

In other words, you tested as term and oppterm, and the one which doesn't turn on more mass – of course these things all have a little mass associated with them – but the one that doesn't turn on more mass is the right way it is.

If you say, "Unlimited wealth oppose," when it should be "Oppose unlimited wealth," you of course are running a wrong item. You recognize that by using it as a terminal, or using it as an oppterm, you get a wrong item manifestation. All you've got to do is say that the thing is a terminal when it's an oppterm, or an oppterm when it's a terminal, and you've got a wrong item. You recognize that, and the thing behaves like a wrong item.

So here is a test. The right way to turn on less mass than the wrong way to. Because of course a wrong item turns on mass; that's your stable datum. The wrong item turns on mass always. You can keep that in mind.

Anyway, here is this very interestingly brief 2-12A package. We look on here and we see here this is "Who or what would unlimited wealth oppose?" And of course here we start in our list as we normally would, just go right on down here with this list, on down here with the list, and only is two more items on the other side of the page. Now, that should be of considerable interest to you that a 2-12A list can be that short, because very few of them are that short. But this is the equivalent that – we talk in pages, this is the equivalent of – of course one, two and a bit, pages. Fantastically brief. So it must have been right up on top of the bank. And she did this, and this is done exactly according to the rules.

Now, the rules are simply this: That you get down here, you're listing down from the top, down, down, down, down, down from the top to the bottom of the page. You take your next page, and you're at the top down here, and here your TA motion ceases.

Now, the characters have been having an awfully, awfully hard time of it. I sympathize with you terribly. You're going to think yourself to death someday. I – after my absence of being kicked in the head earlier a few weeks ago – I haven't been very alert on what's going on. And let me tell you, a rumor that there is no such thing as a still TA is more asinine than I have heard since 1950. Anybody that will take a meter – anybody that will take a meter and hold the meter on a cognition-surge basis, and every time, every time the needle ducks, duck the TA. You, you see that now. The needle does a cognition surge, so they think immediately
– I tell you, you're going to think yourself to death someday. I'm not kidding you, you know. You're going to think yourself right straight into the grave.

God give me a simple auditor who can just sit down and just list and pick up the item and pat the pc on the back and say, "That's it."

No, no, people got to get fancy. Every time the tone arm – every time that needle goes this way, see, needle goes – so, so. Pc had a thought, see, comes back to the approximate place. Then the auditor figures out, of course, that this tone arm would have gone that way, that way, see – there we go, so therefore didn't still tone arm. You nut. I mean I'm being very, very insulting, but when I heard about this I said, "My God, this can go on at Saint Hill, what the hell goes on in Keokuk?" Now, that's a – that's an interesting question isn't it?

Look, you don't count the surges. A still TA is a still TA. Where have you got to put the TA in order to read the needle? Well, if you don't have to put the TA any other place in order to read the needle, that's a still TA. You got it?

Do you know there have been two or three cases out here that have been wrecked with that – wrecked with it, I'm not kidding you. Somebody just figured himself to death, see. So you quit that.

You know I could probably dream up more problems for you to solve in Dianetics and Scientology than you could count in the next million years. But no, you've got to pick on something like this: "There is no such thing as a still TA, that's ridiculous, a still TA." No, a still TA is a still TA.

Of course, you did something better than that today as a class. There was a member amongst us who thought that an R/S was a tick, was a fall, was a dirty read, was a rocket read – and all the pc's items, all the pc's lists were beefing up because the R/S was on everything. And Mary Sue got bright enough, being an old D of P to look over somebody's shoulder and say, "What on earth do you think an R/S is?" And anything was an R/S. So of course it looked like the pc's lists were all beefing up.

Yes, I'm giving you – I'm giving you a bad time, but I'm giving you a bad time with malice aforethought. And that is because when I tell you something very simple like you put the pc in the chair, you say, "Start of session. Give me your goals. Now, here is the list we're going to list, and can you answer the question?"

And the pc says yes, he can answer the question. And then he... the auditor simply sits there and writes down the items, one after the other – without tripping the pc, without spitting in the pcs face, without dropping the E-Meter, without getting in the mid ruds for yesterday, without getting in the mid ruds for tomorrow, and so forth – just finishes the list and goes through the 2-12A routine and comes up at the end of the session with a nice item, and everything is firing – and there it is. Give me that auditor please, because the evolution – the evolution which you go through as an auditor is very interesting.

The first day you confront the pc, you do everything you can think of. You've heard – you've heard of 8-C, and you've heard of this, and you've heard of auditor control, and you've heard of this and the other thing. The more complicated the auditor is being the less certain he is of the tools of his trade. And you can just put that down in your book. And that's the only
thing that gets in the road of Routine 2, and will get in the road of 3MX. Mark my words, it's just somebody who really doesn't know what he's doing, so he's doing everything.

I heard this afternoon, with some horror, of a staff auditor in a Central Organization who couldn't get much done because the last two-and-three-quarter hours of the session, every session, had to be taken up with the end rudiments on 2-12. Oh, no. You know how you end the session? There's a reversal on this. If you just – if you could just end the session like you say, "Make any part of your goals? And you make any gains?" You got the item, see. "You make any part of your goals? You make any part of your gains? All right. Fine. Now, notice the ceiling, notice the floor, notice the walls of the room. Thank you. Is it all right with you if I end the session now? That's the end of session." You know, that didn't take two hours and forty-five minutes. You know it's infinitely better than anything else anybody's doing. You see what I mean.

Sabotage comes with uncertainty. If your TRs are perfect, if you can sit there and hold a pc in-session – listen to me, you don't need any mid ruds.

You know I've had people right here at this desk over here. I had them sit down and say, "What's your goal?" Do a goals list of fifteen, you know a lot of those goals worked out. And they did a little goals list, and I'd go over the thing, and they're happy about it and I'm happy about it, and...

Somebody was standing across the desk from me just yesterday and he said, "Do you know one of the biggest session gains I ever had, you brought me in here one day and you found something that might be my goal. And you didn't say it was, but you, so on, and it's the biggest session gain I ever had. Had a lot of cognitions on it," and so forth. Total session time – ten minutes. Total mid ruds – zero. There wasn't even a "start of session." Why? Well, he didn't have to be told he was in-session. I was auditing him. I'm sorry, but that's the way these things go.

Now, look-a-here, you can see this paper better here, all in one fell swoop. This is a list down here. I'm sorry to – to chew you out on such things as "There is no such thing as a still TA," because you actually just destroyed your primary indicator, don't you see.

Now, she got down to here – I'm not showing you these because these are mine, but I just happen to be a set of stuff that I know about on 2-12 and on 3MX. So I – I can show you very intimately and correctly exactly where these things are. All right, we come down here, we've got a tone arm read of 4 on this border here. On this border we've got 4.75, 4.75 and nothing moved, obviously, and there are no more reads. It's all 4.75, 4.75, 4.75. In other words the auditor did not have to move the TA in order to read the needle, so it was a still TA. That's all there is to that.

Now, you'll notice in all this that after you've gone in 2-12A, fifty items, your needle starts to tighten. Not only do you have a motionless TA, but you have a tightening needle. Now, here we go five items deep, we had an R/S. This is all still 2-12, see. We add another four or five items – we had another R/S. Four items – an R/S. About two items later – an R/S. Three items later – an R/S. Then an R/S, and an R/S, and an R/S, and an R/S, and an R/S, and an R/S, and then it skips an item and R/S, R/S, and then another R/S. You say, "This thing is
hotter than a pistol." Well it was. That's because the whole thing is being hit right there into the middle of the package.

All right, and we get up here to this second column here and we've got an R/S, and then we've got another R/S, we've got another R/S, and then we've got another R/S, and then it goes two – and there's another R/S. And there's no R/S, and no R/S, and no R/S, and nothing, and so forth. TA has already hit its still point. Now, she's got to list herself her fifty items, see. So she did. Actually, it was: needle started to tighten up so that she didn't finish off listing her fifty items on this particular thing, because it was just getting asinine. There isn't anything going to happen. Why finish listing the things?

So it's just a jump of that thing based on the smartness of the auditor not to list the pc into the ground. The needle is getting tighter, and tighter, and tighter – and the TA actually has been still for quite a long time, and there's nothing else happening here, nothing else happening – and there's nothing else going to happen either.

So there it is. There's the last R/S. All right. So she says – so she says right away to the pc, she says, "Now, I'm going to read the next to the last rock slamming item – the next to the last rock slam item I'm going to read to you." See it'... there's the R-factor. She's not going to read the pc's item so he can ARC break, you see, and say, "It's not my item."

"Well, I didn't say it was your..." I can hear you now. Omit the R-factor, see.

"Well, here's the item, Joe Blow."

"That's not my item."

"Well, I didn't say it was your item." How to not get along.

All right. So we... all those R/Ses ended up down here with one R/S, so she reads the next to the last R/Sing item to see if it reads. It had better not. And out it goes – bang. She marks it out – didn't read. She reads it to pc – didn't read. No, no Tiger Drill or nothing like that.

And then she says, "Now, I'm going to read the last rock slamming item on the list." Not even, "This is your item," see. And she reads "being homeless," see. She said, "That R/Ses."

You see she – she doesn't do this, and I don't do this, and you're not supposed to do this. You sit there, "Being homeless. Being homeless. Being homeless. Oh, well."

Pc says, "Well, did it, did it, did it, did it R/S?"

"Oh yes, yes, R/S."

"Well, how big was the R/S?"

"Oh, about a third of a dial, so forth." [scrambles with papers] "Let's see now, we've got to get over onto this, and so forth. I don't know if that's your item or not."

And pc's saying, "But, gosh, do you know, that's always what I worry about."
"Yeah, well just a minute, I – I've got to get some – get my auditor's report written up here. Now, let's see, let's see, that doesn't really seem to be your item, and so forth, because I can't figure out the significance of it."

That would be a bad show, wouldn't it? I hate to get this sarcastic, but I have some things reported from organizations particularly that make me hold my head in my hands. Something like this:

"Are... well here's an item here, irresponsibility: How do you like that?"

"Oh, it – it's all right," the pc said, "that's all right, all right, all right. Always been pretty irresponsible."

The Auditor Supervisor comes along and says, "Well, did it R/S?"

"No, no."

We don't know what this interlude was all about, don't you see. We haven't a clue. Why was he reading this item to the pc in the first place?

Now, it's just a direct positive action, and in 2-12A your rules are very direct. You take your source list – the item can appear on it anyplace – so you go over every item on the source list that R/Sed. Just make sure there aren't two R/Sing items on the source list. Take it wherever you found it. If it's not a big R/S don't do a thing with it, you hear me. Scuttle it. Find out why this pc doesn't have a big R/S. Something else has been done to this case in the past.

Now, take that reliable item, find out if it's pain or sen, and start opposing it. Do your pain/sen test on the one that didn't turn on more mass on "Consider committing overts against," and "Consider so-and-so committing overts." Then just start listing it.

Look, don't get in your – your beginning/end ruds with the mid ruds on the this-ruds, on the that-ruds, and so forth, unless the pc's fallen out of his chair, or screaming, or something like this, you see. Don't use the tools of auditing unless you have to use them.

You – how... what would you think of a plumber who went into a room and he sees an awful lot of fittings. So he gets out spanners and just work, working on all the fittings, and so forth. And pretty soon the whole place is leaking, so he gets out big spanners this time to repair it. And that's the way you'll go, you see. He's got to get out sledgehammers after a while and demolish the whole works.

No, the pc's sitting there, pc's interested, you start listing – pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, bang-bang-bang-bang.

Now, some other genius around here someplace dreamed up one that you tell the pc what R/Sed. You say, "That R/Sed." This is an absolute invitation – a complete, utter invitation to the pc then to represent a rock slamming item. He's trying to get his item on the list, so you have something like "a penurious person." So he says, "A penurious person."

And the auditor says, "That R/Sed," you know, this hope factor, see.
So after that the pc says, "A cheap person, a person without any money, a person that ain't got nothing, a – uh, a broke person." You see why? He's representing a rock slamming item.

Actually you mustn't even let the pc see your list. You understand? I don't care if you've got to get a cardboard barrier across from you. That's better.

Now, when you flub and don't complete a list and read it to the pc – which you will do every now and then, the best of auditors will – the pc then, almost certainly is liable to take the next to the last rock slamming item that you read, and the last rock slamming item that you read that didn't. And he's almost certain, completely certain, to represent those unless you, the auditor say, "Now, that we have those, your item's probably nothing like them. Now, just answer this auditing question, 'Who or what would catfish oppose?' Now, that's all I want answered."

Because if he starts representing in order to get his item on the list, you are going to get a false increase of R/S. It's going to look like it's wrong way to, and it's not going to list out, and you're not going to get the item on the list. Do you understand?

All right. So those are the things you can do wrong. Let's take a look at what you do right. You come right down the list here. You start in, here you go, you are... list and list, and list and list and list – and there are your R/Ses. The pc seems anxious. He looks at you, and so forth. You say, "There are R/Ses on the list. It's okay." You do the same thing with, with 3MX. You say, "There are, there are R/Ses on the list. It's all right."

"Oh yeah. Oh. Okay." And he plows right ahead.

All right. You list on down your page, and keep your note of your TA over here on the side. Keep it – keep pegging it in, pegging it in, writing it down – whenever you see it, oh, every five, ten items, something like that. And when it doesn't change why you probably should make a list notation occasionally. Get on down here and all of a sudden you notice that about this place – and by the way most lists are much longer than the one I'm showing you. This is a freak list. This is a very short list. Lists usually go seven, eight, nine pages. This makes a good illustration for you. So right about this point here, tone arm motion ceases. You've still got a needle moving every time he cognites, you understand, but you don't have to move the TA to keep the needle on. So for all intents and purposes you have no tone arm motion.

And there we go, down the line, down the line – all of a sudden we see that R/S – ha-ha-ha, we see that R/S. It's the last one that we got. We don't see another one, see, we don't see another one. We keep on going, going, going, going, going, going, going, going, so on. Actually we count from this last R/S – fifty for Routine 2-12A, and twenty-five for 3MX. Never more than twenty-five for 3MX. Never more than fifty for 2-12A. That's fifty items after the TA stopped moving. Fifty items after the tone arm stopped moving, or after the last R/S, see – either one. But not fifty items after the tone arm stopped moving if you now have an R/S. See, your R/S cancels out the point from where the TA stopped moving on down to the last R/S – and you've got to have fifty items now from that last R/S. You got it?

And you just list them, and the pc says, "Isn't this getting awfully tough?"
And you say, "Yes, it's getting awfully tough," and so forth.

Count them up, you know – you know that's twenty, twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty-seven, twenty-seven [eight]; "You've got twenty-two items to go. Twenty-two, let me have twenty-two."

And the pc will sit there and snarl, and list the twenty-two for you. But nevertheless list them because every now and then he will pick up a rock slam, and then you should go on by the rock slam. Go on by the rock slam, and when you're safely by it so that he can't identify it, you say to him, "I'm afraid I got to have fifty more items: I've had a rock slam."

"Oh, you have. Well, fine." And he'll give you the fifty more items.

Those are the exact rules of listing. Now, look, there isn't any more to them – except in 3MX the difference is simply this: The difference in 3MX is just this one difference – that it's twenty-five, not fifty – because 3MX caves in fast, and 2-12A caves in more slowly after the still TA.

All right. So anyway, to get back on this other sprint. Just – I'm talking about this not because it's my case I'm trying to show you – because this was a research sprint and I'm trying to give you the stuff that we got out of it.

We got the rest of that package carrying it right straight on around, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And that gave us four RIs, and now having four RIs, why, we were all set. That was the end of that 2-12 package, and all of a sudden Mary Sue says to herself, "R/S." I had a big R/S on that, but she was muttering, and she went back to this goals list that she had been listing two days before and she decided to test the R/S. She tested the R/S. She tested the one before and found that the last R/S on the list fired as it should, and simply took off and opposed it. And what did she turn up with but a rocket reading item which was an RI. And we had to go to town right at that point.

In other words, the first part of the package started out with an R/S. Now, that's the goal oppose that we were doing, you know. Now, you have to have a question there that the pc can answer. And one of the ways that a pc doesn't answer the question is not be asked the right question. You've got to have goal oppose.

Well, that can have several wordings. There are several ways that can be worded. "Who or what would somebody or something with the goal 'to catch catfish' oppose?" Well, all right, he can answer that. But he can't answer "Who or what would catching catfish oppose?" You understand, you got to have a question that a pc can answer. And listing that on out the line – that was the one that had been listed two days before – we'd listed, she'd listed that out and she found an R/S, and this was a proper rock slamming item – the kind you'd expect to see in 2-12.

Well, turning that thing – testing it for terminal or oppterm, and listing it further produced another rock slam – rock... a rocket reading item; produced another reliable item, but it rocket read. And from that moment on, opposing and using the exact same rules that we had already worked out – it was a little bit tough being audited and working out the rules at the same time – but found out that the tightening of the needle is more rapid in the middle of the GPM than it is out on the fringes. You see, 2-12A is out on the fringes of the GPM, and when
you list a goal you go right straight into the middle of the GPM, and the tightening of the needle is much more rapid. So you get something that looks like this.

It also, apparently – I wouldn't say so at first glance – but apparently compared to 2-12 average lists, the lists of 3MX are shorter. They are a shorter list, but they're not lists of one or two, they're a little longer than that. Now, here's one of the item lists that came off of this, and here's one of these – now we're into 3MX, and here's the way 3MX works.

You ask the pc, "Who or what would consider committing overts against" – in this case – "detectives? Consider committing overts against detectives. Consider detectives committing overts." Say one one way two or three times. Say it the other way two or three times. Which one turned on the most mass? The pc tells you, and that's the wrong one, so you pick the one that didn't turn on any mass.

And he says, "That's right." And that is the item, so therefore it's an oppterm, see – whatever it was.

Oppose "Consider committing overts against detectives," turned on less mass, so therefore it is "Who or what would oppose detectives?" as simple as that. So we take this and we list this right on down here, "Who or what would oppose detectives?" We list it down against the meter.

Now, if that needle were tightening and we're getting no TA of any kind we would come off of it because there's something wrong. But you're not likely to get these items as wrong as you were 2-12 items.

All right, "Who or what would oppose detectives?" And we're listing here, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, we come down the line here and we're about seven or eight down the line and we get an R/S. And then we come about ten down the line here and we have another R/S. And then we got eleven and we get, twelve is another R/S, and thirteen, fourteen. Fourteen is a rocket read. There's your rocket read – first rocket read. And then we come down here fifteen, sixteen, eighteen, twenty, something like that – we have another rocket read – and at that moment TA action has ceased. It has ceased, there is no TA action.

And so she went on and on, and was just getting along fine with no TR action... no TA action, and almost had her twenty-five, and so help me Pete, she got an R/S on the list. So that cancelled the other twenty-five, and now she's got to have twenty-five more; much over the pc's dead body, you see. But gets the twenty-five more, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, lists twenty-five more on down.

Now, this later thing was an effort to patch up a package. But there's a line drawn there to show distinctly that it didn't belong to this first package. Actually this first package was quite correct. This was just to come back as a – experimental test to see which way was what. We found out you could get TA action after you've listed something and found it's oppterm, you can get TA action back on it again. That's very interesting.

All right. So, all right, she gets down here, TA's been stopped all this time, there's twenty-five items past this R/S. There we go, all set. Let's go back here. Now, let's read the last rock slam on the list, if there is one, to the pc because we know that isn't it. But, of course, if that was rock slamming there's still charge on this list, so there's something wrong.
We knocked that out, and there she's marked it X, and we come back here to the next to the last rocket read and knock that out. Read it to the pc, say it's the next to the last. Didn't rocket read. All right. Then we say, "Now, here's the last rocket reading item on the list, 'a personality." And she says, "That rocket reads," you see. So she's got a rocket read, she reads "a personality" a couple of times, and that's all set.

Now, you'll find the cognitions are sometimes not as bountiful on a pc when they get rocket reading items. They sometimes merely say, "Yes, yes, that's the item, ha-ha, yeah, of course, yep."

And you sit there in vain waiting for them to cognite. Hell, they cognited, it blew. What do – what do you want? What – what do you want, Rodgers and Hammerstein's Oklahoma? Because you're not going to get anything, it's gone. But the pc knew it was his item.

Now, look-a-here, let's – let's get another one here now. You see how this goes. It's quite mathematical. There's nothing – nothing ever different in it. There's no variation in it. You do it the same way. And if it works any other way – you see your listing for 2-12A and your listing for 3MX are both identical. There is no difference in this listing.

And if you have listed something and you've flubbed the dub, and it doesn't follow the exact rules, the last rocket read doesn't read, the last R/S on the list doesn't R/S, somebody has goofed, see. Something you have taken it from is wrong. Your list isn't complete. There's something wrong, see? Your source item was wrong, something – something's wrong. That's the way you work this out.

And you watch these things, because here was a patch-up she had to do, and she was all ARC broke, so I had to come out of session and tell her that the auditor ARC broke. Everything had gone along, I think this was about the eighth consecutive reliable item – now we're into the session of the 6th of February – and this is the 8th consecutive or 6th consecutive, or something like that, reliable item found from this goal. Everything has rocket read, she takes this "personality," and she goes right in, she tests it, it works, everything works, everything is fine, everything is beautiful. She lists it and it goes down brrrrr, and you never saw so many rocket reads in your life, it's just rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads, rocket reads. Oh, my. Action, action, action, and then suddenly no rocket reads. And we go way down, and then some rocket reads, and then down here, and then some R/Ses, and then one R/S, and then way down here, and then the twenty-five from the last R/S, and she calls off the last R/S and it doesn't R/S. She calls off the next to the last rocket read, it doesn't rocket read, all is well, you see. Then she calls off the last rocket read and it doesn't rocket read.

In a hurry then – I had to hold her hand while she's doing this, this is nervy stuff, you know – she went back over all the RR's on the whole list, read them all. Like to blew my bank up – nothing. You know what the rule for that is – if you cant get the item on the list – she went and extended it after that, and she still couldn't get the item on the list – if you can't get the item on the list, you've lost one someplace. It's back of you. And that's true of 2-12A, and it's true of 3MX. It's true of all listing, in other words. If you can't get an item on the list, then there is no item to be put on the list because it's already been found, or something like that. It's been found elsewhere.
But in actual fact this would have been a catastrophe because we were listing right down the center of the GPM, rocket reading item, reliable items, one after the other, all of them following this rule: you list it all the way down to your last R/S or RR, still TA, twenty-five more items. The last rocket read is it, every time. Everything's just going like clockwork, and then all of a sudden here's one that doesn't go like clockwork.

Well, that's the time when you pass in the chips and try to commit suicide, or something, because that—that's a gruesome day. And pc feels a little ARC broke along about that time. So we sat down, we had a conference. I knew I had to think fast to save the auditor. So I dreamed up a rule which you'll be using, and I think you'll be very interested in this rule. And the rule is, is simply that if you suddenly draw a blank, well, go back and find the item, terminal or oppterm that the pc was less, least happy about.

In other words show him the items and say, "Which one of these weren't you quite as happy about as the others?"

And he will say—he will say, "Well, detectives, I just wasn't happy about detectives."

Look back and see where detectives came from and continue the list that you got detectives on. In other words, continue the list just before that, you understand. The one that detectives appeared on, let's continue that list because the pc says he's unhappy with it.

And here's the trick! You get your next item which belongs where you should have found it, here. In other words here's this "personality" list that didn't have an item on it—you've got this now—here's a "personality" list, couldn't get an item on this list. Went back and took an item the pc was unhappy about, and all the same he scrubbed that one and continued the same list that it occurred on. Another item did come up, a late RR—there's where the thing had gone astray, don't you see—and used that RR, not canceling out everything the pc has found on him, but just using that as your next consecutive RR.

Why did it come up in the first place? Well, it came up now because it's ready to come up, not because the auditor missed it. In other words this is another method of finding your consecutive line plot item that belongs on that. Here's a rocket reading item then, "convention" which gorgeously rocket read. Everything was fine, and it simply fitted exactly into the line plot where the oppterm of "personality" should have had a point, see.

Don't even tell the pc you've destroyed his items. Don't tell him you've scrubbed anything. You've just reached back, backwards, found something the pc wasn't happy about, continued the listing of that, found another item and just moved it up the line plot and used it as normal and just keep right on going.

Well, we're nine rocket reading items and one R/Sing item—which was the source that came off the goal—deep at this particular time. I've had quite a few R/Sing 2-12 items found. And over the period of time we're now nine rocket reading items deep into the GPM.

Now, about the only thing that showed up is a darkening of skin, a lightening, actually of body mass, and look a bit better. But, at first when you start into this you're liable to get a lot of black showing up on the pc anyhow, that's apparently one of the characteristics. And after he's been audited for—you've gotten a few rocket reading items, then he starts to lighten up. But at first, why, he's liable to look kind of black. That doesn't—doesn't mean anything.
It does mean something when the pc turns black. You start running a list, or list an item or something, the pc goes black on you. You just better get off of that now. Goes blacker than he was at the beginning of the list, you understand that. Any of you characters use this just so you can abandon the list, why I'll have your thetan.

Anyhow, there's your – your setup of 3MX is a very precise listing which is the same listing pattern as Routine 2-12, except that in Routine 3 you only use rocket reads except when you have to have an R/S on your goals opposition in order to start you into the bank. Sometimes that will be an R/S.

Now, an R/S and an RR fade into each other. That I have also found recently. They – an R/S, if it will become one, can become an RR, and an RR can become an R/S; but it doesn't mean that these are interchangeable. They definitely are not. You can't say, "Well, I'm running a rocket reading line because look at all the R/Ses." See, that's not true.

An R/S is a little bit further out than an RR. You get that? So an R/S normally is rather a lock phenomenon on an RR, and that's how these things are related.

So if you're running R/Ses you're really running locks; if you're running RRs you're running right in through the Goals Problem Mass.

So you see anybody that knew how to run 2-12A perfectly, could convert over and list with much greater ease, by the way – because its precision is greater – could move right over and at once list on 3MX, because it's twenty-five items beyond the still TA or the last R/S, whichever comes last; twenty-five items beyond that for 3MX and it's fifty items – now, 2-12A – in 2-12A.

In 2-12A you're dealing with less precision of action than you are dealing with 3MX. This is their main difference because in 2-12A you will occasionally be horrified having gone exactly fifty items, just like the book said, to start the pc listing again and have the item that he gives you, the very next item that he gives you – which is item 51 – R/Ses and is the reliable item for that list. You've gone around and round, holding your head wondering where it was.

In other words, that can vary. Sometimes if your sources are poor, and so on, you will find the R/Sing item is not the last R/S on the list, but is number fifteen on the front page. Oh, there must be something wrong there someplace. Actually the best thing to do is to bear on rather than to keep repair, repair, repair all the time.

Now, this is the score then with regard to 3MX, and I've given you this mostly on the basis of a personal experience of the material. I've seen how this material operates myself. Been over the jumps on it. I've been trying to find a goals line in that we could really give you and really square up. And want to get all those old goals straightened out, and so forth. Well, I'll talk about that in the next lecture. I just wanted to give you a good review of what's been happening here with the old man and research.

I've been getting killed daily for the last hundred and fifty hours, but that's not quite fair because the last fifteen hours of those were more processing than I have ever seen in the last twelve years. So it all paid off, and you have my bravery to thank for the whole lot.
So, thank you very much.
R3MX

PART II

A lecture given on 7 February 1963

Okay. Here we go. Second lecture Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 7 February AD 13. This – a briefer lecture. This has to do exclusively now with the mechanics of 3MX. What is 3MX, and why? It's called 'X' because it's still experimental, and therefore its designation is really Routine 3M.

Who can run it? Well, anybody that's trained and qualified to run it. And that takes up your classification. This is a Routine 3 and a Routine 4, a Routine 3 process is run by a Class III Auditor, who, however, must get his material checked out, such as "did the goal rocket read?" and so forth, by a Class IV Auditor.

Now, the probability is that a great deal of listing under supervision of 3MX will occur, and therefore we have to modify it and say that a Class II Auditor under the supervision of a III Auditor with the essential points checked out by a Class IV can run 3MX.

This is a very precise process. And the main danger of all these processes is the gross auditing goof. That is the main danger of any process. This is quite remarkable the number of goofs that can be pulled in an auditing session, like somebody is marking every time the needle twitches, that's a rock slam, fall, that's a rock slam, so forth. That is just an asinine goof. And if you and I were to get together and think of the number of goofs which we could think of, working day and night for about thirty days, we probably would not have begun to cover the goofs which can occur under the gross auditing error. These things have to be seen to be believed, and that is the basic foe of processing at large.

Pc is never required to sit in the auditing chair, you know. Everything is going along fine, and you've got R/Ses marked on the list, and everything seems to be just fine, except we find out that the auditor has never used an E-Meter and doesn't have one in the session. Honest, honest, the... you can't outguess what goofs can occur.

Now, what you have to do is be very sure that your supervision in an area is adequate and knowing, that your technical people are anxious to pass on the information and to get people so that they really can audit. And your next big hump is to make sure that bulletins which come in aren't just read, the last paragraph, and put aside, "Well, I know that."

"Do you have bulletin so-and-so?"

"Oh, yes, I have bulletin so-and-so." They didn't add, "But I've never read it."
You've got to have good bulletin checkout. You've got to have tape listen, and things of this character. Staff training and auditor training, and so forth, has got to be very good and very straight. This is how you get along the... around these goofs.

So in actual fact it isn't the complication of the process, or the difficulties of the process which is our biggest foe, but the relaying of the proper information with regard to the process. That is the stumbling block.

Now, you'll find perhaps there's some chap down in lower north, southeast Bulawayo, or something of the sort, who never, never, never hands out a bulletin. He just won't let anybody see a bulletin, but hands out gratuitous information from the bulletins he has never read. Now, that kind of thing can occur.

Therefore, the liabilities of Scientology are basically those of gross auditing errors which are just unimaginably God-awful and... or ridiculous, and next to that, actually, is just no study of the information. And given those – you've already got good-hearted willingness on the part of auditors. Never doubt that. But given these other two items corrected, why, then you could have as complicated as a process as you wanted to have.

Now, 2-12, 2-10, apparently had a tremendous number of rules. They were just rules, rules, rules, and never, never, nevers, and all this kind of thing, and so forth. You notice those things are boiled down.

Well, now I haven't sat down and given you a long list of the exact codifications of these things, but they start to become obvious to you as you look them over. And you will shortly have a very precise rundown of this material.

You've got lectures on it. You've got lots of tapes on it. Most of this material is – not all of it is on tapes, or in the last bulletin I handed out on it, and we've got a long way to go with this information because we've been waiting for this – for this breakthrough.

All right, there's a breakthrough Routine 3. Fine. Some people went Clear. Then there's this fact that this case, and that case, and the other case just didn't quite make it, and they hung up in listing, so there must be bugs on listing.

So I started to work on listing, and worked on listing, and I've been working on that for some little time. Actually, you don't need too much new technology in order to find a goal. But the technology that was needed had to do with listing. And in 2-12, and 2-10, working with those I found the answer to goals listing. And goals listing becomes more precise and more exact than the goals [item] listing of 2-12 and 2-10, or 2-12A. There is much greater precision connected with listing on a goal.

Now, let's take a look at this 3MX and find out exactly what we've got. I just remarked here "Give me a rocket reading reliable item and I can clear the pc. Just give me one, off this case that I can make rocket read, and it is a reliable item; give me that, and somehow or another I will steer him right on down through by oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, on a 'Spiral Staircase.' And after he's clear of his first goal we find out what it was." That's remarkable, but there's the look which you're taking right now.
So let's take a look at what we have. Here then, is not a process which actually completely depends on finding the pc's goal. More pertinently you've got to find a rocket reading item.

Well, supposing somebody was busily listing 2-12A and found a rocket reading item. The last – there were three rocket reads... reading items occurred on the list, and one of these still fires with a rocket read – the last one, and just one and there's no R/S fires; it's just that rocket read fires.

Now, if the auditor knew that rocket read, and it was checked out as a rocket read, the thing to do is to determine whether or not it is a terminal or opp-term, unload immediately from whatever other process one is doing and immediately go into 3MX just like that, bang. Just shift gears right there at that point because you've got pearls on your hands, man. Why, why bother with anything else because you can enter the "Spiral Staircase" of 3MX with any reliable item which rocket reads.

Well, that's good news. What's the "Spiral Staircase"? That's just oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, and when you go off the rails go back and find an item the pc didn't really like, extend the list, find another rocket reading item, put it on the line plot as the consecutive one to the one you want, and just go on oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, and you're just going right straight through the GPM. You'll get terrific relief, and terrific knockout of masses and pressures, and all this sort of thing. When you're dealing with rocket reading items you're not dealing with the liabilities – and if you're dealing with rocket reading items perfectly according to the rules of Listing and Nulling now – you're not dealing with the liabilities that you are with rock slamming items. A rock slamming item is quite a liability. You can only go around it four times. It leaves mass hanging, it does this, it does that. Oh, yes, it's good processing, but it is susceptible to error, and it is susceptible to going off the rails.

Not so – not so with a rocket reading. You take an R/Sing item that goes off the rails. A rocket reading, reliable item, give me that and I can keep it from going off the rails because it will go much more precisely.

The GPM is made up of a greater level of precision, of course, than its locks. Its locks can be far more random.

Therefore – therefore, when you get right down to it here, and look over the situation, 3MX is actually easier to run than Routine 2-12A. You say, "Well, why not run it exclusively?" Well, you sometimes can't find the pc's goal or even really get him to take much of a goals list, and their goals list go into the thousands on some particular cases unless you take some relief off the bank. So there is your purpose and function of 2-12A: it's just trying to unburden and relieve the bank.

Now, given the pc's goal which rocket reads, or a pc's goal which at sometime in the past was reliably observed to have rocket read – I mean reliably observed to have rocket read, Class IV Auditor saw it – given that goal, what do you do? Well, that goal is a terminal. Therefore, you list it as a terminal only on an oppose. You must never represent a rock slamming item, you know that. Well, that also applies to rocket reading items. Don't represent a rocket reading item. That tells you at once what was wrong with four-line listing that we were
doing with goals earlier. It is not as serious, but it is the same order of magnitude to represent
a rocket reading item. And on some of these cases they didn't – their goals listing didn't sur-
vive the represent of the rocket – the representing the rocket reading item. "Who or what
would have your goal?" All right, that's a representation of a rocket reading item; and so the
individual didn't get down to cases on the thing and there it is.

Now, frankly it didn't mess up the case. That's one thing you can be very happy about.
It might have eclipsed the goal so that you couldn't see it anymore and it didn't fire anymore,
but you take that goal, and wording it in some way that the pc can answer, "Who or what
would the goal to catch catfish oppose?" and just list that one line, pow-pow-pow-pow-pow; if
that was the pc's goal you're going to get rocket reads and you're going to go right on down
the line.

Sometimes you won't get rocket reads, but you're certainly going to get an R/S, and
you follow right on through. It's the last rocket reading or the last R/Sing item that you get on
that list. That's the last rocket read or the last R/S that you get on that list. And that's all you
do with a goal. You complete that list, and that completes, by the way, under the same old
rules that you've been doing with 2-12A. You'd better go beyond it about fifty just to make
awful sure, because it's not going to mess up the pc to the degree that the items themselves
will mess up the pc.

All right, though you're sure you've got this now, and this is a good R/S. Determine
whether it's a terminal or an oppterm by – ask the pc, "Which one of these lines... which one
of these questions turns on the most mass or feeling on you?" Well, we don't care what it is.
And the one that doesn't seem to produce any action on the pc, and produces the most action
on the E-Meter is the right way to. So you know now whether it's a terminal or a – an
oppterm.

Now, when it comes to opposing this thing, just make sure it's right. Now, you can test
anything, you can test anything with a few items, and if it tightens up the needle and doesn't
give you much TA that's wrong way to. That's the same way, isn't it? Well, you try not to test
these things. Just make sure that when you start to list, the needle gets looser, not tighter, and
you've got it right way to for the oppose. And you run right straight on down, you get your
last rocket reading or rock slamming item, go twenty-five beyond it. When you've got twenty-
five beyond it, take your rocket reading – take your last rock slamming item on the list, read it
to the pc, it won't fire. Take the next to the last rocket reading item, read it to the pc, it won't
fire, and (if your list is complete, if your list isn't complete they'll fire), and then we take the
last rocket reading item on the list, we read it to the pc and it goes phew, nice rocket read – all
right, every time we read it.

No, there's no Tiger Drill, there's no monkey business, there's no rudiments, there's
nothing, you don't do anything, you just do this, you understand. I'm getting impatient about
that. I swear to Pete, you know. The most auditing that you can do on anybody, the most au-
diting that you can do is just the auditing I'm talking about.

If a pc ARC breaks, your list isn't complete. I don't care what the pc thinks, or any-
body else, the list isn't complete, period.
Now, you can get an ARC break out of a pc by not finding any item on the list. The probability is his item wasn't on the list. You have to go back to the earlier trick I talked about where "Find something he wasn't quite satisfied with," and continue that list to get the item if you can't complete the list you're working on. But the point I'm making here is that ARC breaks come from the item not being there.

Now, I suppose you could goof it up this way. The auditor – this requires a considerable amount of watch – I better not go into that at the moment. You've got to watch your E-Meter carefully, I'll just say that at that point.

What you do is just keep carrying this on, this same rule, same rule, same rule. You find out if it's term or oppterm. You consider your first listing of it a test listing. If that tightens the needle, get off of it and get the other way around, and oppose it the other way to, in other words. And all right, that loosens the needle so you keep on then and you keep a record of your tone arm, and your tone arm, and your tone arm, and your tone arm. And you keep... and record rocket reads, and R/S and whatever it is, and you get down and finally you get your last RR or R/S, we don't care which it is. You've got to go twenty-five items beyond that, not twenty-one, or twenty, nineteen or something like this, you've got to go twenty-five beyond that.

You don't get in any rudiments, you don't do anything, just go twenty-five beyond that. When you've actually gone twenty-five beyond that, providing the tone arm motion is out, you see, why you read your last R/S, if there is one, and if there isn't one you read – or if there is one, you read your next to the last rocket reading item, and then you read your last rocket reading item. The last rocket reading item on the list is it, that is it, bang. "Catfish," bang, "catfish," bang, "catfish," bang, "catfish," bang, rocket read every time. You say, "Dandy, fine, three cheers."

Now, supposing it didn't? Well, that's no time to go into fits. That's no time to say, "On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been careful of? On this item is there anything you have failed to reveal? On this item is there anything been suggested?" Eighteen hours later, "On this item has anything been blah, anything blah, blah, blah." No, you goofed, man.

Now, how did you goof? Well, actually the pc could have been thinking of one item while he said another item. So you read the one above and the one just below it, and see if they rocket read. Neither one of them rocket read. All right, that's your first prevention.

Your next prevention on the thing is that you didn't see the rocket read. Read that last one again. The last rocket reading item, read it again. No, still doesn't fire. Take your pencil in hand, take your ballpoint between the thumb and forefinger and say to the pc, "Who or what would catfish oppose?"

And the pc says, "Oh my God, no more of those."

And you say, "Well, all right, what's the matter?"

And he's pulling in mass, "It's killing me," and so forth.

"Well, just give me a – just give me a few."
All right, so he gives you a few, and you watch that needle, and that needle is going tight, tight. Well, don't list the poor guy into the ground. It ain't there.

Well, if the auditor's very green I think I would then start nulling from the last rocket reading item on down to the end of the list. I think I'd actually do that. That's only thirty or forty or fifty items at the absolute outside, don't you see.

There's no reason to go earlier than that because if you saw a rocket read on the list, there is no rocket read earlier. You saw a rocket read on the list and it doesn't fire, there's no rocket read earlier on the list that's going to fire.

Now, how about this: it might be earlier on the list? Well, let me tell you if it's earlier on the list you've goofed somewhere. It almost isn't worth finding. It's got to be the last rocket read on the list, you understand. That means an earlier list was incomplete.

Now, I'd say if the auditor was awful green I'd ask him to null on down from that last rocket read. Just read each one off once and see if those rocket read. He might not have been watching.

Now, the point is, as you write, a rocket read is much more rapid and much less persistent than a rock slam, and you are liable to miss it. And a green, green, green auditor certainly will miss some of these rocket reads. In other words he was watching the chandelier when he should have been watching his E-Meter.

Now, you can't get around that, but I hope that someday we will have an E-Meter improvement that will actually throw a reflection of the E-Meter needle on – as a shadow or something – onto the paper the auditor is writing on. And maybe by a prism, or something of the sort, that could be effected. That would be very desirable.

But nevertheless you can do it this other way. A lot of your writing ought to be done without looking at the paper. And that needle should never be out of the corner of your eye. In other words, as you look at the paper, even if you look up at the pc, that meter dial must be in your field of vision. So you see that thing flick, you can see it flick if it flicks. That's the main prevention for this other thing happening.

When an auditor has a little experience on this line he'd never null on down from the last rocket reading item if he didn't find one. He'd always pull this trick: He'd say to the pc, he'd say, "Now, pc, I've got several items here, and, take a break – take a break here. I want to talk this over with you. I've got several items here, and which one of these things didn't you think fitted very well?"

"Oh," the pc says, "Eggs, God, I-I-I-I'm thinking now I don't know how you got eggs on the list, you know, because it – it just doesn't oppose the Empire State Building."

And you don't remind him, because an auditor's always tactful. That should be part of the Auditor's Code. He doesn't say, "But at the time you said you knew exactly how it opposed the Empire State Building." You don't do that. That's – we leave that for the psychiatrist.
When we get him into that position, he says he doesn't think that does, so therefore you take whatever eggs came off of, which was, "Who or what would oppose the Empire State Building?" And the item you got was eggs.

Well, he doesn't like eggs, so you add to that.

Now, don't be so alarmed as you might be if you didn't know this fact: There's going to be tone arm action. Now, you tell me why there's going to be tone arm action. We've loosened up the bank of course, and you're going to get tone arm action. And by extending that list twenty-five or thirty, you're going to get another rocket read. Take that as your item. Don't keep badgering the pc. Bring that item down to the list, and now terminal, oppterm, whatever it is, and just carry on with your oppose, oppose, oppose.

In other words, you can get back on this "Spiral Staircase" even when you're hanging over the well in the middle of the stairs. You don't want to get off of that "Spiral Staircase" so don't goof under these rules. If... only by goofing on these rules can you get in trouble. It's a matter of you find out for sure if it's a terminal or oppterm. If you're not absolutely sure, you determine it by what you're listing is not tightening the needle in the first few items, then you keep on going. You list all the tone arm action out of it. When the tone arm action no longer is showing on the thing, from that point on you are counting items.

And then if an RR or an R/S shows up after that tone arm action has ceased, (and that tone arm action does not include surges, cognition surges, in other words, "thinks" that are registered on the thing. You couldn't follow them with a tone arm anyhow. I don't know how this theory got in that there's no such thing as a motionless tone arm because there is) and you get this down the line, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, it's 4, all of a sudden, pow you've got a rocket reading item. Bang, that thing goes, just like that, pow! You write it down, RR, and you keep going for a little while and the pc says, "How's it going?"

And you say, "It's going all right. I need twenty more items."

"Well, all right."

And you notice now, and you'll see – if you watch that needle – you'll see your needle start to tighten. Well, that means you're not going to get any more on the list, but you go ahead and put those twenty items down. And then you take the last R/S if there is one, and whether there is or not, the next to the last RR and you read those to the pc. You tell him what they are, not that they're his item, and then you take the last rocket reading item, you read it to the pc, it's going to fire. And you say, "That's your item," promptly and immediately, "Yes, that rocket reads, that's beautiful."

All right, and don't do something else. Keep your eye on the pc. Don't go off and do something else. Keep your eye on the pc. When you say that last item to the pc, don't shift the pc's attention.

Now, why don't you read the pc's item first, and then read the one above it? Well, because when you read that item that is the pc's item to the pc – see, you can determine now which one is the pc's item – and when you read that to the pc, his attention fixes on it and it is very confusing and upsetting to him to have his attention now fixed on some corny item that isn't his. You understand that. So you don't shift the pc's attention after you have read to him.
and found the rocket reading item. You don't do it. That's a misdemeanor of the first water. So therefore, any tests you're going to make are made before you do anything with that. Anything you are going to do here, do it before, that is the thing, do it before.

Now, when you read the item, keep your eye on the pc. Don't talk, don't write up auditor's reports, and don't expect him to tell you the story of his life, particularly. He'll give you a cognition, he'll say, "That's it," and so forth. In rocket reading items – he's liable to cognite for a half an hour on an R2-12A item, but not on a – not necessarily on a rocket reading item at all. He'll give you pow, "That's it."

We've had... been watching this out in the Z Unit now, and pow, pc says, "That's it."

And the auditor says, "But he never cognited. He just said it was his item and that was fine." Well, the idiot. What more do you want? The pc says it's his item, and of course he knows what it is. Well, but the auditor was expecting a cognition.

Now, today the pcs – wastes a half an hour of session cogniting. Well, the auditor I suppose, is very happy about that because it's always better... easier to listen to the pc than audit. But you – it's the uncertainty factor you're looking for, and the darkening of the pc's eye pouches, and so forth, that you're looking for.

You say this item, "catfish."

And the pc says, "Let's see, catfish, catfish. Uhhhhh. What-what-what's it supposed to oppose?"

"Well, it's supposed to oppose eggs."

"Eggs, catfish, hm, well, I guess I, yeah I-I – you could say – you could say that..."

"Well, we're going to list a little bit further," the auditor says, right about that point. I mean that's all it takes.

All right. Did his eye pouches darken? And, E-Meter again, did the tone arm fall down? When you said that item "catfish" to him, the moment before it was at 4.0, you say "catfish" and it goes phew, 3.25. If that doesn't happen you haven't got the pc's item. You've goofed. That's just the open and shut of it. I haven't seen it yet where you had on any of these items... where you didn't get a blowdown when you said them to the pc. That's enough cognition for you. That's mass blowing off like mad.

You say to him, "catfish." And it was 4, and it remains 4. The pc will also say, "Well I, catfish, put that on the list, catfish, that's a funny thing, I don't quite know whether that will oppose. No, let's see, catfish, two catfishes, say. I guess so. Well, if you say it's the item I guess it is." See, that will accompany a stuck up TA, your TA won't blow down. You goofed. List probably incomplete. Now, what... or gross auditing error, the auditor didn't know you were supposed to look at the E-Meter, get the read off of it. The... there'll be something wrong if you – if you keep getting things wrong with 3MX there's something awful wrong.

And it's not good enough for you to be sitting around at a desk looking at folders. You go out and take a look at the pc and the auditor in action, and you'll find the pc hangs by his heels from the ledge of the building blowing smoke rings so the auditor can be sure that he is
now able to confront space. And that's the direction they are auditing. Or you will find out some other damn thing, that the E-Meter hasn't had its battery working in it for the last month.

You'll find something *goofy* that you just never think of, and it's – I've seen a – I've seen a student here now go weeks and weeks and weeks, that nobody could get anything on, and they had to do new lists, and nobody could get anything on and they had to do new lists; and we find out that the auditor didn't know the difference between a dirty needle, a fall and an R/S. And so everything was an R/S, and so the guy's lists all looked like the R/S was increasing throughout. You see how that would be.

So, where you're... with this gross auditing error don't take – don't take no for an answer, because, listen to me now, depend on me in this instance, you'll find 3MX and 2-12A work by the rules of listing. And if they don't work by the rules of listing there's something wrong, and if there's something *wrong* you've got to straighten it out. You've got to go maybe earlier to a better source item. You've got to do something earlier.

Now here's another rule. If the pc ARC breaks, *go earlier*. Don't *ever*, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever start a new action. You hear that? *Never*, never. That is the most *serious* error you can do. Don't ever start a new action on a pc that is ARC broke. Don't ever start a new one.

We had somebody around here that was starting a new one every time the pc sneezed. "Oh well, the pc didn't have any action here, didn't have any action. He wasn't getting anyplace with this list, so we started to list 'Who or what does existence consist of?' Well, he didn't get anyplace with 'Who or what does existence consist of?' so we started to list 'Who or what are you in contact with in church?' But that didn't work out very well, so then we thought of a new list, and so..." Oh, bunk, man.

ARC break – earlier. Always go back from an ARC break. You understand, that's one of the basic, fundamental stable data you have. Pc ARC breaks, pc nattery, pc feeling sad, pc misemotional, not about his items. He'll say, "Oh, a poor little boy. Yes, that's a very sad item, isn't it, Joe?" That isn't what we're talking about.

We're talking about, "Oh, I feel so sad sitting here being audited. I wish you'd never started to audit me in the first place." We're talking about misemotion about the auditing session. We're talking about the pc going *splat* on the subject of auditing. We're talking about this. In other words, a misemotional ARC break, *go earlier*. The error is always *earlier*. You understand?

Now, when we say earlier, how... what earlier do we want? Five minutes, ten minutes, an hour, two hours, sometimes the last session, more rarely; actually never a session a long time ago. Pcs don't ARC break on last month's session; they forget those. But if you keep going, and inventing new things, the pc *never* has a chance to recover from the ARC break because it's all ARC break now, because nobody went that few minutes earlier to find out that a "hat rack" wasn't her item.
The auditor said, "hat rack." There was no R/S, gross auditing error. Pc was so pleased with the item at the time that the auditor said, "Well, all right, I'm sorry but I let her have it." Oh yes, that happened. It happened right here. Unbelievable!

If an item doesn't fire it isn't the pc's item. That's all. I don't care if the pc cognites. Pcs are liable to cognite on anything. Did you ever realize that they're all the pc's items? I know, look over one of your own lists someday and realize that you've had a leaning toward every one of those terminals. They're all the pc's items, so sure the pc will cognite on these.

You didn't see an R/S, it isn't the pc's item. That's all, period. And yet you can goof with magnitude by, "Yeah, well, it didn't R/S, but... I didn't really have a rocket read on it, you know. The pc would have been so upset if I'd said it wasn't his item."

Funny part of it is if you'd been watching the pc very carefully, and he had dark shadows under his eyes, if you'd been watching him very, very carefully, this would have taken place: He says, "A billing Joe, that's my item, oh yes, yes, oh man, that's my item, that's a beautiful item, oh I love that item, I just love that item, that's just marvelous. You know, I've always been-I've always been 'Joey Billings' ever since I can remember, you know."

You watch him. Note carefully the pouches under his eyes and the color of his complexion. Note it carefully and then say to him, "I'm sorry but that is not your item," and watch his face go lighter.

In other words, when he tries to sell you an item and you buy it, you make him worse every time.

So you go by the rules, and you go by nothing but the rules. And if the rules don't fit in 3MX – there is more flexibility in 2-12A – but when they don't fit in 3MX, boy, you're not there.

You can't even say what's wrong because we haven't now defined a list as complete or incomplete. We've defined a list as something which twenty-five – the last twenty-five items had a motionless tone arm, and there were twenty-five items after the last R/S or RR, and that is a complete list.

Now, that doesn't tell you that anything else is a complete list does it? That the RR, that on that list – that is the last RR on the list, is the pc's item, that's that. If that isn't it then it's not the pc's goal. The auditor has goofed. God knows what has happened, but it is wrong. And the error is earlier. The error is never later. That's something that you really must learn. It's just earlier, the error always is.

The pc just had been given an item, "dog's breakfast." And he had this item, "dog's breakfast," and the pc sat there and he said, "Dog's breakfast, yeah, that's my item," (he was propitiative that day.) "Yeah, I see, 'dog's breakfast,' that's a good item. Fine, fine, 'dog's breakfast.'"

And you list "dog's breakfast," it fired. You list the thing, and it didn't go anywhere. And it's just solid RR the whole way. Everything is an RR, and then all of a sudden there aren't any RRs. You say, "What on earth is this all about? This looks different than all the rest
of the lists." Yeah of course it's different than all the rest of the lists; there's something wrong with "dog's breakfast."

Well, you've got to go back and correct "dog's breakfast" if you really want this straightened out. You now got to go back and correct "dog's breakfast," there's something wrong with the item. And you will find out that you've hit once in the blue moon situation that item twenty-six rocket read. The twenty-sixth, you just stopped one short. Once in a blue moon it'll vary to that degree. But the error is always earlier.

This is quite interesting, pcs go on a hard sell. But the auditor who thinks the pc knows is goofy. And the auditor who thinks the pc has nothing to tell him is also goofy. It's "What has the pc got to tell the auditor?"

Well, the pc can tell the auditor how he feels about things, and he can tell the auditor this, and he can tell the auditor that, and these are all quite valid. But the pc says, "Well, actually the whole trouble with this package, the whole trouble with this package, the real trouble with the package is your earliest list there, on the package, 'Who or what would oppose Wheaties?' That earliest list, I... that's wrong, that's wrong, and all the items since are all wrong."

And then you put down five more items on the list you're completing. The pc's R/S goes on that list, that's it. It's very funny, five minutes later, why, he's forgotten that he told you that he was going to scrap all of his items. It's very funny.

You don't take the pc's advice on what to do, in other words. You take the pc's advice on how he feels about things, but you don't take the pc's advice on a remedy because he's more likely to be dramatizing his remedy than otherwise. He can't think clearly on the subject of his own case. You can usually think far more clearly than the pc on the subject of his own case.

That also occasionally has modifications. There's... that isn't always completely true, as witness many instances. Sometimes the pc knows very well what's wrong. Pc has been sitting there saying, "Well, I was... we can't list it this way, that's all." And the auditor keeps on listing it that way and the pc says it can't be listed that way.

All of a sudden the auditor says, "Well, all right, I'll try it the other way," and he tries it the other way and it's right. This does happen.

Now, 3MX goes on, and on, and on, and on, and on, on the "Spiral Staircase," oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, as long as you can stay on it. You'll probably find out that you'll run out the whole central core of the goal, and that a simple Prepcheck on the goal puts you in a position now to find the next goal. And that's all there is to 3MX. You don't have to do any more than that. You always prepcheck a goal before you leave it, and make sure that it isn't reading. And make sure that it isn't reading because it's been squashed. You don't want a goal not reading because it's squashed.

So anyway, make a long story short, the guts of 3MX is listing, because you can do it without a goal, see. The guts is listing. Do without a goal, you can go all the way without a goal. I think that's quite fascinating.
But that's only in theory. In actual fact, although there are Prehav methods, particularly with roll your own Prehav where he could probably turn up a rocket reading item without the pc's goal, you will find that the easy way to do it is to find the pc's goal.

Now, how do you find the pc's goal? Well, just the way we've always been finding the way... the pc's goal. You could take – do you realize you can take any firm oppterm which is still reading on Routine 2-12, and get out of that by listing List 1 and List 6 of old 3GA Criss Cross on that oppterm – you can usually turn up with the pc's goal. It'll usually be goal number 1 of List 6. I mean it's easy as that – finding a pc's goal.

There... the best method of finding a pc's goal is the first method, which is you list goals. That's the best method. Why? Well, we've got several cases around here that had an awful time with goals, and they've had a terrible time with goals, and we've turned them loose on listing goals and we are absolutely fascinated. We are getting tone arm action on the goals list the like of which you never heard of. The rule is list the tone arm action out of the goals list. I don't care how long that goals list has to be to get the tone arm action out of it.

Somebody said here today, "Oh, well, I have twenty pages. You mean I have to go on?" Look, twenty pages is no goals list. I've seen a goals list of a hundred pages. How do you like that? So you just list all the TA action out of the goals list.

Oh, I remember there was another question on TA motion. If you had some two-way comm with the pc, and the tone arm went down, and then you returned him to the list and the tone arm went back up again to where it had been before, was that tone arm action? Well, tone arm action is caused by a fixation of attention to the pc, and if you change his – change his attention and you put his attention on something else, you're going to have that. You're going to have tone arm action aren't you? Well, you put it back on the list; it's the same thing isn't it? I mean you've got to go – you've got to ask better questions than this if you expect some idiotic answers.

Now, the best way to get a goal in actuality – because you're going to have too much trouble as long as the goals list is charged – is just to sit there and list goals.

Now, in 3MX it is preferred, and you'll find out it's much better indeed, to list goals on a meter. And you sit there and list goals on the meter looking for the RRs. And you mark them down, RR. You don't drill the goal. Pc says, "That's my goal," and he screams and beats the floor with his fist, and so forth. You go on listing goals because the TA action isn't out yet. You say, "I've taken good note of that. I've marked down the fact that it rocket read. We'll come back to that as soon as we have finished your goals list. Okay?"

And the pc says, "Okay." It's not his goal anyway.

Here we go on down to the end. All the TA action is out of the goals list. We now go back and take those we have noted rocket read, and we test those things out to see if they still rocket read. Actually the last... if it followed the rules of 2-12A – which it probably will not because it's too general a question. You see it's a source list, and therefore the thing can appear on it anyplace – if it followed the exact rules it would be the last rocket reading goal on the list would be the pc's goal. I think that will have some priority. It will be more often that goal than other times, but it could also be any of the other rocket reading goals.
Now, you don't go into five or six weeks of prepchecking and that sort of thing to make goals read or not read. Just go over those goals and read them to see if they rocket read. The main goal may be rocket reading like mad. There'll be one of those goals you can't really get rid of the rocket read. This is finding a goal without a Prepcheck. You just read it once, rocket read, you read it again, didn't rocket read, you read it again, didn't rocket read, you read it again, did rocket read. Hey, get alert. All right, read it again, didn't rocket read, read it again, didn't rocket read. Now, you've got a lot of suppresses off of the thing, and anxiety, fails to reveal – in other words you tiger drill it a little bit – by golly, you read it, pow it rocket read, then it didn't rocket read.

You know, that's really enough to run 3MX with. You can't get rid of the rocket read. Now, any goal that isn't the pc's goal, the rocket reads aren't that solid or aren't that good. And that's worth knowing.

Now, if anybody has ever seen somebody's goal rocket read, rocket read, rocket read, and now it doesn't rocket read and you can't get a peep out of it, if you can get reliable evidence that it did rocket read, or if you can get a sixty-fourth of an inch rocket read out of a goal that was found a year and a half ago; my God that goal will survive almost anything, won't it? Well, list it.

That isn't an invitation to list a wrong goal. I'm telling you that a right goal has a tremendous reluctance to give up its rocket read. In fact, you can always uncover a bit of a rocket read on the thing again if you plug at it. Of course, it may even only rocket read once.

What do you think of the strength of a goal that you rocket... it rocket read twice when it was found, was prepchecked and was found to rocket read again, and you, a year later take this goal, prepcheck it and get one rocket read out of it. What do you think about that? Well look, if it wasn't his goal it won't. That's only true of the pc's goal that the rocket reads can be recovered, and that are persistent and will continue to rocket read. On locks on that, they go off, pow! Gone.

So it rocket read. You read it again, half rocket read, you read it again, doesn't rocket read. You prepcheck it, you never get a rocket read out of it again. It just never yeeps. You can take it a year later and it still doesn't rocket read anymore.

But a real goal, it's very spotty. It rocket reads, and then it doesn't rocket read, and it does, and six months later you take the same goal and you drill it for a little while and you can get a rocket read out of it. Must be the pc's goal.

Then you just list that down the line according to the rules of 2-12A, and take the last R/S, or the last RR on that goal oppose, what is the goal oppose list, and you're going to have your entrance into the GPM. And after that the pc is going to go giddily right on down the "Spiral Staircase," providing you follow these rules of listing just as I've been giving them to you in this lecture.

The variability of 3MX is much less than that of 2-12A. How do you repair 3MX? Well, it's too soon to tell. It's too soon to tell. I don't know what errors are going to be goofed on 3MX. But remember this, if you will simply audit, and not make a whole bunch of goofs, you don't have anything to patch up, and therefore you don't have to patch up anything.
Now, there's the secret of auditing. Audit well enough and accurately enough so that you don't make a goof you have to patch up, because the case condition deteriorates from the first goof that you have to patch up. That's where the case condition starts going down.

Now, you get this goof, and then you get another goof, and then you get another goof, and then you patch up those goofs, and then you goof again, and you patch up that goof, and then you patch up the goofs; and then you patch up patching up the goofs, and by that time there's no room for auditing. The way to do auditing is just sail in and do it right.

Now, there's a few changes on 3MX in Model Session which are as follows. You put in the life and livingness goals before you put in the session goals. Reverse that around, and you ask the pc at the end of session for his goals and gains before Havingness. And you also, after you've got his – if he made any of his goals and gains, you ask him if there's anything he'd care to say before you end off the body of the session. In other words, push the goals and gains over into the body of the session. End off the body of the session.

When you do, then check the pc's havingness. Run a few little taps of Havingness just to exteriorize him into the room, and simply say, "All right. Here it is, end of session." And if you carry on a session like that you'll find you exteriorize the pc out of the session very easily.

As far as pcs carrying around items between sessions, and pcs missing items, and pcs suppressing items, I don't interfere with the pc unless he stops listing. I only straighten out those things which get in the road of the pc's progress. That's the only thing I'll ever straighten out in a session anymore. It's actually – he can't list, so I will straighten it out. I'll get off the suppresses and the invalidates, and halfway through my doing so he starts listing again, and so he sails.

I can't get the pc to hear the auditing question at the beginning of session. I just can't get him to hear it, so I run some general O/W because he seems terribly agitated. Don't you see? And at the moment he can hear the auditing question, and can answer it, I'm auditing right straight on down the line, bangety-bang.

Now, what you want to do is become a very accomplished auditor, not a sloppy auditor. The better the auditor the less he has to patch up. The perfect auditor never has to use any of the tools of auditing. Somebody sits down, he knows... the pc knows he's in-session. This is very interesting, the upshot of auditing is getting something done.

If you get the things done which you should in an auditing session, the pc will just walk forward with seven-league boot strides all the way. The less you interfere with the pc thinkingness and the less you distract him from the job of listing and the job of cogniting and so on, why the less tools you have to use. And it's the mark of a very bad auditor that he has to use the auditing tools all the time. That is the mark of a poor auditor.

Now, it goes worse than this. If an auditor is obsessively, continuously, and insistently, forever and aye butting into the session to straighten it out, he hasn't got any session to straighten it out. Why is he trying? The whole secret of auditing is getting auditing done.

Now, when you see a green auditor start doing 3MX, or 2-12A, you'll find out that they have to patch everything together and they have to do everything, and do everything, and
do everything in order to get around to doing some 2-12A. They may do that the first session, the second session, the third session, the fourth session. If they are capable of observation, if they are capable of being a good auditor, you're going to find something new is going to occur – that session by session they start dropping the tools of auditing. They start dropping these things, and they're doing less and less monkey business and more and more auditing. And finally when they are very confident of their Routine 2 or Routine 3, and they're very confident of these things, why, they have dropped the use of auditing tools to practically a minimum. They see that the pc is a bit fogged in, and the second that pc looks a little bit dopey they know that's going to stop their tone arm action and it'll give them a false, flat list. Well, it isn't that the pc can't list, it's the fact that the tone arm won't register on a doped-off pc. So right away pull the missed withholds, pull the missed withholds, pull the missed withholds. Soon as they are pulled, the pc is bright, alert and wide-awake. The auditor is off of that. He isn't pulling missed withholds as a profession, he's pulling missed withholds just to brighten that pc up and get that pc up there so he can get any residual tone arm action going.

These are the tools of auditing and how they are used. When an auditor is auditing like that he's getting something done, and he doesn't have trouble with the pc. He doesn't have ARC breaks.

The first thing to know how to do, however, is the Routine 3 and the Routine 2. You... to make these conditions obtain in a session you have to know your Routine 2 and Routine 3 perfectly, and have good confidence in it. And actually, to get to a point where you could have good confidence in it and perfectly, your auditing has to be very nearly perfect.

So there – there's where the thing adds up. You've got a situation here where you have terrifically workable processes if they are done. And that's the one thing you must keep in mind. Any of you who are ever supervising auditors, and so forth, that they are not going to be done in the presence of gross auditing errors such as, "You can't audit a pc who stays home." Gross auditing error.

"Well, we didn't make much gains in that twenty-five-hour intensive. Guess 2-12 doesn't work."

Say, "You didn't make much gains. What did you do?"

"Well, I don't know, just 2-12, 2-12, that's what I did."

Well, if you just let it pass at that, you'd say, "Well, 2-12 doesn't work," or something like that. Make a little bit of further inquiry and you find out the pc was only there for two hours of the first session of the first day, and was home the rest of the week.

Doesn't sound like 2-12 doesn't work. It sounds like the auditor never got the pc into the auditing chair. Never got him into the session. Never had him at the session. It wasn't a case of being in session, the pc never arrived in the same building as the session. You get the idea.

You say, "Well, they're..." You will encounter auditors like this. They'll make a gross auditing error. They're very green, and so forth, but they don't recognize these things are that gross. And the other thing is, is you cannot expect somebody to follow a technique or follow a procedure who doesn't know what the procedure is. Therefore you have systems of checkout,
you have systems of training, you have systems of observation, and you keep somebody under supervision until they get a good win.

All training of auditors has certain liabilities. You get people in the road, and things in the road, and cases in the road and all that sort of thing. But it can be done, and I think you'll find out that 3MX done as it can be done with a maximum of purity and snap and polish, and right on the groove as I've been telling you in this lecture tonight, I think it's going to produce you some Clears. And I think it's going to produce Clears with far greater rapidity than you ever thought was possible.

So there's what we've been aiming for, and there it is.

So okay, and thank you very much.

Good night.
ROUTINE 3M

A lecture given on 12 February 1963

All right. This is the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, first lecture. And this is the 12th of February, AD 13, and you'll have only one lecture tonight. Reason for that being you—there's less data to put out now, more persuasion, and you're going to have to exercise this, and probably you get very tired. A lot of you get very tired and exhausted being talked to a couple of hours on a couple of nights.

So I'm going to talk to you tonight about 2-12A, and 3MX.

All right. I have a bit of a news bulletin, has nothing to do with the mental health empire that Mr. Kennedy is trying to create in the United States at 1.6 billion dollars, that isn't news. The Federal government, of course, always has wanted the right to incarcerate any citizen for... without trial, and of course, immediately they get their legislation passed, why, they'll be able to do that. In other words, they'll be able to incarcerate any citizen without commission... permission from his family, without a medical consultation and without a trial, and will be able to move him at any time without the consultation with the family or a hearing or a trial, and do anything to him they wish, such as electric shocks and prefrontal lobotomies. And of course that makes a very interesting political empire, and Mr. Kennedy is trying to create just that empire right this minute.

So I think that's very interesting. So I'm not going to talk about that. I'm going to talk about something much more important. Something much more important: me. I was a Clear, last night. It's a very remarkable experience. Very remarkable experience. I was a first-goal Clear. You say I was a first-goal Clear? Well, actually I was a first-goal Clear for all of about three minutes – and we went on to the second goal. What happened – what happened was quite interesting, is I got the last package of items, the last two, on the "Spiral Staircase." There were twenty-five items in all, and I got the last pair, and in listing the last item, actually the last two items, my TA sat exactly at 3.0. At about the eighteenth reliable item, the goal had already blown. I felt like an electron parade. I felt like a proton sitting in the middle of a heavily spitting electron. I thought that was quite fascinating. The goal was going bzzoom, bzzoom, bzzoom, bzzoom, actually. And on the meter, why Mary Sue was sitting there and she went completely out of session.

Sitting there, and she was just bringing the needle down and the thing was blowing down on rocket reads. Psww-psww-psww-psww! And it blew all the way down from about 4 to about 3, and that was about that.

That was at about the eighteenth. But the goal didn't give up the ghost until we had seven more items. And the... she got the twenty-fifth item, that includes finding the goal, by
the way, that's twenty-four RIs and the goal. And she found the goal, and went straight into it, went straight on through, I never had any time to cognite, because on some of these sessions she found some championship numbers. As a matter of fact, one of these sessions, in five hours and fifteen minutes plus some breaks, she found nine RIs.

This didn't give us much time. Actually, this auditing sprint goes from about the fourth to the eleventh, is about one week, something like that. The total time elapsed during that period is probably – because it was prepared, the goal had been found before – it was probably about 30 hours on this, something like that.

But I was a first-goal Clear, for 3 minutes. I got up and went over and sat down and... on the couch and I ate four or five peanuts and I drank a Pepsi-Cola, and, well, that was very nice, and I sat there and enjoyed this sensation of being unburdened and all cleaned up and I probably looked very young and very dashing. Everything was fine. And I came back, and she saw that I was sitting on a free needle. And I sat on a free needle while you could count one and two and three, and then she started opposing the final oppterm.

And all hell broke loose and I went through straight, bang. I cautioned her. I said, "Wait a minute. Wait-wait-wait," you know? "Wait-wait, I'm not sure this is the right thing to do." I said, "Test the goal." The goal she'd already tested, it wasn't firing, and so forth. So she opposed this last oppterm, and what do you think? What do you think? She found another oppterm, and then something that won't happen to you because it has already happened to me, we didn't make the test, she treated it as a terminal and listed it.

Of course, that was the end of the free needle. We'd gotten this all straightened out, finally. We had a very hectic time of it. But the bridge between the first goal and the second goal is very simple. You just oppose the last oppterm and you're in the soup. Actually, as I got the first pair, one of them listed backwards, I told the auditor what my next goal was. And that rocket read, and that's fine. So we're operating on this goal, and it was very hard to get these things – next item straightened around, because of course, they're in reverse to what you would expect.

So anyway, we're about two or three items deep now on the next goal – actually found one RI and we have a list going – and we've got to take this oppterm against the last oppterm I got on the first goal and we've got to do something with that and list it right way to. We made some progress.

But you never saw anybody nose-dive quite as fast from the sublime to the soup. That was really remarkable. Which is very good data for you. I'm not telling you just because it's me, I'm telling you because you undoubtedly, you knucklehead, I know you, I'm looking straight at you, I know you, you sooner or later will hear the pc say, "That goal is gone." Check the goal, find it doesn't fire, you'll be twenty or thirty RIs deep, and you'll say, "Well, I don't know," and then you will oppose it, and then you will fail to apply the terminal-oppterm check to the result, and list it backwards. And then your pc will be very unhappy indeed. So it – I know you'll do this sooner or later. Even I, I may do this sometime when I'm in a hurry.

But the funny part of finding the next goal, the pc presents you with the next goal. But let me tell you something. You actually can't list without that next goal. You've got to know what the goal is. Everything fouls up unless you really know what the goal is. So you can't
really, in spite of what I've told you, go very far on RIs without knowing the pc's goal. In other words, you can't take rocket reading RIs, just all by themselves, and list, list, list, and expect the thing to be very happy as an experience. Because the pc has nothing to align them against and is running in the dark concerning what his goal is. He doesn't know, so this leaves a tremendous mystery.

No, you had better find his goal. Actually, it's very easy to find his goal because he's sitting right in the middle of a terminal that has that as a central goal. So you just take a short goals list – two, three, four goals – and one will rocket read like mad and you check it out. That's his goal and you continue. It's very easy to do. Make sure that you do it.

Now, I didn't mean to be so hard on you with regard to your auditing. But when somebody in Z Unit can actually take the source list of a pc's goal, take the source list of this pc's goal, take it, extend it out and find an R/S – an R/S – after having found a dozen or two rocket reads, ignores the rocket reads and opposes this little tiny R/S, after the lecture I gave you Thursday night! Haaaa! Hanging and drawing and quartering – haaaa – that's too good for him! That's a completely knuckleheaded act. Its asinine. Goals are RR. If you got RRs on the list, you want RRs. You don't want R/Ses. And you never – get me now – you never take one of these little squirt, little tiny half-inch R/Ses on 2-12, or anything else. You carry one of those little tiny R/Ses around, aw, they're going to get you no place. They're going to pull in mass in on you and everything else.

When I was being hard on you a moment ago and said that you were liable to do it, when this kind of an error can exist after my last Thursday night's lecture, after a bulletin on the subject and, I'm ashamed to say, passed by an Instructor's view, and actually can be listed when the pc's rocket reading item lies on that source list all ready to be picked up and opposed, you understand, now, why I sometimes speak with – well, bitterly, shall we say, bitterly. I sometimes speak bitterly.

Because you couldn't do it. You try to figure out – try to figure out what a little kid's going to do with a coaster wagon, you know? And you never can figure it out. It becomes a tent or something like that. The alter-is is fantastic.

Now, we're talking now about 3MX. All right, it ceases to be 3MX, and become 3M. Because it'll carry right on through, right according to Hoyle, bangity-bangity-bang. But you are dealing here with a precise process. It's built like a watch. It has exact rules. It doesn't have too many rules. And it is very, very easy to do. Only you can make it difficult. Actually, it's a fact. Only you can make it difficult. It is probably the easiest process to do aside from the simple repetitive process of olden days that you have had. It's even simpler because it reveals its exact result, bang-bang-bang. And if you don't get that exact result, you're doing something wrong, that's all. You're just doing something wrong.

Now, for a very long time I've been looking for a process that invariable cleared pcs easily. Well, I know enough about how 2-12 works and how – so on, to know that this listing phenomena will continue. They all behave the same providing they have an auditor. It always helps – always helps to have an auditor. And there have been pcs here and there, from time to time, who have had an auditor.
Now, given an auditor and an invariable process, why we could achieve a process that invariable cleared pcs easily. And we've got that now in Routine 3M.

Now, we also had to have a process that was very precise and it was invariable. You didn't have a whole bunch of rules in connection with the thing that could be varied. On pcs with green hair you run sixteen items, except on pcs with purple hair you go seventy-two items, and then pcs with splayfeet from Puget Sound, only go fifty-nine items. See, that isn't what we wanted. "When you come to the crossroads, if there are several leaves on the ground, you always turn to the right except when you turn to the left, but on some pcs you go straight ahead." Well, I didn't want that kind of thing. I wanted the kind of process that was a perfect process. In other words, pc, process, same – same difference.

All right, you've got that now in 3M. But because you haven't had processes like that lately, you're going to have to learn to live with it, because it can call you an awful liar. You say you've done it right, you've done it right, and all of a sudden it all goes wrong. Something goes wrong. Well, it isn't 3M that went wrong. It was you. You took a terminal and treated it as an oppterm, or you took a wrong source of some kind or another; any number of plain-to-see goofs. But the wrong source just wouldn't have fired. And the terminal-oppterm wouldn't have passed the checkout rules for an item. These are the things that would have gone wrong.

Now, to settle those things and make sure they're right, we have to have invariable rules. And we've got those. It was through breaking one of these invariable rules, by the way, failure to check out an item as to whether it was a terminal or oppterm, applying the eight tests, that caused us to blunder as we dropped into the second GPM and made a much massier second GPM for a little while than I care to confront for a while.

But it was just dropping one of these rules. Getting cocky, you know. Everything's going along pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, bang-bang-bang, everything, and everything's falling into place. Why check them, you know? So, heh-heh! Didn't check one. Boom! It was wrong way to. The thing goes wrong way to when you drop from goal one to goal two, and probably will do the same thing on... between dropping from goal two to goal three.

The next rule is the process has to be teachable by rote. In other words, you had to be able to teach it by rote. In other words, you say, there's this, and there's that, and there's the other thing, and the other thing, and you do this, that and that and that. Doesn't much matter how complicated the road is, but you have to be able to teach it by rote.

And after that, why, it'll fire.

You leave much to judgment on such a thing and it can't be relayed. And the final thing is – would not be subject to change. Now, that's totally foreign to you in Dianetics and Scientology. You wouldn't know what to do with that. But there it is. The actual fact is I have been working toward it. I wanted something for the long haul, so that when we train somebody to do it, we train them to do it. And they do that from there on out.

I've been working and working. Several times I've thought I had it and each time you've proved me wrong. And I'm making very sure this time you don't. This one – we're holding the fort on this one, man. This is it.
Now, with 2-12 we had a "This is it." And 2-12 is just as good right this minute as it was when it was first released – with this exception: We have found it unnecessary to null and we have found there was invariability of the occurrence of the R/S as the last R/S on the list if the list was complete, and so we got 2-12A. Well, that simply dropped out some unnecessary points in 2-12. It threw away Tiger Drilling and so forth. And made it very good.

But out of the listing phenomena of 2-12 we now have the listing phenomena of Routine 3M. And you'll find out this is just as invariable, and it's very good.

It's invariable to this degree: In 2-12 you always go fifty items beyond. Fifty items. Never forty-nine, never forty-two. There're fifty items, count them, fifty. You do that with any source list whether it is 2-12A or Routine 3M or 2-12. Just do – any source list, go fifty beyond. And on all lists of 2-12, 2-12A, always go fifty items beyond the point where the tone arm became still and fifty items beyond the last R/S.

I'll give you an idea. The tone arm goes still, you count thirteen items, you get an R/S, now you go fifty more. But at the point where the tone arm went still, why, you didn't get an R/S after that, it's just fifty, don't you see? That's the way that works. That's invariable. Never go less than fifty. Never, never, never, never. If the needle is tightening up, you've probably got a wrong way oppose or something like that. Because it shouldn't in 2-12 tighten appreciably in that fifty. Seventy-five, eighty, hundred, aha, you're liable to get something going pretty tight. But that needle will stay loose for that period.

Now, in 3M, you go fifty items beyond in a source list. Fifty items beyond in a source list. Never forty-nine, never forty-two, never twenty-seven. That's fifty items beyond the still point, where the TA became still and the last R/S. Same rule. Same rule exactly.

Now, on 3M lists from RIs, you only go twenty-five beyond. That is adequate because you're dealing with rocket reading items and they are more closely compacted together, so you always go twenty-five. In other words, the source list to Routine 3M is fifty beyond and the lists for the reliable items taken from a reliable item go twenty-five beyond the still point of the tone arm and the last rocket reading or rock slamming item.

In other words, you get a rocket read or a rock slam, you go fifty... you go twenty-five beyond that in Routine 3M. You understand? It doesn't matter whether it rocket reads or rock slams, you go twenty-five items beyond that needle agitation.

Why is this? It's actually because a rocket read converts very easily to a rock slam, and vice versa. Actually, these things – many rock slams do not convert to rocket reads, but rocket reads, as they start blowing up, go into rock slams. It's quite interesting that a goal in the last part of its run may suddenly give rock slam, rock slam, rocket read. And then tiger drilled a little bit will give rocket read, rocket read, rocket read. And then frayed up by another couple of items and so forth, go rock slam, rocket read, rock slam.

In other words, these are cousins. These, well, they're worse than cousins. Actually, it's uncle and nephew, where the rock slam is the nephew. The senior of the two is the rocket read. So you only need to go twenty-five items beyond that, but always make sure you go twenty-five items beyond. Now, an Instructor is not to check out anything that hasn't been carried twenty-five items beyond. And you're not to muck it up or start calling the pc's atten-
tion to anything until you've got twenty-five items beyond. I mean, that's all there is to it – Routine 3M. And it's fifty is the figure for 2-12, 2-12A. Those are invariables.

See what I mean by an invariable rule? Now, the source list for 2-12, just the source list, can have the rock slam occur on it anywhere. The rock slamming item can occur anywhere on that source list. It's not the last rock slam, it's any rock slam on the list may be it, so long as you don't have two things rock slamming. You have one thing rock slamming, you apparently have a blank list, you check over those other rock slams and all of a sudden you've got a nice great big, wide R/S that you didn't suspect existed. And sometimes this is embarrassing because the source list – you're starting to list the source list and all of a sudden it R/Ses and you think the source wording – like, "In present time what are you in contact with?" - you think that's rock slamming. No, no, it's the first item that the pc's already thought of. You put that down on the list and you carry on and you get some other R/Ses and that sort of thing and pretty soon you really can't find... "What happened? What happened to your rock slam?" because nothing is now rock slamming. You go back, it was the first item he put on the list.

But does that mean – does that mean, then, that you shouldn't complete the list? Heh, well, it doesn't mean you shouldn't complete the list. You should complete the list and go fifty beyond the last R/Sing item because just as likely, the rock slam would have pulled out of that first R/S into another item.

The contest in a source list is to try to get the most fundamental item you can get for that list. You don't want any item on the list and you never want two reads on the same list. You don't want two items reading on the same list, rock slamming or rocket reading. That tells you the list is incomplete. There will only be one slamming on a 2-12A list and that will be the item. But it can occur anywhere on the list.

Well, similarly, similarly, in 2... in 3M, in Routine 3M, your source list, of course, is your goal oppose. You never list anything off the goal except goal oppose. And that source list takes you intimately and at once right down one of these rock slamming, rocket reading lists, if it's the right goal of course. And it goes right on down the line, bangity-bangity-bang, and you go fifty beyond the last rocket read or rock slam.

Now, don't go blow your brains out or try just to test that last R/S and say, "Well, it isn't on the list because the last R/S doesn't read," or "The last R/S reads a tiny little bit," and so forth, "so I guess – blah – we better go on," and so on. You've got rocket reads all over the list. Look, in 3M you don't fool with rock slams unless you absolutely have to. If there's nothing on that source list but rock slams, you'll have to take the rock slam. But if you've got rocket reads, you only examine rocket reads – or let us say you only use the rocket reads; you can examine the R/Ses.

Now, this means what? This means that the first rocket reading reliable item may occur anywhere on that 3M source list, so long as the list is complete. The only sin is not to complete the list. I remember we had a couple of students down here, I've forgotten when it was, 61, I guess it was. We had one of these students – she was always flying in everybody's face – and she used to go down, and the auditor would list on her a 3D list. Horrible. Terrible to behold. His 3D list, 12 items long. And then the pc would say, "Oh, well, that's it. I know
what the item is now and it didn't even have to read." The auditor would simply use it. Naturally, she wound herself up zangity-bang.

Actually, when a pc tells you that is the item, it's a sure thing you'd better list further. Pcs do cognite on items but not until they're well on their road to Clear.

Now, the point I'm making here is the rule consists simply of completing the list. And this completion of the list, or the item that comes off the list, has nothing to do with the pc's opinion. This is not up to the pc. It's simply a mechanical action. And when you do that mechanical action you look for the thing mechanically. Well, when do these rules blow up? When do these rules blow up? Well, they blow up when you've goofed and start relisting.

After you've opposed the wrong item or run one wrong way to, you'll find your lists and rules and things are wobbly. So you want to do them right in the first place. Occasionally you'll do one wrong. You'll get down to the end of the list and you won't find anything. And you'll say "Ulp! Oop. What happened?" You won't find anything on the whole list. Well, you probably listed something wrong way to. That's what it is.

Now, you go back and try to extend some lists, you'll find you've got more TA action and you've got more rocket reads and you've got more R/Ses. Where did they all come from? Well, they came from the fact that you've shaken up the bank. And it's not lying there neatly now, so the rules go out accordingly. All kinds of weird things happen. You got that now?

After you've done a mistake, then other things can start going adrift on you. But if you don't make mistakes, they won't go adrift. The most costly thing in time consumption is to make a mistake. That's terrible.

Now where – where you have listed something wrong way to, then you've gotten the item and you've opposed that item that you got wrong way to – it won't go anywhere. Now, look, in 3M, on items taken from a source list, it is always the last rocket reading item. It is never any other item on the list. It's always the last one. Now, if it isn't the last one, then, just before that, you goofed. You pushed one wrong way to or you didn't complete a list or you didn't complete it to a point where all the tone arm action was out. It was a real good goof, and so on. And it dead-ends you. In other words, it's something like riding a donkey and the donkey takes you over to the edge of the corral and he authoritatively dumps you over the corral fence. And you find yourself, you're no longer in the corral; you're no longer in the GPM; you're floundering around outside saying, "Where is it? Where is it? Where is it? It's gone, gone, gone." Well, you just goofed on these rules. And you'll stay with the GPM and clearing as long as you don't goof. But if you do goof, you know it, because you all of a sudden dead-end. You will do a list on which there are no RRs or R/Ses, or it's just gone. Or if they had RRs and R/Ses you go back and you check each one with great confidence. You say, "I will now read you the last rocket reading item on the list," you say. "A tiger." Heh! It didn't read.

First time it's happened, you see, gotten cocky. You've done twelve, fourteen items perfect, you see. Now, always the last on the list. You – cocky, you see – you say, "Well, I'll now read you the last rocket reading item on the list. A tiger." Ha-ha-ha. It didn't rocket read. Imagine your embarrassment at this time. You see the pc's face sort of screw up, you know, and he says, "What's this? What's that? Tiger? Oh?"
And you say, "Well, it didn't rocket read."

And he says, "Well, I shouldn't think it would. It doesn't mean anything to me."

Where did you go wrong? No, you didn't usually – you could fix it up so you hadn't completed the list – but usually it isn't that you haven't completed the list and ifs not that the RR lies someplace else on the list. The... you goofed on your source item. You've either done it wrong way to or you have taken it from one you've done wrong way to.

You've made a mistake or you failed two lists ago to take all the tone arm action out and go your twenty-five items, because the pc said he was feeling too dopey to go on.

I'd love to hear some pc say that to me. I would get in my mid ruds so fast it'd make his head swim. I'd get them in between the last sessions and I'd take all his missed withholds and his mother's missed withholds and his grandfather's missed withholds. Because the only thing that can knock you flat on one of these lists is to have your mid ruds out. You can get this pc who's doping, he's going dopey, he's going dopey, "Ya cowsow, and a clug-wug. Uh-wu-wu-wu-glgg-wlgg."

After he's done this for a half an hour, even somebody in V Unit might notice. He might notice. And then, by some miracle, remember Ron said that the person had missed withholds, and pick them up and get the mid ruds in, between the last two sessions or something. Do the works and straighten it all out and then get your list and your tone arm action picks up. Because a missed withhold is the only bug. That's the only thing that can... if your rudiments are wildly out – you've got a missed withhold which all amounts to the same thing – you're going to get no TA action and think a list is complete when it is not complete.

That is particularly patent. The symbol you want to look for is the doping pc. The pc goes dopey. He can't keep his eyes open and he... so on. And he says, "Well, the mass keeps hitting me in the face," and so on. Very reasonable. It's very reasonable, but he's just got missed withholds and his between-session rudiments are out. So put them both in.

Now, these are about the only variables you're going to run into. These things can be taught. I can see you teaching them now, with a knout and a ruler, but frankly, 3MX has its own discipline.

If you ever wanted to see a worried auditor, if you ever wanted to see an auditor dripping blood on the – on the report sheet, it's an auditor who has all of a sudden had 3MX go up in smoke. He's been going along, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, everything's fine, everything's fine, everything's fine, you know, he's got about fourteen items deep, and all of a sudden the donkey moves over to the edge of the corral and dumps him outside. And he's sitting there and it's not the last rocket reading item on the list and you'll see the auditor start to go yahhh, and there's nothing on the list, and he checks – reads all the rocket reading items. Bank's beefing up on the pc, you see, more and more. More rocket reading items he reads, you see, the more the bank beefs up on the pc and the unhappier the pc gets.

And he'll say, "It's a – a tizzlybum, uh-uh – a Kennedy-killer, uh – a psychiatric swindle, heh-heh-heh. Where the hell, where is it? Didn't write anything on the back of this thing, uhhhh... Well, maybe we ought to complete the list. Yes."
Well, before he says, "Maybe we ought to complete the list," actually he ought to look over – did he run all of the TA action out and did he go his twenty-five items beyond the last rocket reading or rock slamming item? Did he do these things? If he did them, then there's something just ahead of this list, like the item it came from or the item that the item this came from came from, see, tracing it back, where all the tone arm action wasn't out. Or he didn't go twenty-five items beyond or where the pc doped off throughout the whole thing – there's something wrong there.

He either did a wrong way to oppose, he thought a terminal was an oppterm, didn't do his tests, you see, and did a wrong way oppose. He got an item, all right. And then all of a sudden he winds up with this list. It doesn't have anything on it.

Well, it doesn't occur to him to just step back two – two items and check those lists. Usually he shatters because it's so perplexing. What you want to do is just step back a couple and check up and find out if you did those right, run your tests on those items, find out if they still fire, find out what item you goofed up. It'll only be one or two back of you. Do the thing right way to.

But now, don't expect – because you've goofed, you see – don't expect the rules to hold good. That's my message for you. Don't expect the rules to hold good now. Let's say you didn't complete the list. Well, you've already opposed what you did take off the list, so you've loosened the bank up, so therefore the rocket reading and rock slamming count is going to go out on you. You see what's going to happen? In other words, this thing is not going to behave exactly according to Hoyle.

And I'll tell you what you do then. You pay the penalty for having goofed and you somehow or another get the car back on the highway, or get the saddle back on the donkey. Somehow or another. You do it by repairing the immediately prior items to this, straightening them out as best you can and proceeding on down.

Actually, there is a way to do this, but as long as you leave an item wrong way opposed, you're going to leave a jam in the pcs bank. So you're going to have to straighten that out anyhow. If you just lost track entirely and you couldn't find out where you went, you can still run goal oppose, and running goal oppose, you will wind up with your next consecutive item. But make sure that you find out by test if it's a terminal or an oppterm. Make very sure of that. If you don't make sure of that, you've had it. Because there's the one, it's the oddbeat one, which is most likely to fool you. You're listing for a terminal, you see, you're listing opposition to an oppterm. So in your head you say, "Of course I will get a terminal." So therefore your whole attention at this point is on getting a terminal. So you get it and then you give it to the pc and the pc is all too willing to buy this thing as a terminal, so he says it's a terminal. You list "Who or what would that terminal oppose," and it's wrong way to, and you can get an item, believe me.

For the moment, your rules will hold good. Because you're clearing the width of your needle swing and so forth, doesn't give you the same indicators of a tightening needle that you get in 2-12. It doesn't get that tight. It gets tighter. But what do you mean tighter? The thing is going this way and it's not very tight. So you don't – don't think that it amounts to anything. And you say, "Well, that's ..." See, your tightening needle.
You don't make these tightening needle tests, by the way, in 3M. It's too hard on the pc. You don't list it one way and then the other way, the way you do in 2-12 and 2-12A. You just list it right in the first place. And you've got several things that tell you whether or not it's right and those are given to you here. There are a lot of these tests as to what the thing is. There are eight tests, actually, and they're in a slightly prior bulletin to this.

You go down these eight tests, one right after the other, and you will get yourself full knowledge of whether or not it's a terminal or an oppterm. It's not very hard to establish it. You don't have to establish it by listing. You don't have to establish it by pain and sen. You can establish it by whether it turns on mass when you say "oppose it," or "it oppose," or... and you want the one that turns on the least mass. There are actually eight methods of testing this. And that's the way you do this, you always test these things.

Now, you'll tend not to test them because the pc complains. It upsets the pc every once in a while. He's sitting there, and he knows a tiger is his terminal. He's very happy about this, see, he knows it's his terminal, he's all set, fine. And you all of a sudden say, "Consider committing overts against a tiger," and he "Nyah, nyah, commit overts against a tiger?" and so forth.

And you say, "Consider committing overts against a tiger. Consider committing overts against a tiger. Now, did that turn on more mass or less mass?"

"It turned on more mass."

"All right. Now, consider a tiger committing overts. Consider a tiger committing overts. Now, did that turn on more mass or less mass?"

"Turns on less mass. It's a – it's a terminal! What's the matter with you, you idiot?"

And the pc will say things like this to you and you'll get to a point after a while where you won't test these things. And then one day, you'll be sitting there and everything was going along beautifully, and all of a sudden you haven't got an item on the list. Gone. Magic. Disappeared. What did you do? You didn't test. That's as simple as that. That's the immediate penalty for it.

Now, there's something you should know about a goal. Here's another part of tests on the goal. You don't find a goal, let's say – let's get this goal, let's get this goal: "To be a 'ero," see, let's take this goal, "to be a 'ero." And you're listing it and the first terminal you get on it is not an heroic man. Oh.

You say, "That's obvious, you know? Obvious, you got the goal 'to be a hero,' and therefore the first terminal of course would be an heroic man. And what would a heroic man oppose?" And you list that and you get "a coward."

And you say, "That's very interesting because that's the oppterm." And then you do your third list and all of a sudden you're looking at your papers and you can't find any RR that now reads.

You say, "Where is it? Where did it go? Heh-heh-heh-heh." There you are.

That's because you don't know this about goals: The pc's goal at the beginning of the run has always gone into the hands of the enemy. The enemy has his goal; he doesn't. That's
always an invariable. Actually, you won't even get the straight things if you – you know – if you oppose wrong way to you don't arrive with the right item. You arrive with some other item.

And so you're going along and you get your first item for this goal, and it's a "pusillaminoous punk." That's to be a hero, the goal, see, a pusillaminoous punk. You say, obviously it's an oppterm. Oh, no it isn't. It's the terminal. That's where he wound up with that goal. That's where he now is. He is a pusillaminoous punk.

And what is the oppterm? An heroic man! Ho, ho! Interesting, isn't it? That's his oppterm. That's his enemy. He's gotten to a point now where he sees anybody acting in an heroic fashion, and he says, "Snee." Interesting, isn't it? Whatever his goal is, he's in the opposite terminal when you first find it. In other words, he's not in the oppterm. Now, don't misinterpret this and think yourself to death. His first terminal designation – the less you have to do with significances, the better, but this will help you because you're liable to fall into this trap.

The first item you find may be an heroic man for the goal "to be a hero," and you go right along and you say, "Well, of course that's a terminal." No. If it's the first item and it says "an heroic man" and the goal is to be a hero, you know doggone well that's an oppterm. Invariable.

Let's get an idea now. The pc has a goal, "to be nice." And your first opposition item coming up is "to be a nasty, snot-nosed little brat." See, "Nasty, snot-nosed little brat." You say, "Well, obviously, that's the oppterm." No it isn't. That's where your pc got to on that goal. That's the pc – a nasty, snot-nosed little brat.

Now, the pc very often doesn't like this. Because he's found out that his goal was to be nice. And so he's going to sit there and say, "Now, let's see, I'll be nice. So therefore my terminal is obviously a nice person." No, it isn't. That's the oppterm.

Now, when he gets – now, listen to this carefully. When he gets halfway through these terminals, let's say he's going to have thirty terminals on this or some such thing, and when he gets to about fifteen, it's even-steven. In other words the terminal and the oppterm alike are, well, it's something like this: "A person who is all right, I guess," opposes "a person who is probably okay." Neither one of them "to be nice," see?

In other words, there's counter-balance here. And at the beginning, the oppters are all big heroic goal oppters, you see, that represent the goal, and then that comes down through kind of like an hourglass on a curve, and then gets to a middle ground. And then after that, the oppterm starts to lose. Don't you see? And the pc's items start to get more and more like the goal. You understand? And finally, the last oppterm, which explains to you why old Routine 3 ran when you got the right item, the last oppterm – and when it did run – that you get on the goal "to be a hero," the last one, see, that's number thirty, or something like that, will be "a pusillaminoous, cowardly, shaking piece of jelly." And the pc's item will be "a hero."

But that's thirty items later. That doesn't sound like it at the beginning, see. And in the middle ground – you'll see these things. The enemy is less and less the goal and the pc is more and more the goal on a fantastically gradual gradient. And it's quite remarkable. So that
when... you can count on this. You can use this. This is – this is very precise. You can use this very well.

Let's say "to be a hero" is the pc's goal, and you do "Who or what would the goal 'to be a hero' oppose?" And you finally come up with a rocket reading item on the list, which rocket reads beautifully, and it says, "an heroic man." Actually, you've arrived with the oppterm. Not because it was listed that way, but because that would be the first RI. Invariable. And the last one will be comparable to the pc when you first find him and start pushing him through the bank. The last oppterm is a pusillanimous punk, see, and the first terminal is a cowardly brat, you see?

In other words, they're at opposite ends of the pole, see. It's very interesting. And they cross in the middle and become quite similar to each other. You see how this goes? You can actually know where you're progressing on running out a goal by just looking at these items and seeing how they less and less approximate the goal in the oppterm and more and more approximate the goal in the terminal. And also, you can prevent yourself from making a God-awful mistake.

All this is very interesting. But how long does it take, how long does it take, actually, to clear somebody on a first goal? Well, given his goal and given perfect, rote, rapid auditing, everything going along fine, you're only looking at a maximum of about fifty hours. Unless you goof. Now, goofs are what cost time. Now, man, you could get five RIs, see, while you're straightening out one goof. It's fantastic. The thing that eats up time is the goof. Get one RI backwards just because you didn't have time, because you're in such a hurry or something like that, and list it backwards on a wrong way to oppose, and there you go. I mean, you're just – you're sunk! You're going to eat up five, ten, fifteen hours trying to get back on this donkey. You understand? I mean, that's what costs time in 2-12, 2-12A and so on. That's what costs the time. And in 3M that can be said with exclamation points.

Because the pc's been perfectly happy and now the pc is miserable as hell. He doesn't know whether he's going or coming. He's miserable! Terrible state. He says, "Well, I don't know," and so on. He's thrown for a loop. "Well, I thought it would be the – the item. I cognited on that item I gave you, a supercilious idiot. I cognited on that and so on. It's perfectly all right with me. And you say it doesn't read."

Well, of course, somebody who was trained in some far-reaching place would say, "Well, we'll just give him the item." Well, just commit suicide because you're never going to have a Clear. "Heh, well, we'll just give him the item. He – he liked the item. It didn't read, but he liked it."

Well, he might have liked it, but I don't. And if it... if you just want to not clear somebody at all, just give him a false item that doesn't read, and say there's good reasons why it didn't read, and all that sort of thing. These things read, man.

In other words, your goof is what's going to eat time. Actually, if you were very rapid and very slippy, and your pc was not having a bad time in his own environment while he was being audited so you didn't have to waste lots of time getting in all kinds of rudiments and all that sort of thing, and you're going along, you're probably looking at – oh, I don't know – you're probably looking at thirty hours with absolutely not a slip anyplace, you see.
But we'll say that it went a little slower than that, and so forth, and estimated it about fifty. All right. What do we rack up with some auditor who's driving all over the road and that sort of thing? Well, we rack up all of his auditing time lost plus all of the auditing time that somebody else has to put in to straighten the pc out. And it will take you a hundred to a hundred and fifty hours to straighten out a pc that's been thoroughly loused up by some lousy auditor. Yea! And it's... you're going to sit and swear, because you can't help but skid on the ice particularly when you're first starting in on this, once or twice, and you're going to sit there sometime for two continuous days trying to figure out, "Oh, my God, what – what did I do? You know? What did I do? Heh-heh! Where – where did it go? I mean, what – what was it? What was it? Hah-hah-hah-hah. Well, let's see, Ron said if you opposed a ...if you ran a goal oppose again, you could come up with an item."

You come up with an item and it doesn't fit anyplace and you get that one wrong way to. And that's happened. And you didn't know where to go with that. And so now you've got another item you don't know where it is, and oh, God! You'll wish that you had put in that extra ten minutes testing the item out each time. And you'll wish that you were a little smoother, and you'll wish you had paid attention to this exact sequence of delivering the item. The sequence is "Read the last R/S, if there is one. If there isn't one, you don't."

"Read the last R/S. Tell the pc, 'I'm now going to read to you the last rock slamming item.'" And he sometimes is doped off, and he thinks you're going to say the last rocket reading item or something. Pcs get educated like this. Don't worry about raw meat, just use the same parlance.

And he thinks it's his item for a moment, and he says, "Well, that's not my item." And you said, "Yes, I know. I said the rocket reading... the last rock slamming item," and so on.

"I didn't hear you."

It's no reason to get into sense like that, so just be positive, say, "This is the last rock slamming item, I have to see if it reads, it is not your item." And you read it, bang, you see it doesn't read. "Now, I'm going to read the next to the last rocket reading item – it is not your item – to see if it reads. And it is – bong." And you read it, and you see that it doesn't read.

"Now, I am going to read the last rocket reading item on the list, which is your item. A tiger." – Bang. Immediately tell the pc, don't monkey with it, see? "That reads. That reads. That's fine, that's your item," so on. You'll get back so you'll groove right in to that exact procedure.

What's the reason for that procedure? That's so you don't read the pc an item and then take his attention off of it to something else. Because the rule is: The last thing you do is read the pc's item to him. And you don't ever drag his attention off of that item, with anything.

Now, let me show you the difficulty you can get into. You didn't know – you had two rocket reading items together on a list, see? You had one rocket read on the first column of your list and you had another rocket read on the last column of your list and you had two together. So you say, idiot-simple, walking Simple Simon in the pies, you say, "I'm now going to read you the next to the last rocket reading item, which is not your item." And then read him the item of the – the upper item of the pair. Well, actually, the only way you had to tell when you first put this thing down, you see, he actually was thinking of the item while he said
the other item to you. So actually it looked like two rocket read and you've just presented the pc with his rocket reading item, see? And it goes pow!

You say, "I'm now going to read the next to the last item. It is not your item. 'A water-buck'" –pow! You say, "Uh-oh!"

And the pc says, "Yes, a waterbuck! What? What? What? What? What? What? What?" You've now got to say, "Well, I've got to read the other item now, I'm awfully sorry," and you'll find the pc will start going real sour on you and now you have to get in and get in some suppresses off and all this kind of thing, you just had trouble, see.

So there's an additional rule to this: When two lie together, you don't lay in any statement that it's the pc's, and you read the rocket reading item earlier than that pair. Read the earlier item than the pair. Don't call the next to the last rocket reading item, the one... the upper one of the pair, because you could be very wrong. This has actually happened in session, which is why I know about it. It'll be the pc... you've given him his item, you said, "This is the next-last... next to the last item. It isn't your item." You see, you gratuitously invalidated the whole thing, and there he goes. Wow! No, you mustn't distract the pc's attention. You mustn't distract his attention after you've given him the item. That's your nuance.

Now, these are – these are very simple rules. These are very simple rules. It's something like learning a number of addresses. You can read any God's quantity and memorize any quantity of addresses. You can memorize them in complicated ways, so long as they always come up in that series. Well, that's what you've got here. But there's something for you to memorize on it. You better get these rules.

Now, I know that this material is not immediately available to you and you haven't got it in hand. Actually, you now have three lectures on this subject. I invite your attention to them. I also invite your attention to some rules and regulations of HCO Bulletin here on Saint Hill Briefing Course, HCO Bulletin, I think, the 12th.* I invite your attention to those, because it says that ignorance of the technology is no excuse for a goof. And if you goof, you've had it. It isn't the Instructor's fault, it's yours. In V Unit, on your first day at Saint Hill, we hold you responsible for knowing the whole of everything you are doing.

And the Instructor comes along, and he says, "Well, that rocket slam looks big enough to me! Heh-heh! It's an eighth of an inch wide. Go on, oppose it."

And the person says, "Oh? Yes, well, all right, all right." And goes ahead and opposes it and the bank beefs up and the pc starts caving in and dark hollows underneath the pc's eyes.

And somebody happens to see this pc and says, "Who's your auditor?"

And he says, "Oh, that's – that's Joe Blow," and so forth.

Well, Joe Blow gets an infraction, and if it looks too bad, it's two weeks with no auditing, which is just two weeks lost course time, and which carries with it the same equivalent of

* [Editor's Note: This was issued as HCO PL 11 Feb. 63, AUDITING REGULATIONS, in OEC Volume 4]
a fifteen hundred word infraction sheet, and you can only have five thousand words of infrac-
tion until you get sent down from the course.

That's terrible, isn't it? In other words, you've got a bunch of new auditing regulations
coming out. Why? Because I want you to take responsibility for cases. And I don't care if
some Instructor came along and said, "Stand the pc on the head." You did stand the pc on the
head and it didn't work. You're for it, not the Instructor. You got that? I'll take care of the In-
structor. You see why?

Now, we've got to turn Clears out here. Now, the material I've been giving you follows
a one-two-three-four rule. And I've already seen that somebody Thursday night, listening to a
lecture, somebody with a bulletin in his hot hand, on a case on which the goal had already
been found, could disobey all of it and wind up in 3M opposing a rock slamming item a quar-
ter of an inch wide. And actually go ahead and oppose it!

Haaaa! Somebody's counting on the Instructor, man, somebody's counting on Suzie
telling them what to do. You're not going to have an Instructor when you get out of here.
You're not going to have Suzie. And we've just got to make up our minds right now that you
have to know how to clear people. And you're going to be able to clear people. And we're
going to make sure that you're able to clear people. And I start making sure of that on your
first day on course now because you saw into the entire complications of 2-12A, if your pc
looks bad, you're for it.

Yes, you say, "But I haven't had time to read the bulletins. I haven't passed them on
my checksheet." Ha-ha, I'm sorry. That has nothing to do with it.

"The tapes are all used up and we can't listen to them anymore." I'm sorry, that has
nothing to do with it. Makes you responsible for getting your own data.

Why? Why can we move up like that? Well, we've been talking for a long time that we
Scientologists ought to be an example in ourselves of the efficacy and working of Scientol-
ogy. And that's what we've been saying for a long time. And I'm sitting in the driver's seat
now. I was a first-goal Clear last night for three minutes.

Thank you very much, and good night.
TV DEMO: RUDS AND HAVINGNESS

An auditing demonstration given on 13 February 1963

Auditor: Okay. George, what I'm going to do here is run a rudiments and havingness session. Okay? All right.

PC: I don't see any cans.

Auditor: Don't see any cans. Here are some over here.

PC: Mm-mm.

Auditor: Now you take the cans. All right. Please squeeze the cans. Good.

LRH: All right. This is just a rudiments and havingness activity. And we're just going to have a rudiments and havingness demonstration here and see what's being done in the rudiments and havingness section. All right, go ahead, auditor, start your session.

Auditor: Okay. Is it all right if I start this session now?

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Good. Start of session. Has this session started for you?

LRH: Eleanor, move a little bit over to the right. You're obscuring the TV set with your shoulder. Thatagirl.

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

PC: Oh, I'd like to find my havingness command. And uh, or how good I can feel on it.

Auditor: I didn't hear the last of what you said.

PC: How good I can feel doing it.

Auditor: Good. Mm-hm.

Okay. Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?

PC: To go home.

Auditor: Good. Any other?

PC: Well - to get my case in shape.

Auditor: Thank you.

All right. What I'm going to do now is to put in the mid rud's.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: I'll be doing it "since the last time you were audited," and when was that?

PC: Well, it was this morning at 12:25.

Auditor: Okay. Just put a note down here. All right.

Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Well, you might say, my spirits. When I thought I was going to uh - go ahead and find some more item, as a pc, I thought, I was transferred here so that kind of dashed my hopes on finding my item.
Auditor: Thank you. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Mm, no, not that I'm aware of.

Auditor: Okay. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed? That reads. What was it?

PC: Ummm. Gee, I don't have the faintest clue.


PC: Oh, the only thing I was thinking of there was – I guess I suppressed thinking about him so I could just go ahead and study a bulletin.

Auditor: I didn't quite get that.

PC: I said I suppressed thinking about him so I could go study a bulletin.

Auditor: Uh-huh. Okay. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Not that I'm aware of.

Auditor: Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Good. Now, I'm going to fast-check the rest of these.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? That reads. What was that? There. There. That.

PC: Well, I-I don't quite know I didn't quite sort it out, really.

Something about, uh - my auditing wasn't invalidated.

Auditor: Mm-hm. What was it?

PC: Well, it had something to do with uh… switching pcs and auditors around in the morning.

Auditor: Mm.

PC: I haven't quite pinned it down exactly. Something was invalidated. It wasn't my auditing because I don't know how good or bad it is.

Auditor: Mm-hm. Well, what was invalidated?

PC: Well, I was somehow. I don't see how that could be...

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: ...I just thought I was invalidated.

Auditor: Okay. Are you satisfied that answers the question?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? That reads. What is that? There. There.

PC: Oh, studying that damn little stinky bulletin tonight. You know, one of them little CCH ones.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: And it was one of the hardest ones I've ever run into. I couldn't seem to nail it down for some reason. And uh… I thought I'd be getting me one of those little ones, and get it after a reasonable length of time, but I sure couldn't get that one.

Auditor: Yeah, well what was ...
PC: Well, I felt invalidated. It's sort of a - it was such a little dinky one at that. Couldn't get that. And it was a sort of, you might say, self invalidation.

Auditor: Uh - what I don't understand is just what that was ...

PC: Well, my ability even to do a little thing like that.

Auditor: Mm-hm. Okay. Thank you. I'll check the question on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? That reads. What is that? There. Right there. That. What's that?

PC: I don't know. I get - get kind of - kind of a question mark on my mind. I don't know what it is.

Auditor: Okay. That.

PC: Well, the same thing. It's kind of a, well, what - what could it be? But this happens in auditing all the time.


PC: Well, the same darn thing. A kind of a - a question again, well, you know, what could it be, what could I have invalidated?

Auditor: Uh-huh. Right there. What's that?

PC: It's the same darn thing. Every time I kind of pose it as a question ...

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: ...you know, what could it be?

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: I-I have the same trouble with auditing when I get run on rudiments. Uh... either the abruptness, or it pulls a question, you know, just an idea of what could it be.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: But we're arguing with the darn meter. I get so disgusted with the meter.

Auditor: All right. Uh... thank you for answering that. I'm going to check it on the meter and we'll see if that is - is your answer on it. Okay. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? There is another read on that. What is that? Right there. That. That. What is that?

LRH: Eleanor, you are cleaning a clean.

PC: ...let's see, familiarize myself with it, trying to figure it out completely. I found several things that might help me.

Auditor: Yes.

PC: But I didn't think – I didn't think I found them – not as well as I should have.


PC: Sort of a self-invalidation again.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you, George. All right. Now, uh... I made an error on that. That was a clean that I was cleaning.

PC: Hm!

Auditor: Okay? Do you agree that that question is clean?

PC: Oh, probably is.

Auditor: Okay. Now I'm going to check the next one.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Okay?
PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suggested? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Good. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's a read on that. What is that?

LRH: That was a clean, Eleanor.

Auditor: All right. I'm not going to leave you hunting for that. That was also a clean. I was – I was in error on that. Now, uh… do you agree that that question is clean?

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Very good. Thank you. Here's the next. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What is that?

PC: That was uh… now what came up there on this – um – not to show disappointment over things.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: Um, several things have come up that I've been disappointed about. There – there's no use uh… complaining about it or particularly showing it.

Auditor: Oh, I don't understand what you've been careful of in that.

PC: I-I said I've been kind of – kind of a bit careful not to show my disappointment.

Auditor: Ah!

PC: Okay?

Auditor: Thank you.
PC: Golly, I don't know what that would be. It could – it had something to do with uh... processing I got this morning. Some mass on something moved into the head and...

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: ...made me real dopey. And just – it has – might have something to do with the headache now. I don't know what the connection is. But the "careful of" – I don't know why.

Auditor: Mm-mm. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What is that? There.

PC: Well, I'm still thinking about that again, kind of puzzled by it.

Auditor: Mm-mm.

PC: I-I don't know all the reasons.

Auditor: And what have you been "careful of" about it?

PC: Hm?

Auditor: What have you been "careful of" about it? There. That.

PC: Oh, I guess – I guess I've been careful not to become too overwhelmed by it... I guess I've been careful not to uh... become too affected by uh... no results from processing.

Auditor: Mm.

PC: If I did, I would have gone a long time ago.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: But, I guess a guy just keeps hopping.

Auditor: Okay. Does – does that satisfy you've answered the question?

PC: Yes. Mm-mm.

Auditor: Good. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. Since the last time you were audited, has any mistake been made? I'm – that is equivocal. I'm going to check it again.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, has any mistake been made? There's a read there. What is that? That.

PC: Well...

Auditor: Right there.

PC: I don't know whether I made a mistake or not. I-I know I-I didn't make a mistake, I'm pretty sure, in picking the uh... universe for the pc to run on. I think I got the right universe. And if there was any mistake, the wording wasn't quite right.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: That's what I was thinking of.

Auditor: Okay. That answer – that satisfy you you answered...

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has any mistake been made? That reads. What is that? There. There. That. That.
PC: Hm! Just when I'm puzzled about things.

Auditor: Uh-huh. Okay George. What I want to do is – is check that question again.

PC: All right.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, has any mistake been made? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Yeah, it probably is. I couldn't find anything there.

Auditor: Very good. Thank you.

PC: Just rolling now.

Auditor: All right.

PC: I can see this can be a real auditing session because I'm surprised here.

Auditor: How are you doing here.?

PC: Yeah, I-I looked at a couple of things I-I had never thought of before. The way – the way I – uh… am quite bitterly disappointed that I'm not making more result from my processing.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: And uh... I've got a lot of other things to do so I kind of shove it off to one side and don't look at it.

Auditor: Yeah. Okay. Well, how are you doing in this session here?

PC: Real good.

Auditor: Real good. Thank you.

PC: I've kind of forgot about that silly TV camera.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Here's the next rudiment question.

PC: All right.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, has anything been nearly found out? That reads. What is that? There. That. Right there. What was that? There.

PC: Uh… rocket reading item – items on my pc. And I would have liked to see that goal checked out to see if it was one.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: It looked awful good.

Auditor: Okay. When was that nearly found out? That.

PC: Well, I was asked a time or two by different people about it.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: And, some others around didn't say anything but uh… I-I-I don't know who it was, I don't.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: You know, and it doesn't make any difference.

Auditor: Yes. Well when was it that you wondered if somebody had found out about that disappointment?

PC: I was going to say, oh ...

Auditor: You've got it, right here. There.

PC: Yeah. I think that would be about the time. Yeah, I think this afternoon.

Auditor: All right. When this afternoon?

PC: I was sitting at the table, I-I guess I was talking to Jim, I'm not sure.

Auditor: Uh-huh. Who nearly found that out?

PC: I don't even recall, really. There was a lot of people in there. And
uh… well, I talked to Jim some about it.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: Someone did turn around and looked at me. I-I don't know – possibly is. Something like that.

Auditor: Okay. Now, who was it that you wondered whether they found it out?

PC: Well, I didn't even bother to see who it was. It was just some people around there.

Auditor: Mm-hm. Uh ...

PC: I mean, I-I didn't look at them. I just was aware there were people there.

Auditor: All right. Uh… what did they do that made you wonder whether they found it out?

PC: Aw, they just turned around and looked at me talking to Jim.

Auditor: Okay. Now is there somebody else that you wondered whether they found out about that disappointment? Okay, that's ...

PC: I don't think so, really. There might have been some of the guys right around. I don't think so. This is all kind of a vague incident.

Auditor: Mm-hm. All right. Uh… I'm going to check this missed withhold question to ...

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: ... see if we got it. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been nearly found out? Okay. Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Good. All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? There's a read. What is that?

PC: Well, sure. Getting the goddamned items so I can get moving.

Auditor: Thank you. I'll check the question on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything
you have been anxious about? I missed that read. I'll ask it again.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? There is another read on that. What is that?

PC: Well, I've been anxious about to try to nail down knowing more about 2-12 and 3 for that matter, too. To really know it. I-I don't think I know it well enough. Too many things I don't know.

Auditor: Yes. Thank you.

PC: I'm kind of anxious about that. I-I-I can't seem to get it down where I want it, either.

Auditor: Uh-huh. I got that. Now, do you feel you answered that question?

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Good. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? There's another read on that. What is that?

PC: Oh, not being able to remember the damn bulletin.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: They want, they want you to get it down to the fine print anyhow. You've got to know the whole thing. It's – it's right at this moment a kind of an obstacle to me.

Auditor: Uh-huh. Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? I'm not certain of that read. I'm going to check it again.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? There is a read on that. What is that?

PC: Oh ...
PC: I'm kind of anxious about that.

Auditor: Thank you. All right. I'm going to check that question now. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? Okay. Before I just finish checking this off, I want to check another button here.

PC: All right.

Auditor: Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have protested? That reads. What is that? There. That.

PC: Last time I was audited?


PC: Oh, sure. I-I protested to my – when they changed the auditing schedule around.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: Of course, it didn't do any good. You can protest all you want to the Instructor and nothing happens.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: And, uh… that's all I can think of now.

Auditor: Thank you.

PC: That's all that comes to my mind.

Auditor: Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have protested? That's another read on that. What is that? There. There. That.

PC: Oh, I guess I just kind of thought to myself, protesting like, about uh… we were cleaning up old lists and nulling them out and prepchecking on their old goal.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: Odds and ends here and there. I just go from one thing to the other. I guess I kind of mentally protested that.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you very much. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have protested? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Very good. Now, I left one rudiment question that I wasn't sure I had a clean read on and I'm going to check it again.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Okay? Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been anxious about? There is a read on that. What is that? There.

PC: Oh, that!

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: Well, I'm moving from where I'm staying over to another place.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: And I'm kind of anxious that I can get off and move Saturday, you know, clicked off.


PC: Everything like it should be. I finally found where I can, uh… especially gain some time. I spend the whole weekend taking care of myself and leaves no time, reasonable, for study so I got to have more time for it.

Auditor: Good. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have
PC: Oh, I-I decided I had to restudy the uh... latest 2-12

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: ... bulletin to see if I could get a little sharper on learning what the heck to do.

Auditor: Thank you. I'll check the question. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been decided? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Very good. Okay. Now, I'm just going to make a notation here.

PC: I think it's been a long time since I've had my rudiments cleaned up.

Auditor: Well, good.

PC: We don't do it in the V Unit.

Auditor: Uh-huh. Now, what is the Havingness Process you usually are run on?

PC: Hm, I think they're running "Feel."

Auditor: Okay.

PC: Oh, I can run "Feel" or "Touch" or "Look around here and find something you could have."

Auditor: Okay. Now we're going to — I'll — I'll check this very soon, soon after I start, we'll — we'll run — we'll run, "Feel that object." I'll indicate the object.

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Okay? Squeeze the cans. Very good. Put the cans down, please. All right. Feel that table top.

Thank you. Feel the sleeve of your sweater.

Good. Feel the floor.

Very good. Feel that board behind you.

Thank you. Feel the table top.

Good. Feel that can.

Very good. Now, pick up the cans. Okay. Please squeeze the cans. That's working fine. Okay? I'm go-
ing to run a little bit more on that. Put the cans down now. Okay.

Feel the floor.

Thank you. Feel the back of your chair.

Very good. Feel the end of the table.

Thank you. Feel your knee.

PC: Pardon?

Auditor: Feel your knee.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Very good. Feel that sweater.

Feel my sweater.

Very good. All right. Feel the back of your chair.

Good. Feel the floor.

Thank you. Feel that board behind you.

Very good. Okay. Pick up the cans. All right. Please squeeze the cans.

Good. That worked fine. All right. That was the last command.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end that process?

PC: Oh, yeah, I-I learned a few little things here. I kind of want to do it, but I sometimes I really want to do it, uh… something I don't particularly want to – get my confront up all the time – I kind of shove off behind me and sort of not-is it.

Auditor: Mm.

PC: And I picked up a few little things. I do that.

Auditor: Okay. End of process. All right.

Have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: Let's see, what were they?

Auditor: I'll read it to you.

PC: No, I got it.

Auditor: Did you get that?

PC: Sure.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?

PC: I feel a little brighter.

Auditor: Good.

PC: I feel a little better. Sometimes I think what I need is a great big slug of Havingness run.

Auditor: Uh-huh.

PC: It always makes me feel better whenever I do any of it at all.

Auditor: Good. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: Mm.

Auditor: Good. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Okay. Here it is: End of session. Has this session ended for you?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: Good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You are no longer auditing me.

Auditor: Very good. All right. Now you can go back – you can go right back over there, George.

PC: Okay. Fine. Thank you, Eleanor.
LRH: All right. There we had our rudiments and havingness session. Basic errors is asking the pc if he's answered the question – something we never do. That – that's a very bum show to ask the pc if you've answered the question. That's the auditor – the auditor's TR 2 tells the pc that.

Then the meter reading there was not too good. And when I asked the protest button to be cleaned up, the way you do that is, you simply say, "Has this question been protested?" and the read will come off of it at once if the question is reading merely because it's protested. Protest is a random rudiment on all of the mid ruds.

Other than that, that was pretty good and the pc felt a bit better and his havingness came up. So it was a successful session. So thank you very much.

Next team will be on in just a moment.

PC: Ron is talking?

Auditor: Huh?

PC: Ron is talking?

Auditor: Yes. He's waiting for us – waiting for us to ...

LRH: Put your earphones on. Got'em there?

Auditor: Yes.

LRH: All right. Here we go. Just do a rudiments and havingness session the way you ordinarily would in the unit.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Okay. Just take the cans, Mario.
PC: Well, to get out of here Clear and Class IV.

Auditor: Very good. Okay. Any others?

PC: Uh... to start things newly would be nice.

Auditor: Okay. Any others?

PC: No.

Auditor: That's fine. Now, what I'm going to do, I'm going to do Suppress repetitively, and I'm going to check the others straight on the meter. Okay? All right. Now, I'm going to use "Since the last time you were audited." When was that, Mario?

PC: This morning.

Auditor: Okay. Got that session in mind?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Oh, I think I suppressed anger this morning after my session.

Auditor: Okay. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I suppressed to communicating this evening.

Auditor: Okay. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I don't see anything.

Auditor: Okay. I'll check it on the meter. All right. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed? That reads. What was it? There it is. There.

PC: Yes, I suppressed – I suppressed saying the goal – a goal for this session. I suppressed saying: To keep my auditor in-session.

Auditor: Very good. All right. Well, do you want it to go down on there?

PC: Well, no, I don't think so.

Auditor: Okay. Good. All right. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I think I suppressed – however, this is not since the last time, this is – this was before or during my session.

Auditor: Okay. Would you like to tell me about it? Just ...

PC: Well, yes, I suppressed asking that the goal that I think I have found in the item be checked. Or maybe wanting to know or making tantrums in order to make it be checked.

Auditor: Okay. All right. I'll check again, "Since the last time you were audited." Okay? Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Um... I suppressed being disappointed at not having received mail. For some reason I'm expecting a letter, and when I went back home there was no letter and I was a bit disappointed not having received the – this letter.

Auditor: I don't quite understand what was suppressed about it.

PC: Well, I suppressed, how shall I say – I suppressed – I did something else. I went – I came out of this disappointment. I suppressed being – staying in disappointment.
Auditor: Okay. Thank you. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I don't see anything.

Auditor: Okay. I'll check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. Next one we're doing straight on the meter, Mario. Okay?

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? That reads. What was it? There it is. There again. There it is.

PC: Uh... I don't know exactly what it is. But it has to deal, probably – it has to deal probably with uh... my auditing this afternoon. The auditing I gave this afternoon. I think this was the first time in which I really had pleasure in auditing, this afternoon. And – uh... this is the first time I had the – the feeling that I was doing something and not being told to do something. And even if I made a mistake... And the uh... somehow this evening I didn't feel... This afternoon I decided myself to do something in auditing – the auditing of Ken.

Auditor: Yes.

PC: And uh... I was very sure that things were going to be very good. I mean, an item had been grabbed off an incomplete list and you – I went back and looked at the list and the list still... I tried again the list and the list was still getting tone arm action. So I decided that this item had been grabbed from in the middle of the list.

Auditor: Yes.

PC: So I decided that we should go on listing. And the needle smoothed out very beautifully. And uh... my pc seemed to be bright and cheerful and uh... and tonight uh... somehow I had a kind of a critical subject.

Auditor: Yes. Yes, I understand this.

PC: And I invalidated myself for having done that, for... I'm not wrong, but this is the invalidation.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you, Mario. I got that.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: All right. Just check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suggested? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Okay.

Auditor: All right. Just check it on the meter.

PC: Yes. I thought – uh... it's still on account of this auditing – a comment – was thinking that we should go on opposing this item that had gone – that had been taken off this – in the middle of this list. And I said, no, I think that we should actually do that – actually, I think that if I must make mistake – if I must make a mistake, it's better for me to make it myself rather than have it uh... I would have more reality on what – the mistake if I made myself
than just being told, "Do that," and then it turns out *mummm* – that it's not the right thing to do.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: Actually, I got uh… quite desperate, because this was my trouble with – when I was auditing Dick. That I was being told, "No, do that, do that, do that." And I got uh… quite miserable. I was given Dick – Dick to audit and I was told, "Do this and do that" and uh… well, things couldn't – I don't know, so – things went sour – I could not audit. And I suggested, I think, to myself this afternoon that I'd rather be mistaken myself than being right when told to be right.

Auditor: I understand.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Good. All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? I'll just check that again, Mario. I wasn't quite sure of the read. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Now what we're going to do – have you got a Havingness Process?

PC: I think I have been careful before coming here. Yes, a very strange thing: I have been careful of not protecting you as an auditor here. I decided that if I have anything to say, I would say it. And that this would help you more than if I... trying to – to be – careful as a pc.

Auditor: Thank you. All right. Just check it on the meter. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you've been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Now what we're going to do – have you got a Havingness Process?

PC: I don't know. I think it's "Point out."

Auditor: Well, what we're going to do, I'm going to check it. Okay?

PC: Okay.

Auditor: All right. Just give the cans a squeeze. All right. Just put them on the table. Right. Now, what we're going to do is point out something. Okay?

PC: Uh-huh.
Auditor: Here's the first command. Point out something.
PC: This camera.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This microphone. This one.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This chair.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This... business.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This earphones you have there.
Auditor: Thank you. Just pick up the cans and let's just check.
PC: Thank you.
Auditor: Okay. Now, give them a squeeze. Good. All right. Okay, give them another one please, Mario. Good. All right. Just going to continue this process. You can put them down.
Auditor: Thank you. Here's the next command. Point out something.
PC: This... business.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This... business.
Auditor: Thank you. Just pick up the cans and let's just check.
PC: Thank you.
Auditor: Okay. That's fine. Here's the next command. Point out something.
PC: The light.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: The column.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: Your brooch.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This table.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: The door.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This chair.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: The floor.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: The ceiling.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This wall.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This wall.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: These racks.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This camera.
Auditor: Thank you. How are you doing, Mario?
PC: Okay.
Auditor: All right. Just pick up the cans, please. All right. All right. Give the cans a squeeze. Fine. All right. Just put them down. We'll just do a few more commands. Thank you. Anything you wanted to say?
PC: No. I'm all right.
Auditor: Okay. That's fine. Here's the next command. Point out something.
PC: These wires.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This chair.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: [sighs] This wall.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This other camera.
Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.
PC: This wooden handle.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This door.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: These tubes.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This table.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This floor.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This wall.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This cover.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Uh... these, uh... I don't know how you call them, these things where - plugs, these electrical plugs.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: Uh...

Auditor: Did you want to say something?

PC: Did you give me a command?

Auditor: No, I didn't. I'll give it to you now. Point out something.

PC: This E-Meter.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Uh... these, uh... I don't know how you call them, these things where - plugs, these electrical plugs.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This wall.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This wall.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: The books of "Alice in Wonderland" behind you.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This contraption there. I don't know what it is.

Auditor: Which one?

PC: The round one.

Auditor: Oh. Thank you.

PC: Control thing, I suppose.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This door.

Auditor: Thank you. Now, Mario, will you squeeze the cans and let's see how we're going.

Okay. Give the cans a squeeze.

Oh, that's fine. All right. Now, put the cans down. I'm going to give you two more commands and then I'm going to end the Havingness. Okay?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: This collar.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: This wall.

Auditor: Thank you. That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?

PC: I was able to yawn. [laughs]


PC: Thank you.

Auditor: Pick up the cans. That's fine. Now, what I'm going to do, I'm going to
Auditor: All right. The first one I'm going to give to you and then I'm going to check straight on the meter. All right? All right. In this session, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Yawning.

Auditor: Okay. In this session, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Uh... yes. A certain amount of anxiety. I was a bit uh... I feel freer now than at the beginning of the session.

Auditor: Well, that's fine. Thank you. In this session, has anything been suppressed?

PC: A certain amount of stage fright.

Auditor: Good. In this session, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Telling you that I-I preferred being a pc than an auditor. [laughs]

Auditor: Fine.

PC: And even though I may have had to reveal my withholds and rather be - tonight, you see, I probably would, if I continue liking auditing as I did this afternoon, I will probably enjoy being an auditor...

Auditor: Very good.

PC: ... more than a Pc.

Auditor: Very good. Did I cut you off there, Mario?

PC: What?

Auditor: Did I cut you off then?

PC: No.

Auditor: Okay. Good. In this session, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I don't see any – any more.

Auditor: Okay. I'll check it on the meter. All right. In this session, has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yep.

Auditor: Good. In this session, has anything been invalidated? That reads. What was it? There it is. There.

PC: Uh... maybe uh... the beginning of the session I couldn't really – I didn't perhaps feel I was very much in-session as I am more now. Maybe that was the invalidation, that I felt that... I'm not sure it is that but I'm telling you the first thing that comes to my mind.

Auditor: Okay. All right. I'll check it on the meter.

PC: All right.

Auditor: All right. In this session, has anything been invalidated? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Good. In this session, has anything been suggested? That reads. What was it? There.

PC: [laugh] That I had pleasure in being an auditor on TV. This ... [laughs]

Auditor: Very good. All right. Okay. Just check it on the meter. In this session, has anything been suggested? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. In this session, is there anything you have failed to reveal? Do you agree that's clean?
PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. In this session, is there anything you've been careful of? That reads. What was it? There. There. There it is. There it is.

PC: Uh... I may – I may have been careful of what I was saying during this session. But – well, I'm not sure. This is what I feel.

Auditor: Okay, well, I'll check it on the meter and if the read's still here I'll give it to you again. Okay?

PC: Uh-huh.

Auditor: All right. In this session, is there anything you've been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: All right, yes.

Auditor: All right. Okay, I didn't get the same read again, Mario.

PC: All right.

Auditor: All right. Now, have you made any part of your goals for this session? "To feel better at the end of the session?"

PC: Oh, yes. Yes. Yes.

Auditor: Very good. "To go through this..." Oh, that's a life and livingness goal. Okay. That was the only one we had for the session.

PC: All right.

Auditor: All right. Have you made any gains in this session you would care to mention?

PC: Uh... well I don't know if I could say that, but the gain was I was enough of a pc myself to – I suppose this would be protecting your auditor, but uh... I was enough myself a pc and I was willing to be audited and interested in my own case for you to – to be a better auditor at the end of the session and soon after the beginning of the session and really get a gain.

Auditor: Thank you.

PC: And I suppose this is both a gain for you and for me.

Auditor: Thank you, Mario. All right. Now, is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end the session?

PC: That it is very interesting, to be on this end here.

Auditor: Anything else you want to tell me about that?

PC: I – no, I don't think so. There – there's more of a feeling than – that now I could go on for hours, I suppose. [laughs]

Auditor: Thank you, Mario. All right. Now, is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end the session?

PC: That it is very interesting, to be on this end here.

Auditor: Anything else you want to tell me about that?

PC: I – no, I don't think so. There – there's more of a feeling than – that now I could go on for hours, I suppose. [laughs]

Auditor: Fine.

PC: But anything else, great.

Auditor: Okay. Anything else you'd care to ask or say before I end the session?

PC: All right. Is it all right with you if I end the session now?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Here it is: End of session. Has the session ended for you?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Put down the cans and tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You are no longer auditing me.

Auditor: Very good. Thank you.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: Well, that was pretty good meter reading and – not bad. Pretty good auditing. One thing I'd like to call to your attention is the Tone 40
characteristic of "end of session." Tone 40 end of session is very desirable. There's – was no opportunity for the pc to say that the session had ended for him. Well, you give him an "end of session," and then say, "Has the session ended for you?" And I don't know where this has disappeared out of the lineup. These little things get in and get wrong and get fouled up. Well, we're going to have this next one fairly brief. And then we're going to give you a break and I'm going to talk to you for a few minutes concerning these sessions.

Put on the earphones. All right. I want this session to be fairly brief and I want you to get in just the small mid ruds. You know? Just the four. And bash the thing off in a hurry. Loosen up his needle and change his tone arm position and end it. Okay.

Auditor: All right. Just talking to Ron, here. Okay. Okay. Want to grab the cans? Good. Okay, Stan, I'm going to be – going to be running the small mid ruds and Havingness in the middle. Make this sort of brief, you know. And that'll be about it. Anything you want to say?

PC: No. Fine.

Auditor: Okay. Very good.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Great. Got any anxieties about being audited in here you want to tell me about or anything like that? You know, anything...

PC: Just physical reactions, that's all.

Auditor: Okay. Good enough. Okay. All right. Is it all right if I start this session now?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: Fine. Yes.

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

PC: Um – well, to feel more relaxed.

Auditor: Mm-hm. Any others?

PC: Um – be more in present time.

Auditor: All right. Okay. Any other goals for this session?

PC: No. That's it for this session.

Auditor: All right. Very good. Any others for life or livingness?

PC: No.

Auditor: Okay. Fair enough. Okay, got it all here. Okay... Right. I'm just going to check the mid ruds here. Check suppress repetitively and the rest of it straight on the meter. Okay?

PC: Fine.

Auditor: Good. Okay. Now, do you recall the end of your last session?

PC: That was this morning. Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Good. Well, since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I thought of writing a note to Ron, expressing my feelings about –
keep turning all the responsibility over to the auditors. And that's – it's great.

Auditor: Yeah, I didn't get quite what was suppressed with this.

PC: I suppressed writing the note to Ron.

Auditor: Oh, I see.

PC: That it was okay, you know.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Very good. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Nothing I can think of right now.

Auditor: All right. Fair enough. I'll check that here. (Clean this thing off, okay.) Now, since the last time you were audited, has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that that's clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been invalidated? Do you agree that is clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. Since the last time you were audited, has anything been suggested? That reads. What was it? There it is. Something you failed to reveal there?

PC: Only thing I can think of is uh… my auditor was taken away from me. She was graduated.

Auditor: Hm.

PC: Doing goals now or something. She's been listed for the B Unit.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: And uh… I was glad for her, but sorry to lose her as an auditor.

Auditor: All right.

PC: I guess I failed to reveal that.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. Got that. Okay. Check that here. Now, since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? That reads. What was it? There it is. Something you failed to reveal there?

PC: That's why I raised my hand.
There it is. Yeah. There it is. What's that? Yeah.

PC: Uh... a decision I made this afternoon on uh... some new idea on how – on how to organize the data. I don't know who I failed to reveal it to. Nothing comes in about failing to reveal. Except I failed to reveal it.

Auditor: All right. Okay.

PC: I made a decision. I failed to reveal it.

Auditor: Fair enough. All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? That reads. What was it?

PC: I get a feeling I'm, uh...

Auditor: Yeah, that's it.

PC: ... suppressing something.

Auditor: Yeah. All right. Fair enough. Let's look for something you failed to reveal. There it is.

PC: Only thing I can think of it would be is feelings about being in front of uh... the group.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: The feelings I had.

Auditor: Yeah.

PC: Feelings I had in the pit of my stomach. I guess that helps – by clearing it now.

Auditor: And you failed to reveal that?

PC: Yes, about that.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. All right, how are you doing?

PC: All right.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: That – that blows some of it.

Auditor: Okay. Good. Just check the question here.

PC: All right.

Auditor: All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. I'm not sure about that. I'll check it again.

PC: Every time you've asked this question, my left hand has started to shake.

Auditor: All right.

PC: So there must be something there or there's nothing there but a shaking hand.

Auditor: Okay. Now. Okay, now, since the last time you were audited, is there anything you've failed to reveal? Yeah, I get a read there. Something – another read here. Something you failed to reveal? Yeah, that's it. There.

PC: The thought I got is I feel clear, on failed to reveal.

Auditor: All right. Very good. Okay. Now, since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Very good. Okay. All right. Since the last time you were audited...

PC: Just a moment.

Auditor: Okay, sorry about that.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Okay. Comfortable now?

PC: Yes. Better.
Auditor: Very good. All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you've been careful of? That reads. What was it? Something you've been careful of?

PC: Well, I've been careful to keep these hands still.

Auditor: All right. Very good. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. Not sure about that, if it was body here or what. Check it again. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What have you been careful of? Anything you've been being careful of today?

PC: Uh… to do what I consider to be the optimum thing. I mean, nothing specific comes to mind, but from moment to moment that's a decision...

Auditor: Uh-huh

PC: ... of mine.

Auditor: All right. You've been careful to do that, have you?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. Something you've been careful of there?

PC: You get a read?

Auditor: Um.

PC: I just thought my hands start moving the minute you start talking.

Auditor: Okay. Well, we're not getting that same read here. I might have – I might have goofed that. Just check that over again. All right. Just keep them as still as you can.

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: All right. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? Yeah, got a read there.

PC: Got a read?

Auditor: Yeah. What have you been careful of since the last time you were audited?

PC: Stopping myself.

Auditor: All right. Okay. Since the last time you were audited, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What was it?

PC: Avoiding present time.

Auditor: All right. Okay, actually, I didn't quite – I didn't quite – I didn't quite...

PC: Be careful to avoid...

Auditor: Yeah.

PC: ... present time.

Auditor: I don't quite understand.

PC: This moment.

Auditor: Oh, you mean right now?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Yeah, I see.

PC: No, not particularly this particular moment, but just generally being careful. Since the end of the last session, I've been careful to avoid looking, confronting, being in present time.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you. I got that now. Very good. Okay. All right. Now, since the last time you were au-
dited, is there anything you've been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Very good.

PC: The hands are still going...

Auditor: All right.

PC: ...but the question is clean.

Auditor: Yeah. Fine. It's clean on the meter; that's all we want. Okay. Very good. Now, we're going to run your Havingness Process. You had – what did you say that was? Point out something?

PC: Point out something.


PC: That board back there.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Some paper over there. That paper over there.

Auditor: Okay, I got it. Very good. Point out something.

PC: The mirror.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: The table.

Auditor: Very good. Point out something.

PC: The wall here.

Auditor: Very good. Okay. Point out something.

PC: The lamp behind your head.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Grab the cans. Good, okay. Okay. All right. Squeeze the cans. Okay. Very good. Once more. All right. Okay, we'll just run a few more commands of this.

PC: All right.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: The chair.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: Your sweater.

Auditor: Very good. Point out something.

PC: My jacket.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: These cans.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Your meter.

Auditor: Good. Okay. Point out something.

PC: Your sweater.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: That microphone.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: Your – your earphones.

Auditor: All right. Good. How are you doing?

PC: Okay.

Auditor: All right. Good. Just want to check on this process. So grab the cans here, I'll make sure we're working on the right track. Okay. Okay, now squeeze the cans. Very good. Okay. How are you holding these cans here? Have you got – are you holding them all right? Are you gripping them or...

PC: All right, I think.
Auditor: Okay. All right. We don't want to – I don't want you to uh... grip them. I just want you to hold them in a sort of a comfortable position, you know? Okay, that looks fine. All right. Now squeeze the cans. Okay. Very good. All right. That seems to be working fairly well. It's, ah, increasing our drop so we'll continue this for a bit. Okay? All right.

PC: Okay. I'd like to move the chair, just back a wee bit.

Auditor: What seems to be the matter?

PC: It's just my feet are too tight.

Auditor: All right. Just move back a bit. More comfortable there?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Good. Point out something.

PC: That microphone.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Your face.

Auditor: Good. Point out something.

PC: My face.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: My hands.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. Point out something.

PC: The seat of this chair.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: The back of my head.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: The wires on the floor.

Auditor: Very good. Point out something.

PC: The lapel to my jacket.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: Your shoe.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: That piece of equipment over there.

Auditor: Yeah. Okay. Good, point out something.

PC: Those books over there.

Auditor: Okay. Point out something.

PC: My back.

Auditor: All right. Point out something.

PC: These two tables.

Auditor: Very good. Okay. Let's just take a look at that can squeeze now. Pick up the cans. Good. Okay. All right. Okay, squeeze the cans. Very good. Okay. Okay, that was the last command in that process.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: Good. Anything you want to say before I end it.

PC: No.

Auditor: Okay. End of process. Very good. How are you doing?

PC: All right.

Auditor: Good. How does the room look to you now?

PC: Better.

Auditor: Good. Okay.

PC: More here.

Auditor: All right. I just want to make a note here. Then we'll be on our way. Let's see... Okay. Very good. All right, we're just going to go straight into the uh... goals for the session. Do you feel you made any part of your goals for the session?

PC: Well, I feel more relaxed.
Auditor: Good.

PC: And let's see, more in present time.

Auditor: All right. Yeah, "to be more in present time."

PC: Yeah, I'm more in present time.

Auditor: Oh, very good. All right. Have you made any other gains in this session you'd care to mention?

PC: No.

Auditor: All right. Okay. Very good. All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now? Oh, pardon me. I forgot: is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end the session?

PC: No.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Well, is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Okay. Here it is: End of session. Has the session ended for you?

PC: Uh-no.

Auditor: All right. End of session. Now has the session ended for you?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing me.

Auditor: Okay. Thanks very much, Stan.

PC: Thanks, Wally.

LRH: Okay. Take a five minute break and I will – and then get back in your seats – and I will talk to you. Actually, better be back in your seats in eight minutes.
DISCUSSION OF DEMO SESSIONS

A lecture given on 13 February 1963

Let's take a résumé now of these sessions we have just seen. And the reason I'm at this particular angle is I'm looking at a camera which is on the next floor above me. This is pretty good.

Well, now, looking at our X Unit – looking at our X Unit as a whole, they're going along all right. They're going along all right. But their Practical definitely needs buttoning up in meter reading. Meter reading is very, very poor. And you can't live with meter reading as bad as the meter reading tonight. I don't mean to knock everybody in the head on it, but that – that's pretty – pretty bad show, as far as meter reading is concerned.

In actual fact – I know that's terribly condemning, but in actual fact you must realize – you must realize that just one, just one missed read, just cleaning one clean, knocks the pc off his stride. And missing one read leaves the pc with a missed withhold. And it's not good. It's not good. It's the direction of worsening a pc.

So you've got to get along a little better on this meter reading, that's all. You've got to brush it up. And I'm asking you in Practical to give a lot of attention to that. Because I won't even start to add up the number of missed reads tonight, because they were quite large.

All right. Now let's take these sessions up in detail. The first session, Eleanor's session: Now, her presence was pretty good. She seemed to be a little bit nervous and possibly we could assign that to TV. But in actual fact, that presence can be smoother and more assured and more confident. And I'd like to see it so. That isn't a good Saint Hill presence yet.

Now, there's a piece of missing data here. And that's how you use Protest in any mid ruds. You don't swing over to the Protest button and say, "Since the last session has anything been protested?" What you do is ask the pc – and this is just random, anywhere – when you maybe have cleaned a clean or done something – and then you get a read, and it doesn't seem to be going well – you want to ask the pc, if it doesn't seem to be going well, "Has this question been protested?" That is the whole wording of it. "Has this question been protested?"

Now, that you'll find is quite enough. And the pc'll say, "Oh, ha, yes!" You know?

And you'll say, "All right. I'll check the question again. Since the last time you were audited has anything been protested, or anything been... suggested," or whatever it was you were on.

Let us say you were clearing Suggest – "Since the last session has anything been suggested?" – pc can't seem to grasp this and you do have a bit of a read. And he doesn't seem to get across with it. And you're questioning maybe your own meter readings. You're not quite
sure what it is. And *in extremis* – you don't do this with every question, you understand – but the way you use that, you say, "Has this question been protested?"

And the pc says, "Ha-ha, yes! yes!"

You say, "All right. I'll check that again. Now, since the last time you were audited, has anything been suggested?" And it doesn't read. So obviously, it was the protest that was making it read.

You recognize that protest is the reaction – invariable reaction – when you have cleaned a clean or messed up on your mid ruds. You're asking him for one more than he's got. Well, his answer is to protest. And you get a read then. But the read is on protest – the read is not on the question.

And I heard a story – possibly not true – but nevertheless I did hear it. They were spending two hours and forty-five minutes at end of session, trying to clean up the question "In this session, have you protested the E-Meter," or something like that – some such question. And this went on for two hours and forty-five minutes. Well, the fellow was protesting the question because he didn't know that that was the name of the instrument that was on the table.

Now, that's a classic! But there's your answer. There's your answer, that protest is the thing that makes your mid rud buttons read when they're not supposed to be reading. And when you clean cleans and miss reads and all that sort of thing, after a while the pc gets into a protest. And you better clean it up for the question. Don't clean it up for the session or swing into your Protest button.

And then you take your Protest button in its natural sequence, just as before. "Since the last time I audited you has anything been protested?" That's that.

Now, supposing you can't clean that up. And somehow or another we just can't seem to get that clean. Well, we say, "Has this question been protested?" And the pc says, "Yes," so you say, "Since the last time I audited you, has anything been protested?" No read, you say, "That's clean." The test of it is, is did it stop reading?

You should realize also that a pc will suppress things like "suppress," and the rest of that. But that is not as common in actual fact as protest. Natural action of the pc when you've done something bad with the meter is to protest.

Now, the Tone 40 end of session and beginning of session here – got to be picked up. You don't shout at the pc or you don't speak at the pc – you simply get it in positively. It runs something like this: "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now? All right. Here it is: Start of session!" Good monotone, louder, more positive and Tone 40 and wrap it right around his head. And then drop back to a natural tone of voice.

Now, sometimes by shouting too loudly, you put the pc in a complete state of defense. So, you must realize that. It's Tone 40, it isn't the shout. And you end the session the same way. "Is it all right with you if I end this session now? All right, here it is: End of session!" Not "Is it all right with you if I end this session now, all right, end of session." Nothing happens!
This technology, by the way – of how you start and end sessions – comes out of many older things. It – a period of auditing track. An auditing time track is an artificial track. And the pc is actually in a slightly artificial state. You actually put him in that state with your "Start of session" and your "End of session."

Now, maybe the pc in this first session improved – maybe the pc didn't. I don't know. All in all, that sounds, Eleanor, like I'm giving you a very bad time. I'm not. I'm not, there is hope! There is hope. And I'm just asking you to bear down hard on your meter reading – and pull up – pull up your – your Tone 40.

All right. Now let's go to the next session. This was Vickie's session, and I found her presence very good. She will make a good auditor. She thought that she had been ruined completely as an auditor by the course a short time ago and in actual fact she'll find out that she has not been ruined now and that her presence can get even better than it is. And it's very good. She'll make a very good auditor. And the same remarks about Tone 40 definitely apply to Vickie's session. Good heavens, you don't start a session with "All right with you if I begin this session, all right, start of session." It... not hing happens, you see. No, you've got to come down on that. That is a special moment. And you get your Tone 40 up.

Now, your meter reading wasn't too bad, but you did something very peculiar. You know, when a pc is laughing and happy and cheerful and bubbling all over himself – the day I get in end rudiments has not yet arrived! Because you're in... reinteriorizing him back into the session. Very shortly there's going to be a shift, you know, where goals and gains are picked up and run before Havingness. You'll find out that works much better.

But here is a – here's a case in point. That pc is perfectly happy. You didn't have to get in any end rudiments – just end the session.

Now, definitely the pc was improved. That was registered on his tone arm. His tone arm was at 2.5 and at session end his tone arm was very much closer to his Clear read. And the pc was improved. There's a lot of hope for this particular auditor.

And now the last session, Wally's session. And I considered it a bit informal. I think that the auditor presence there was a bit informal. That presence can be greatly improved. There's nothing wrong with the auditor's address to the pc. It's just that the auditor ought to look a little more precise.

You know, they start in, in an Academy being stiff as boards. And then they come out of it – and they get less formal, less frozen. But you know, you can go too far. And it seemed to me like that has gone just a little bit far. So be just a little more formal in your auditing and it'll be okay. But you have good warmth and good presence with regard to the pc – so don't take what I'm saying here too seriously. It's mostly your TRs could be improved a little bit.

Meter reading was fair – but only fair. And I want to point out something to you. Did you see that pc put his head down? Your pc put his head down. "Duh!" he went. Did you see that? You know why the pc did that? And later on while you were getting in your beginning ruds the pc said he had suppressed something. Well, when you left Suppress, it was reading like crazy. He had a read on Suppress and he had a read on Invalidate. And by the time you
got across Suppress and Invalidate – and asked him a Suggest – he was down like this, boom! That's because you'd missed two things.

Now, that read on Invalidate was so tiny, as to be almost undiscoverable. But it was there! Now, the read on Suppress was quite bold. In other words, when you see a pc start in fairly bold and brash, and then all of a sudden go, "Well, thya-thya-thya." And you get less, and so on. Yes, you must have goofed up your meter reading – you must have done something. Because theoretically he ought to get brighter, not darker! You see what I mean? I was using that term slangly. It was... isn't that he would get dark in the face – but he just sort of goes, you know, "Well, so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so" That's what happens when you do bad meter reading.

Now, once more, the pc's end of session here was better handled than in the other sessions. But nevertheless, this Tone 40 start of session and end of session was pretty lousy – pretty lousy. However, the pc was more relaxed and felt better at the session end, which was a good win. And I think that was very fine.

Now, let me give you something that you're missing completely. There is a very formal way that you run a session. And the first thing you want to know about this session: Is the pc under your control in any way? Well, the way you do that is you place the pc's chair. That is your action. Now, if you want to go a little bit further – you would start it in, "Is it all right to audit in this room? All right." Your chair, so-and-so and now your can squeeze and now your R-factor. And it goes in that particular sequence.

Now, actually I use it in this sequence – and I think you'll find it outwork better from the practicality that the pc is sitting down. You say, "All right, your chair's all right" or "Bring your chair forward" or "Put your chair back" or actually seat the pc in his chair. But make sure that you adjust the pc's chair. That's a trick. That puts the pc a bit more under your control.

And then you ask the pc if it's all right to audit in this room. And he says yes or no and so forth. And – you needn't particularly clean this on the meter. But a very edgy pc – I do clean it on the meter. I know we're not auditing yet. But that's all right. I take a look at it. "Is it all right if we audit in this room?" It goes bang! Like that.

"What's the matter with this room?"

"Oh, well, it's so-and-so." We clean that up so we haven't got that falling over. And then we get a can squeeze – that's to make sure that the pc is connected to the meter. That's why we get that particular one. And it also gives us a look into his havingness.

So, we give him a bang – a can squeeze, and then we put in our R-factor and then we say, "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" and you give him a Tone 40 start of session. Now you ask him, "Has the session started for you?" And the pc says yes or no. And if the pc says no – you give him another start of session just like you did before. And you ask the pc if the session started for him. And the pc says no, actually it chops up the pc pretty badly to now say, "Well, we'll take it up in the rudiments," and so forth. That is apt to chop the pc.
If the session hasn't started for this pc in two starts, it'll normally be that something is wrong with the room. You understand? Or the pc is trying to tell you something. So by asking the pc if the room is all right you've gotten rid of that one, so your session is very likely to start. And when you give the pc a start of session – it didn't start for him – and you give him another start of session, and it didn't start for him – you better ask the pc if he's thinking about something. And give it to him again. That is actually a kinder way to go about it.

So much so, that you can count on the fact that there's either something wrong with the room, or the pc is withholding something – or he's got something to tell you – and he's holding his breath waiting for you to say, "Start of session" so he actually doesn't hear the start of session.

And he says, "Well yes, I've been sitting here waiting to tell you, I think my goal is 'excelsior!'"

And you say, "Heh! All right! Good enough. All right. Well, I got that now. Now here it is: Start of session." And off we go. "Session start for you?"

"Oh, yes! Session started for me."

Do you see what I mean? The two reasons sessions don't start is the room is lousy, or the pc's trying to tell the auditor something – is holding it back, waiting until the session starts so he can say something, you see. Unless you release those two valves there, you're not going to get a session started.

Now, here's another good point in all this is, your session is ended or it isn't ended. Now, I've been experimenting lately and I find out getting the goals and gains and what the pc has to tell you as you go there, then end the body of the session and then get your can squeeze and then run your Havingness and simply give the pc an end of session. Your pc is more exteriorized from the session than otherwise. That's... will be coming out here very shortly in a bulletin.

I've been experimenting with that and life and livingness. And I find that life and livingness goals are of use to tell you if a pc had a PTP. And that was the original reason they were used, and we no longer care about that. We're handling PTPs with other processes. All right. So if you don't need those for a PTP, realize that they actually exteriorize the pc from that session.

In other words, he's there to be audited, you ask him what goals he'd like to set for life or livingness, he instantly thinks of all of his PTPs – and you've got more PTPs to handle than you had before. You find out that will be omitted in your next goals Model Session rundown.

In other words, he's there to be audited, you ask him what goals he'd like to set for life or livingness, he instantly thinks of all of his PTPs – and you've got more PTPs to handle than you had before. You find out that will be omitted in your next goals Model Session rundown.

Now, therefore, the optimum way to start a session is – ask a pc to sit down, adjust his chair, ask him if it's all right to audit in the room. Whether you clear it on the meter or not I don't care. Most pcs will take it, but some of them object to it and there's no particular reason to carry on with it over an objection. Then get your can squeeze, put in your R-factor, start your session, get your goals and gains, and look to see if that tone arm is where you left the pc in the last session. Because if it isn't you're going to have to get in your mid ruds. "Since the last time I audited you..." If the tone arm is at the same place, don't bother. You understand the use of this? And you just go into the body of a session.
Now, get your goals and gains at the end of the session. Close the session. Get your can squeeze. Run a bit of Havingness and end your session. And you'll find out that'll save you an awful lot of session time.

Now, I wanted to look at this tonight to see how you were going and what you were doing. And it seemed to me that the worst faults here were simply the Tone 40 – lack of use, the no precise procedure on starting the session and the meter reading. And the meter reading was terrible. Really, that meter reading is just too bad to be borne.

However, you're making progress. And we know that this is better auditing than you have been doing – and this is better auditing than is done in the field – but it's not good enough for a Saint Hill graduate. So improve your presence, get your formality in and square it around.

You realize that an awful lot of your auditing gain depends on the pc's confidence in the auditor. And the pc's confidence in the auditor is born by the auditor doing those things which gives the pc confidence. Not necessarily doing the same rote thing, but doing things competently, talking to the pc competently, handling what happens competently and carrying it on through and remaining in control of the session.

Now, I think we ought to give the auditors a hand here. Would you do that? ...

Thank you. Thank you. And now let's give the pcs a hand. ... Thank you.

Now, there are many, there are many pitfalls along the way in this universe. There are many sad moments. There are many times when your luck is out and you're absolutely down, and you've been assigned to TV demonstration. It's all pretty horrible – but it feels awfully good when it's all over. Because you realize that you have actually put up a presence and put up a mock-up and nobody has shot you absolutely dead. Now, don't think that I've been trying to shoot you down in flames, I'm trying to help you be a good auditor.

So thank you very much, and carry on now with a very... better session presence, a better Tone 40, better meter reading. Let's get those things improved. And let's get some good gains and some good wins on these cases. We've got terrific processes – all they need is application. So let's get it done.

And thank you very much, and good night!
Okay. Here we are on 14 February. I think it's Valentine's Day, isn't it – 14 February AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one – just be one lecture this evening.

This is a lecture about 3MX. 3M, it has become, and I think it's extremely amusing that you've got a tiger by the tail called Routine 3M, because this tiger is going to surprise you very much. This is a very precise tiger and the only way you can make this tiger go the wrong direction and do the wrong things and upset things in general is by failing utterly to do the usual and to do what you're supposed to do.

Because the first time you do something wrong with this tiger he's going to claw you and after that he's not going to behave well. The – I'll give you an example.

Now, on a source list, you say, "Who or what does the goal, so forth, oppose?" or "the goal-ing oppose?" or "somebody or something..." doing the goal or with the goal, whatever it lists. The first time you get that out to the end there and grab an item off that line and try to do something with that item, you're going to find yourself in very, very interesting condition, providing you pick up that item, call it a terminal when it is an oppterm and then oppose it.

All you have to do is make a goof just once on a wrong way to or pick up the wrong item or do something like that, and all you've got to do is do that just once and after that the rules don't come off well. In other words, it allows you just one goof. And that's too many.

In other words, if you find the item, "a tiger" on this goal "to be a tiger" and you find the item, something like that, off this goals oppose list and then you say, "Well, obviously, if it's 'to be a tiger,' heh-heh-heh-heh-heh, 'to be a tiger,' why, naturally, that's a – that's a terminal. Naturally. It's the terminal."

Ah. That is the auditor auditing by significance. And you don't audit by significance, except to this degree. If he's got a goal "to be a tiger" his first terminal is not going to be a tiger. Think of that. It's interesting, isn't it? It's going to be "somebody who is terrified of tigers." It's going to be "somebody who runs very fast." It's going to be "somebody who is allergic to cats." That's going to be the first item up. And that's going to be his terminal. To that degree, you're on the right road with significances but technical tests, that is to say, precision tests, should be made on that first one. Just because you listed goal oppose, don't think you're going to get an oppterm. You're not. You may get a terminal. You may get a terminal or an oppterm.

And all you've got to do is take just that one thing, the one thing, and list it wrong way to and after that things don't fit together. Now, that means this: It means that you've done a
wrong way to, you find an item – oh, yeah, that first one will be all right. That's what fools you. Yes, it's the last rocket reading item on the list, taken from the source, "tiger," and then you take that as your reliable item, the last one on the list, rocket reading. Everything is fine and you oppose that and you list on down and you might get that one. You might get that one. Pc's starting to look rather green or purple or pink or black or something like that, but don't pay any attention to that. No auditor does. Pc starts turning some weird color, don't ever inquire! Just plow him in.

Now you've gone that far, you've gotten your next RI, that's your second RI, and then you list from that and you come up with no item. You go "ah," and it just disappears into the blue. Now you're in a scramble. Now, you say, "Well, maybe if I continued the list of 'Who or what would a tiger oppose?'" So you do, and the pc gets a very coal color. He gets... looks like a coal man who hasn't bathed for three or four lifetimes but, so on. And you do, you find another item and you oppose that and he'll wind up with no item. The list just – you've got a couple of rocket reads on it. And so then you decide, well, "Maybe I'd really better oppose this 'tiger' further." But now you get nothing but R/Ses. Now you go back and look at the goal and it's doing nothing but R/S – if it reads at all.

The pc is in pretty bad shape. Things are looking very grim. And finally lightning strikes, you get the tremendous idea, "I wonder if 'tiger' was opposed wrong way to?" All right, so you take "a tiger" now, and you treat it as an oppterm, which is probably what it should have been in the first place, and you list it out and you keep on going.

You'll get someplace. You'll go on and on and you'll get items and you'll fit them together. But you've upset the frequency of that section of the GPM. You've upset its frequency. In other words, you've messed it up to the degree that for a while nothing is going to settle down. And you're going to keep having lists which don't have items on them and then having to extend some other list to get an item and then wondering where that appears. And then doing a goal oppose again and wind up with another item and wonder where it goes on the line plot, and oppose that. And it's just hunt and punch from there on. Now, you get the trickiness of the situation? It's very tricky.

Therefore, I advise you to keep a very, very strenuous eye on the pc.

Goal oppose. All right, you've seen this goal rocket read, everything is fine, so you're going to list it out. "Who or what would the goal oppose?" All right. Pc can be expected to turn a little bit black on that. I wouldn't worry about that. But when you take the item which you get then and you take a very high-toned item associated with the goal and you say that's a terminal, and therefore run "Who or what would this reliable item oppose?" when it was actually an oppterm, you'll find the pc starts getting black or green or some other color, he discolors. He definitely goes down. He starts looking older, your needle gets tighter, and a lot of other undesirable things happen.

Now, when you notice that, you go back and start listing it right way to. Don't find an item. Don't find an item. Don't keep going in some bullheaded fashion. Just, just knock it off right there and list the thing right way to. And all of a sudden, why, it's running better and your needle loosens up and things look a lot better, and it'll come out. And if you've gone that far, you won't upset the GPM. See? You won't upset its frequency. Then you can go on get-
ting lists where the rocket reading item which is last on the list is the rocket reading item that you want and oppose that properly and so forth and it'll go off like clockwork.

Well, how critical is this? If you find the wrong item on the source list not knowing that the item can appear anywhere, you take... you don't complete the source list and then you take a rock slam that appeared on the end of the source list, even though there are rocket reads up and down this source list – you take this rock slam and you oppose it – you have upset the source list. That list is now upset. What are you going to do with this list? Well, you just have to somehow or another fumble through.

How do I mean upset? Well, the funny part of it is, is your efforts to complete it are difficult. You get odd phenomena occurring, such as something that rocket read when it went down on the list now rock slams. Little oddball things occur.

Now, you can always convert a rock slam into a rocket read if it's been a rocket read in the first place. In other words, you saw it go down as a rocket read. Some drilling – big mid ruds – on the item will turn it back into a rocket read. That isn't true of all rocks slams. You can't do big mid ruds on any rock slam and turn it into a rocket read. But you can take something which you saw as a rocket read which has become a rock slam and turn it back into a rocket read.

What I'm trying to tell you is – is, be awfully sure of what you're doing, and don't go plunging on and on and on, multiplying error after error after error, just because you're supposed to look busy and look like an auditor. You be sure of what you do before you do it. And it's far better just to sit back and give the pc a break and look it all over, doesn't look good to you, go ask somebody, get in touch with somebody, or if you're in some far reach of the world, suspend the auditing intensive until you contact Saint Hill or something like that.

It's far better for you to do that than to keep plunging on, on, on, on, do something new. You know the big mistake you can make with 2-12A is you couldn't find a big rock slamming item, so you did another list. So you couldn't find a big rock slamming item so you did another list. So you have a new source list. So then you did another source list. So you couldn't get anywhere there. So we did a new source list and then we abandoned that and we did a new source list. You see, that's just got to do, got to do, got to do, got to do, on and on and on. And I'm telling you, you can upset everything by doing that.

No, find out where you are before you go on. Your error is always earlier. You always got an earlier error. And a new action does not fix up this other error. See, you can't do a new action that repairs your old blunder. And that's true of both Routine 2 and Routine 3.

If something goes wrong, then it's something earlier that is wrong. And you're not going to repair it by doing something new. Do you understand that?

I'll give you a hypothetical situation of what could happen. You get this person's goal, that's fine. We know how to get goals, that's easy. At about the fourth item, fourth reliable item, we find using Routine 3... I received a most remarkable cable, today, by the way, a dispatch, rather. Somebody said that they had read the bulletin about canceling out Routine 3-21 and were in terrible condition because they had a clearing co-audit, and now didn't have anything they can do.
Give you some idea of how people don't read bulletins. It goes on to say that you convert the case at once and immediately, using the old goal, starting from scratch. You convert the case right over to Routine 3M. And this particular person who was trained here, he actually didn't bother to read the rest of the bulletin. He just went into a panic. And this tells him right there, just convert it. But that, aside from the fact, it shows you how people don't get points that are right there in black and white, or red and white. So you can count on the fact that this point will be missed.

Let me give you this hypothetical case, now. Four items deep, and everything starts running wrong. They do lists; all of a sudden there are no rocket reads on the listing. That's one of the things: no rocket reads, only R/Ses. They go back and look at the goal, it is now R/Sing. Not rocket reading, it's R/Sing.

They keep running out lists and they go totally dead. No item appears on these lists. They all have items on them when they're written down. But you read these items back to the pc – gone. You may find the first R/S on the list is now R/Sing, although there are fifteen RRs followed it. You know, this is all random stuff, see.

Well, that doesn't mean anything is wrong with the technique, that means something has gone wrong earlier. And now look, hypothetically, you could go on and you could find item after item after item after item, straight down the line, one after the other and try to patch it in and go back and oppose – get the goal oppose again And get a new item and then try to go down the line and try to push on out and try to keep going and keep going and going and going and then you're gone to hell, man. Because there's no way of straightening it out.

Now, after a while you can't tell what's an oppterm, what's a terminal, what's the package, what confronted what and the pc is sitting there saying, "What the hell? What-what-what – goes up against what? Which is who? Where – where is it?" And he's sitting there and he lists like mad and then you run down the list and there's nothing on it, so you extend the list and eventually something appears on it and you take that and oh, God! He... after a while he doesn't know what opposes what.

No, your goof is earlier. And there is no additional action which you can do to repair the goof. In other words, there isn't a new technique which you now do if the thing isn't run according to textbook. The reason it stops running according to textbook is you have done something wrong. One of the earlier items found is wrong. You understand that? Something has been grabbed wrong off of the list.

I'll give you the chronic errors. Didn't list the tone arm action out. Left tone arm action on it. Didn't go twenty-five items beyond the last R/S or RR. Grabbed a terminal and used it as an oppterm or grabbed an oppterm and used it as a terminal, in other words a wrong way to listing for your next item. And those are the commonest errors.

Now, in view of the fact the fellow's in the GPM and he's pretty confused, and you ask him if something is a terminal or something is an oppterm, he's liable to do the most remarkable things. He's liable to tell you the terminals are oppters and oppters are terminals. And actually, your mass test, you say it – the best wording, by the way, is "Who or what would oppose?" – just give him your question that you would use on the top of the list. And ask him...
if more mass turned on with this one, or "Who or what would ___ oppose?" other way to, that, ask him – read that to him two or three times, ask him then if that turned on more mass and then take the one with the less mass. That's all very well as a test, but sometimes he can't tell.

Well, a very, very gingery [gingerly] test listing can ensue. But in view of the fact that Routine 3 loosens up the needle, you're not going to see much needle tighten. In other words, that needle can tighten up enormously without your noticing it. That's one of the bugs. You have to look at the quality of item he's putting down.

You've – he's consistently had as his terminal "a skunk," "a bum," "a tramp," you know, that sort of thing. And that's the type of listing he's doing, you see? And all of a sudden he starts listing this next one as, "a high society swell," "a moneyed person," "a very cultured gentleman." Well now, it's bad for an auditor to get too significant about this sort of thing, but boy, that kind of thing, you see, he's listing for terminals. You call this thing an oppterm and he's listing for terminals. Actually, he's putting oppterms on the list. These have always been oppterms for him and it doesn't look right. It's a wrong kind of item he's putting down.

You should get suspicious. And start looking very closely at his face. Is he darkening up? Your next thing – your next thing is, is the tone arm action. Is the tone arm action less?

Now, the next thing you want to look at and ask him: "Is mass drawing in on him?" Because if he's listing wrong way to, the mass comes in, the mass comes in, and he has a hell of a time trying to keep the question in his mind. By the way, he can't remember, usually, the phrasing of wrong way to items. He can't keep the question in his mind as he's trying to list. In other words, listing is very difficult for him. And the more he lists, the more he's getting this mass. And in comes the mass, closer and closer, further and further, tighter and tighter. That's... he'll tell you about it too.

But with that, you will gradually see that your needle is not very responsive, you're not getting much action out of this, there's not much tone arm, the pc is getting darker in color. There are these very specific tests to look at. And remember, the first wrong way to list will behave like the textbook. You'll get your item as the last RR on the list. You'll have RRs; it will be an item. The pc will have reality on it as an item. You get the – you get the liabilities here? So it's a touchy situation. Which way to are these items?

I've given you how to – how to get around it and I've told you what happens if you don't get around it. You've got to always go back to where you did it wrong and now do it right. And something will happen and the case will straighten out and feel a lot better.

Well now, if that's all the tests there were, and so forth – we've left this to a large degree to the auditor's observation and we've left this to the pc's statement and so forth – and if all these things were wrong, you still might get a bad judgment on it. Fortunately, there's a mechanical test which is the proof of the pudding. Let's say you found three items and you're listing and everything goes into the blue. You don't get any item on the list. Well, you know something now is wrong way to. That's what you know. That one of the things you've grabbed... Even though the pc said, "Yes, I have always been a 'paragon of virtue.'" See, and that was the goal, "to be virtuous." "A paragon of virtue. Always have been." And so you said, "All right, his goal's 'a paragon of virtue,' so I'll list it and fine and everything is fine." And you've listed it as a terminal. No, I'll tell you, in the last stages of the goal, in the first
items which you get on the pc, "a dirty, betraying, rotten skunk that would cheat anybody" is far more likely. In fact it's probably the item.

Well, you – you go back to this thing and you say to the pc, "Well, I'm going to list this 'paragon of virtue' as an opptermb, now."

"Well, you already got an item off of it."

You're liable to get an argument. See, Routine 3 makes them better so much faster you don't have the real satisfaction of an ARC break. They just get a little bit cross sometimes, so they feel a little bit cross or misemotional, and they really don't even bother to take it out on the auditor. They just feel kind of nyah! And sometimes won't even express it.

So you say, "I'm going to do this the other way to. Now, we're going to treat this 'paragon of virtue' as an opptermb. Who or what would oppose a paragon of virtue?" Well, pc will list it and it lists like a streak of light. And it goes right on out and you find a new terminal. What do you do with these other two? Oh, well, don't upset the pc about them. Leave them on the plot. They undoubtedly fit in. But it's going to change everything, so you don't use them again. Have you got that? You just set those aside. Don't use either one of them. Because they'll give you trouble.

You take what you get from the "paragon of virtue" right way to, and you oppose that, but remember, it again – because you've upset the bank – isn't necessarily a terminal that you get off of that. You're liable to wind up with another opptermb, see. So from there on you've got to be careful. You've got to be more careful than you would be if you did it right the first time.

The difficult Routine 3 is the Routine 3 that is started wrong. We've already had a case out here, the source list... the auditor actually opposed a rock slamming item when there were RRs on the list. Well, that case isn't going to behave exactly according to the book. It's somehow or another – here and there, you're going to follow the twenty-five rule, and go back and find there's no item on the list and have to extend it another twenty-five and then find an item that sticks in. You get the idea? The exact pattern has been upset by the wrong action, so now be alert.

Now, the only thing that's going to happen is, is things aren't going to start appearing early on the list, it's going to have to be that the lists are longer. And sometimes they dead-end and sometimes you have to go back and list something else further, in order to get a new RR, or have to go back and get goal oppose, a new goal oppose list. You can always do that. It's very interesting. Every time you do a goal oppose list, weirdly enough, you wind up, intimately and directly... So here's some of the saving graces I'm going to give you here now. Everything is going to hell and you can't figure out which is right, and which is wrong, and what you did wrong and you can't figure out anything – you're shot. You – you're sitting there picking up pieces of paper helplessly crying as the auditor, don't you see? Pc is getting mad and everything's going to hell in a balloon. You can always do a goal oppose. And you will wind up with the next item, opptermb or terminal.

That's very amazing. I'll give you an idea of it. You've just done – you've just done a list which would come up with "Coventry" at the end of the list. Well, if you suspend that list
just before you got the item and did a goal oppose, you would come up with the item "Coventry" on the goal oppose. Interesting puzzle, huh?

Now, the funny part of it is if you've got "Coventry" and it is not opposed – and here we'll move into the next one – if you've got "Coventry" as your last item and you do a goal oppose and you haven't opposed "Coventry" and the only item there that's to come up – you're liable to do a goal oppose and come up with "Coventry." That's quite interesting.

In other words, you apparently could do this fantastic thing – this is only theoretical – you could say, do a goal oppose list and oppose it; you know, oppose the RI that you get. Of course, that item's liable to appear anyplace on a goals oppose list; and oppose that. See, do a goal oppose list, find a nice RR item, not two RRs or two R/Ses there, and then oppose this reliable item that you get. And then not oppose that, but go back and do another goal oppose list and you'll come up with the next item. And then oppose that and then go back and do a goal oppose list and you'll come up with the next item, and you can oppose that. Get the idea?

But if you oppose one of those things wrong, the bank will be upset and your goal oppose list will go a bit awry. But you can still go back and always do a goal oppose list. You got that? That's pretty good, isn't it?

Let's give you another solution to this situation. You have one of these on and on and on characters, see? Or you're supervising somebody who is one, see. "There is no action that I should repair; I should always do a new action." You know, you've had this. And the guy finally... he's... there's something backwards somewhere, there's something he should have said, "oppose a tiger" and he said, "Who or what would a tiger oppose?" you see, wrong way to.

And the thing has gotten into a mess and he's done another goal oppose and now he's not quite sure which of these channels to use and so he's just used both of them and he finally winds up with eight items and they don't quite fit because he's invalidated some of them, because he's gotten them by extending lists.

He ran a list all the way out, don't you see, to an RI and he got that RI but it doesn't fit now, or something, he thinks, is wrong and they can't figure out where it goes, so they go back and extend another list that they've already found an RI on, don't you see. They'll come up with a new item. And they think that invalidates the RI they'd already found on the list, which it doesn't – just because the thing isn't firing now is no reason.

So they've taken this new thing and the guy is sitting there with about eight items and you don't know what they oppose and you don't... what opposes them, or where they fit in relationship to each other. You've got a puzzle on your hands and it's a mean one. Because the pc is pretty upset. He can't figure it all out.

You see, you told him – you told him, you see, that a hangman opposed a judge. You've told him that and now you've extended the list out and you've gotten "chopping block." And he thinks, now, "Let's see, would a hangman oppose a chopping block? Judge would not oppose a chopping block, but neither would a hangman oppose a chopping block. And a hangman hangs people and the chop... And I ... " He doesn't know.

What you've actually done is found two consecutive terminals or something like this, don't you see. And you probably now have three items on the terminal side of the line plot and
you've got maybe one item on the oppterm side and he's trying to take two of these terminals and make oppterms out of them, and package this up, and he doesn't know which way he's going. He's having a hard time.

Here's how you straighten it out. You take these eight items and you give each one a brief Tiger Drill to see what fires. And you say, "Yes, well, they... what fires, they've all been opposed so none of them fire." Ha-ha! The wrong ones will fire.

The ones which have not been opposed will still fire. It's interesting, isn't it? You can still make them R/S. Even though they've been listed and you found an item from it, if it was all wrong and backwards or something of the sort, and it wasn't done right or the list was incomplete, you're going to get this weird situation where the thing is still firing.

So you go back and you take these eight items, you tiger drill each one in turn and you see which one fires. Then you determine whether or not that is a terminal or an oppterm and you oppose it, and then you determine whether or not the result is a terminal or an oppterm, and you oppose it. And then you determine whether or not the result is a terminal or an oppterm and you oppose it. And you'll get one of these 2-12 four-way packages. And that will box. And it'll give you something to go on.

In view of the fact that it will improve the pc enormously, why, he'll feel much better if you've done so. Now, you've got that, you've got the charge off, don't you see, the charge was important. Because where the pc's atten... rock slams or rocket reads, his attention still is. So you still got his attention on something up here and they're all his items, it doesn't matter how you got them, they're still all his items, you know. You can sometimes get more items than you needed to get. But they're still his items. If they rocket read, they're his items.

Now, do this: Take one – here's the way you package all this up, now, see. You've got the charge off it, so he's thinking straighter now – take one thing that you know dog... Don't go on finding more items than just taking the charge off, you understand? Go ahead and find the rest of those items in that little four-way package, and the pc isn't going around the bend now. Now, his attention can go onto the other items.

This is how you use a meter to do this: Take one terminal or one oppterm that you're absolutely sure of. You know, you were sure that one was a terminal. Or you were sure that one was an opposition terminal. You're sure of this. Take that one and then just read off the remaining seven to him, watching the meter. And when you read the one that it opposes or opposes it, you'll get a fire. There's just a little residual fire left there and it goes pssww! Don't hang around on it too long, because it's gone. And you'll get a drop of the TA if you start doing this.

Now, that's packaging them up. So you've got one here, now, that fired. Now, let's take another one that should come adjacent to it, that it might also oppose. And put that adjacent to it. And then find the remaining ... You've got three, now, in a line, you see? Now you've got – let's say you had eight, you've still got five items floating out around here someplace. Read the five to him and see which is the best one to go into the next position. And that will fire when you get it into position, you see. And then find one that's very likely as the next position, because the one you just find would oppose it, or something of the sort. And then, put...
that in that position, then find out what opposes this and it will psww! fire for a moment. And then you will get your line plot all back together again and the pc'll be very, very happy.

You can't do this until you've taken the charge off items. The way you take the charge off items is you find which one of those eight – I'll just go over this again – you find which one of those eight, as you read it to the pc (this is not in packaging) you just read it to the pc, and you'll find one of them's still firing like crazy. Little Tiger Drill and this thing goes pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow. Take the one that fires best and regardless of whether you thought it was authentic or unauthentic or wrong way to or any other darn thing, you establish whether or not it's a terminal or an oppterm, make a four-way roundabout package out of that, just like in 2-12, and you've taken the charge off the bank.

Now, take the rest of these items and get them back together again. All of a sudden, the pc being oriented on this, your line plot starting in with your lowest item, which, by the way, the last item you found ordinarily is still firing – you ignore that one, in your other test – now, get that opposed and all of a sudden it will usually be found that it all comes back on the rules and finishes up very nicely. There's how you do it mechanically.

Now, the other mistake you can make is to overshoot. That happened to me, so I speak with authority. And when you overshoot, you're liable to get a double group into your next GPM. Let's say you overshoot like this. The pc is maintaining and the meter maintains by being at 3 and having a bit of a free needle and all that, everything is fine, and the pc maintains those are the last two items. You can't get the first goal to read, nothing like this. Everything is flat, everything looks beautiful and then you oppose – with an overshoot, see – you oppose the last oppterm you found. You're going to go straight into the next GPM.

Now, this is not necessarily bad, because you're going to – within two items from then, oppose oppose, you see, you're going to have the pc's next goal. Because he's going to tell you what the goal is and he'll tell you two or three versions of it and you just check these two or three versions out and one of them will rocket read like mad. That's his goal.

All right. You've got his goal. You'd better not list a pc very far without his goal. But actually, you can't find two rocket reading items without the pc telling you his goal, and the thing rocket reads like mad, so you see, that's no harm on anybody. In other words, you can find the pc's goal very easily. That's nothing to it. But to go on without it is a mistake. And also, to now go back and do a goal oppose list is a mistake of great magnitude. Why?

Well look, you took the two smallest – you took the two basic items of goal one and you opposed, let us say, the oppterm of those, and you shot over here into this other GPM. And then you got an item there, and you opposed – it follows the same rules, by the way, it's the last rocket reading item on the list and so forth; the list is complete. And then you opposed that properly, and you got over here and you got another item. The pc says, "Well, gee. My goal, my goal is to be..." "A scared person" is what the first terminal you found on this new one – is "a scared person."

Very often, by the way, it'll be something the pc is doing in his current lifetime, like a salesman. And he says, "That's me." Oh, no. If it's the first item at the top of a new GPM, that's not him. Even if his goal is "to be a salesman," it is the enemy. So you'll find his straight goal. His goal is probably "to be a salesman" and the first item is "to be a salesman" as the
oppterm. See, that's where you mainly make your mistake. You'll figure yourself to pieces on this, you know, you won't realize that the reason the goal isn't practiced any more; it's totally downgraded. He is now a "haggard buyer," don't you see? Something like this. That's as close as he can coming to be a salesman.

All right. And you've taken – you've gotten those two items and got the pc's goal; now the mistake you make is to do a goal oppose list. And you do a goal oppose list, you've had it. Why? Well, you've already got your two top items of the next GPM. Now you're going to get two more items. Except by doing a goal oppose, because you've entered the GPM, maybe at the non-optimum position, you don't know whether those new items that you get from the goal oppose are before or after the items which you have just found and you're going to find yourself carrying two packages down the bank simultaneously. The pair from goal oppose – where do they fit? And the other pair, you got from the last goal's oppterm – where do they fit? You understand?

So that if you do a sink-through like this, it's perfectly all right for you to do so and probably you will do it – maybe even recommended procedure. But I don't say that it is just because it happened to me. You do this oppose on this key reliable item, you do this oppose on it, and you fall through into the next GPM. See, you've gone twenty-five, thirty items, and that first thing is all run out, the goal isn't firing or anything else, and then you just one more time, you oppose, and you go right straight back into the GPM just before that. You can get the pc's goal.

Well, if you do that, don't do the goal oppose. You understand? Don't get fooled. Because you'll find yourself with two pairs of items which you're not sure where they'll fit. And the pc gets hopelessly bewildered. He gets all mixed up. Interesting.

So, if you do find your second GPM that lies under the first one when cleared up, by doing an oppose, you just go on oppose, oppose, oppose. In other words, the spiral staircase runs straight down through the first GPM into the second GPM into the third GPM and so on. There's the pattern of it. You can just do spiral staircases without ever doing another goal oppose. But if you ran totally out of items and couldn't find your way anymore, you can do a goal oppose.

The essence of all this is when you've found a lot of items, you want to know which ones are still firing because, having been opposed, they normally shouldn't be firing. Now, those items which have been opposed reverse way to will still fire. Therefore, you've got to actually straighten them out as terminal or oppterm and do a little four-way bing-bing, and you'll find a couple of missing – couple of missing items that you otherwise wouldn't have found.

This is very interesting, isn't it? Now, your second GPM, below the first GPM, is tougher than the first one. You should – you think it should be easier. Well, it may be shorter, but it is tougher. It's tougher on the pc. You see, you're running a section of track where he was that much bigger and he made his difficulties with more enthusiasm. And so therefore, you're liable to get into a more massy situation. In other words, it's liable to be more massive on your second GPM than on your first one. Therefore, your auditing by that time should be very perfect. You shouldn't start goofing on your auditing.
Now, the best way to do something like this is to get the fellow down to a point where the goal no longer fires. This is the sequence of a goal: A goal originally, before you start to audit the first GPM, fires very, very sporadically. It's easily put out. It's easily lost. It easily vanishes. You won't even think it exists sometimes. Goes, you see. And then you get some items from it with a goal oppose list and so on and then it starts firing with a great enthusiasm. Great enthusiasm. Lots of fire. Pow! Pow! You never saw such rocket reads as you can get off a goal after it's had a few items run on it. They run, oh, a third to half a dial – the most enthusiastic thing! Somebody asked me the other day – where from? Los Angeles – about reverse rocket reads. Reverse rocket reads were for the oppterm, and right rocket reads for... There is no such thing as a reverse rocket read, so this puzzled me very much.

But let us say that we went... the goal fired with a nice rocket read. Somebody else asked me out here, the other day, he said, "Isn't there... there's a slow R/S, so is there such a thing as a slow rocket read?" The answer to that is "No. All rocket reads travel by the square root of the um-bum theory and they are always exactly on the subject of electrosis." Of course, my answer makes far more sense than the question.

Now, a rocket read's a rocket read. If you tell somebody there's a slow rocket read, you'll get a fall. And he'll start running goals because they fall.

Well, I can show you any God's quantity of goals that fall. No, a rocket read is a rocket read. It starts out fast and decays slow. With great enthusiasm it goes pssww! And it's over here and going very slow by the time it ends. It's an enthusiastic response. It's very satisfactory. After an auditor has run a goal by 3M, he's seen enough rocket reads – he'll never be fooled again in his life. Because all the items rocket read.

Now, the goal goes into this period of very enthusiastic rocket reading.

I didn't mean to insult Los Angeles. Los Angeles is doing fine. Los Angeles is doing fine. Particularly, I see Los Angeles is the only one getting any good publicity around – which I appreciate.

The rocket reading enthusiasm of the goal after you've found four or five or six items is unbounded. In other words, you only could get this goal to fire by Prepcheck one time, two times, out of three, don't you see. A lot of times you'd read it and it'd do nothing. And then you'd read it and it'd fire with a rocket read. And then you... so on. And nobody could get it prepchecked up, you see. And so you listed it anyway, which is perfectly all right. You've seen it rocket read, and you've seen it rocket read again. It was rocket reading last month and it's... people have seen it rocket read and the only way you're really going to get it cleaned up is get the items off. Because the items going into restimulation have dulled its rocket read.

All right, anyhow, you never saw such enthusiastic three-times-in-a-row rocket reading from a goal, after you've properly run five or six items. Boy, you never saw a goal fire like this. Oh, a three-inch rocket read – pow! Real enthusiasm. Every time. Call it – bang! You get a big rocket read. Where does it go from there? Well, it goes into a period – when about half of the GPM is run out – let me say ten, fourteen, fifteen items, something like that – it goes into a period where it R/Ses. And it'll go this way: You call the goal, "to be a tiger" – rocket read, see. "To be a tiger" – R/S. Nice big R/S, but ... "To be a tiger" – R/S. So you say, "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" And pc gives you something. If you want to get all
your suppressions off, you know, you run Suppress, Fail to reveal and Careful of. If you just ran those three buttons you could make anything fire.

Anyhow you'd run them sort of repetitive and get the real answers back. And you can get things to work because of course those are the three left-hand buttons.

Now, you get this goal drilled, perfectly, see, and it's now where you say: "To be a tiger" – rocket read. "To be a tiger" – rocket read. "To be a tiger" – rocket read. And you say, "Boy!" See, you worked three session-hours to get this goal to fire with rocket reads again. And you say, "Ha-ha, that's pretty good." And you fix it all up. And you get the session over and at the end of the line the pc says, "Would you read the goal to me just one more time to see if it's firing?" see? You say, "Oh, why sure!" You see? And you say, "To be a tiger" – rock slam.

In other words, this thing is getting frayed. It's moving out toward the edge of the now-existing GPM, and is therefore rock slamming as easily as it rocket reads. Well, you think, "Well, that's finished. That's finished." No, it goes through the next phase of returning to rocket reading. Now it goes back to being very solidly rocket reading, and it'll keep on rocket reading, but sporadic and early and late. You say, "To be a ti..." – and rocket read. "To be a tiger" ...rocket read. You see? Latent, early, it's not on the button. But they're all rocket reads.

And that goes into a period when you've got about two-thirds of the items off the GPM already. It'll hit a very brief period when you hit one of the items and the goal starts discharging. And the goal starts discharging, pssww-pssww-pssww! Auditor's not saying anything, you see. The goal just starts discharging. You've hit the key item. You've just found an item that is very, very important, you see? It's not the most important, or the first item, but it's a very important item. And you just watch that thing, and instead of the tone arm going down, markedly, when you find an item, boom, it rocket reads itself on down. And the pc will tell you probably that he can feel the goal firing. But it goes, pssww-pssww-pssww, pssww-pssww-pssww! And you just keep centering your tone arm and you see those rocket reads. They'll just go crash-crash, crash-crash, crash-crash.

Well, that's no longer a rocket read, that is a barrage. And you see this barrage of reads and it... the tone arm sinks down. Well, your goal, after that, doesn't fire with much enthusiasm, but still fires. And the rocket reads are still unmistakable, but as I say, they are early, they are late, they are one out of three, it isn't doing well. It's a sick goal by this time. And now, very shortly after this, maybe two, three, four items you get the first two items of the bank. And they'll be very fundamental. The first one will – let's say, "to be a tiger." Well, the first item on it is "a tigerish person," see? Or something like that. And the oppterm will be "a weakling" or "catnip" or something like that.

In other words, those first two will make very fundamental sense. They're quite recognizable. And the pc will say they're recognizable, too. What you really ought to do when you get that pair – you get that pair all straightened out, is read the goal to the pc and you'll find out it won't fire and you try – you try to drill it and it won't fire and you just can't get it. It just won't do anything now. But the last item you found of this earliest pair for that goal is still firing.
Now, what you should do at this state is just package up that bank beautifully. Just get that GPM all matched off so the pc's happy and you're happy. Don't go tampering with it particularly, but you still might have a reverse way to item in it. The way you find this out is read all the items off to the pc that you've already found, you see. Get the pc satisfied that they're all it. But reading those items, see that one of them doesn't fire. If one of them still fires it might have been wrong way to opposed and things might have gotten gummed up at that point.

Well, do another little oppose list and get that thing firing right way to and maybe a missing item appears or that whole goal bla... starts going up in smoke. That's the way you're going to get your free needle. If you want to take the time to get your free needle, you'll do it by straightening up those items. Now, it's not absolutely necessary, but it's easier on the pc if you do.

Then you go down here and find this last item, you'll find it's still reading, you carefully didn't include that in the number of items which you were assessing and you took that last item which was still reading and you find out if it's a terminal or oppterm, oppose it accordingly and you'll drop through to the next GPM. You find two items, after that the pc – you just ask the pc for his goal, he'll give his goal, that's all. He gives you maybe three or four versions of it. You find which one rocket reads, very fine, dandy and so forth. Make sure you've got the terminal or oppterm straight on that, by the way, because when they drop through, it's all upside down now.

In other words, the pc was a big person when you got to the bottom, you see, of this – because why? He'd had a long quiet period, he'd kicked that old GPM over his shoulder, he'd heaved out his thetan chest and he made himself very, very tough and he postulated a new goal and there he is into the next bank.

Well, he drops from that into the degraded character. He's the really degraded character. So you've got to be careful that you don't get taken in. I told you earlier, see? Is... the next goal, let us say, is "to be a dancer." And you get – you get as the first crack out of the box, you get a "ballet artist." And you say, well, obviously that's his terminal. You knucklehead! When you oppose a ballet artist, who or what would oppose a ballet artist, you get a – "a person who – a crippled person who hates the stage" see, that's his terminal. That's where he left that goal. That's why he never had any more to do with it, don't you see. He never had any more to do with it after that. He couldn't go any lower. He'd had it.

All right. So there's the way to find your next goal. But there's that little bridge there for you to worry about.

Now, I've answered most of the problems that you're going to run into. There aren't really more problems than I have given you here. But I'm sure somebody is going to dream up some problems that aren't germane. Like, should the E-Meter – I shouldn't be sarcastic like this, I get it from the Instructors, you know – but should the E-Meter be plugged in during the session? You know? Now, should we write up all of the items or should we only take those items which we think look good and write those up. Should we – should we translate the item into the original language in which it was postulated? I don't know, I could – I really couldn't stretch my imagination. You're going to run into that kind of thing. But as far as I'm con-
cerned, the only real trouble that you run into, you have to give attention to, I've given you in this lecture.

The GPM is very interestingly put together in that things oppose things and things not oppose things. And for some time I have been wondering whether or not we would ever have to use the not-oppose. And now I find that the not-oppose line is the second GPM. What the first GPM never opposed was the second GPM. And if you ran the not-oppose, you would probably drop prematurely into the second GPM, so this may have happened on the first four-line listing. So you probably don't do anything with this at all.

Now, can a person's bank be so scrambled by early auditing and so messed up, that 3M doesn't work? Well, for... only 3M loused up can louse up a bank. The pc may have been sunk in this bank, may have hit various parts of the bank, may have had great difficulty in handling the bank, may have had all kinds of things wrong, and got somatics that never went away, and they ran any process there was. But frankly, there is no earlier process that even made a dent in GPM. It keyed it out. That was the only thing that happened to it.

So you'll find the GPM is there intact, and Routine 3M run straight, cuts right into the GPM, and the interesting thing that happens as he goes along, is there were periods in his auditing when he would hit pictures and sensations which he never understood and never resolved. Well, those uniformly will come up in running the first GPM. That is the first goal. He'll get those pictures out of the road. And there they are.

When he starts running the second GPM, he will find out he has some other, what he would consider primordial-type pictures, more basic, more fundamental in his life, that he really never paid much attention to. Of course, we're getting down past the Freudian censor, and a good thing, I would say.

Now, in answering up how do you run Routine 3M, you use all the rules of listing that have been given in the various bulletins. How do you find the goal? Well, you can find the goal any way that we have ever found a goal. You can take 2-12 terms or oppterms or rocket reading items or stuff like this and make goals lists off of those things. We are rich in methods to find the goal, these days. What if we can't find the goal at all on somebody? Well, we – usually he's a rock slammer and we have to do a 2-12A package on List One before we can even get him into session. This is why he won't answer auditing questions or something like that, yet he'll answer them on List One, don't you see? We could prepare the case around. There are various ways of handling these, but these are all unique problems. They're problems of "how do we get the horse to water?" And 3M is "how do we make him drink?" And they've always said you couldn't. But in our particular case we've got it all taped, and we can make the horse drink very well, and there goes the GPM.

And it will run as easy as you follow its exact, simple rules and it will run as hard as you goof; and think nothing at all of wasting fifteen session-hours because of a goof or finding in ten session-hours ten RIs. You get the idea? I mean, one goof, there goes – there goes maybe ten, fifteen session-hours trying to set this thing to rights and finding things and plunging and being upset and all that sort of thing. It is only lengthy if you goof. So the thing for you to do is to get letter-perfect in the handling of it.
I'm very happy with this, of course, and one of the things that has been interesting to me about it is for the first time in history, probably in this universe, we have the adage "physician, heal thyself," come unstuck. Physicians have never been able to heal themselves. Look at the AMA, and so on. In this particular case, I am quite startled to find out that as messed up and cross way to as we landed into the middle of the second GPM, that it isn't fazing me. I'm handling it quite well. We've got items scattered all over the place now because we landed in the middle of it and did one... did two wrong way to and then compounded it by doing a third wrong way to and we're still making out and I can't even feel sorry for myself. And that's pretty bad. That's pretty bad.

Well, I'm getting along fine, now, and it's amazing to me when I see what we've been tackling over the years, I get a Ron's-eye view of it, right close up, and I'm quite intrigued. I'm quite intrigued. My goals, by the way, have more gotten in my road than they have assisted me, because I find in – every single instance where I have had difficulty working, it was because of my goal, and it wasn't anything else. I was actually working in spite of my goals, and was somehow or another surmounting the GPM all the way along the line. And it's great, you know, just to sit back and have it hit me in the face and blow off, because I've been holding it at arm's length for a very long time.

Anyway, that's enough about me; that's how you run Routine 3M. I haven't given you on a step to step basis, but I've given you the data that you most need, is how to do it right and how to square it up if you don't. And I think you're going to need both equally because it's very difficult to tell a terminal from an oppterm and pcs lie like hell and sooner or later you're going to do one backwards and wish to God you'd never been born. Well, I'm just calling it to your attention that that is straightenable if you don't carry it too far and if you recognize it soon enough.

Okay? Thank you very much, and good night.
Here we are. This is the what? What's the date?

*Male voice: 19th.*

February 19th, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, one lecture.

I have a little bit of news for you tonight. Of course, there's nothing but good news pouring in here from all sides now. And amongst these good newses, we found a goal in Z Unit today. Now, that goal, by the way, was really found in Australia, but nobody has been able to get it to fire, so nobody would do anything with it. And it wasn't until all the tone arm action came out of the goal list that the goal itself started to fire. And I think that's the way it was. And then they got the goal firing and proved it up and so he's away.

And one goal was found Sunday. Not necessarily germane to the course at large to give you a lot of data about staff clearing. You wouldn't care about that, you see. Because, after all, that's just Instructors and people of that sort. But in actual fact they're making very good headway.

As of right this minute, we have one, two, three, four, five - I think it is something on the order of five goals found out of which, I think, three are actually listing. And only about three more people on the staff to go. So you see, that's coming up close to a clean sweep for the staff on clearing. This staff probably will be Clear within six weeks or something like that – first-goal Clears. Starts happening fast, doesn't it?

Now, in the Z Unit... I haven't got the actual statistics in front of me, but in Z Unit we have quite a few goals being listed out to Clear and all those are moving very well indeed, except one that made a colossal blunder. The auditor bought a sell. The pc said something like this: "A tremendously intelligent, brave, good-looking wonderful person." That was, I think, was the first item up or something like this. So the pc said, "Oh, that's me! Ho-ho-ho-ho! That's me. Ho-ho-ho-ho! You know, that's me, ha-ha!" And the auditor says, "Of course that's you," and immediately lists it as a terminal, the knucklehead. And that GPM just is not running well. It's all out of gear and so forth, because of course the thing is an oppterm.

The first item up, if it is a very high-toned item, is an oppterm, always. That's the first one you find. Always an oppterm, if it's a high-toned item. If it's a low-toned item, it's the pc. Because that's the state his goal has gone down into. In other words, you're looking at the dwindling spiral of the goal.

And if you don't pay attention to that, you're going to get in trouble, because pcs go on a big sell. See, they say, "Ha-ha! A marvelous, philanthropic, cherished individual. Oh, yes, that's me, you see." The hell it is, ever. Never. It's never. Never. Never. Never. Never. Never. That's the oppterm. The pc's goal is "a dirty little funking rat." See, something like that. That's his
terminal, rather. And his goal is "to be a good guy," see. Well, the first one up, if it's "dirty little rat," see, something like that, that's going to be the terminal. And "a wonderful, sterling, beautiful, adored, saintly person" – that's going to be an opperm. You get that? Don't let any pc sell you otherwise.

Now, you can't use this significance as your final test. It's whether or not it turns on more mass if it's said wrong. If it's said right, it turns on less mass. Sometimes the pc can't tell very well, but you say the terminal to the pc, "Consider committing overts against____" "Consider it committing overts." Either way. Say it about three times one way and three times the other way, one of them will turn on more mass than the other and that one is wrong.

So watch this. In other words, the only ball-up we've got in Z Unit is somebody who went straight through his knucklehead and bought a big sell on the part of the pc and listed the first item found wrong way to. And of course, four items later they suddenly run out of items, nothing is going right, lists dead end, the item comes up in the wrong places. All kinds of things happen, all of them very difficult to handle and so forth, and it's all traced back to that original blunder of listing something wrong way to.

Oddly enough, those goals in Z Unit which we have had checked out very carefully, and those items which have been checked out very carefully by Instructors, all of those goals are running very well. But just before this we had a period when we weren't checking out the items. And do you know that hardly any of those are running well. They're running raggedly compared to those whose items were checked out.

So that tells us that auditors have been buying, occasionally, occasionally would fake up the fact that a read was there. The pc says, "Oh, well this is my item," something like that. Well, to show you how tough we're getting these days, an auditor in Z Unit ran a list, and only went twenty-four items beyond the last R/S or RR, see, on 3M – only went twenty-four. Didn't go twenty-five – got a five-hundred-word infraction sheet. That's the way it is.

Actually, the thing dogged out. If he'd put about one more item on there it probably would have rocket read.

Another auditor had a slight drift up of the TA during the last twenty-five, didn't note it on the report, said that it was flat on the report: five hundred word infraction for a false auditor's report.

This is the way things are these days. You just have to face up to it. United States has gone tyrannical, Russia's gone tyrannical, the world has gone tyrannical, so S-B – the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course has got to keep up the pace. That's the way it is. The difference is, is they're trying to ruin people and we're trying to clear them. There's a slight difference of polarity in what's going on here. And if we win they lose providing they don't join us. And we're no longer trying to join governments; we're trying to keep the governments sensible enough so that they can eventually join us. This is our spirit on the matter. We're being nice.

The truth of the matter is, everything else in the world is looking very fine. I've given you an overlong report on how goals are going here at Saint Hill, but I thought you would be tremendously interested. I know I am. And I've got my eye on all of these cases. And I don't know what you people are doing dogging around down there in the X and the Y and the O
and the B Units. I don't know, I think we've got somebody that's that far away from getting into the Z Unit.

And some of you, a very few of you, have been here much longer than you should have been here in these lower units, and you want to get up there into that Z Unit and get your goal whistled up and so forth. You won't get anyplace playing around in these lower units. I mean, we ran ARC Straightwire on you a long time ago and we didn't win, so we're not going to get anyplace till you get in the Z Unit. Just make up your mind to it.

2-12 original, for source lists, is the way it's going these days. All of you expected to have that wiped off your checksheets. No, I'm afraid we're going backwards now. We're going back to 2-12. And the 2-12 original issue is the right way to do it. 2-12A simply tells you how you list down better from an RI, that's all. But how you find items: the original issue of 2-12.

So you haven't even got the satisfaction of saying, "Well, new checksheets," you see? "New checksheets." No, no. We want you back on the old checksheets, see. It's the old checksheets. 2-12 is what you need to crack the uncrackable case. And that's what it's for, and that takes a rock slammer out of circulation, does a lot of other beneficial things. So it's a very valid technique, but its use is relegated, 100 percent, to just that minor role.

You can't run this person on 3M, so you do 2-12. And this person is a rock slammer, you can't keep him in-session at all, you run him on the original version of 2-12 and you will find out that they will take off.

In other words, if you can't readily find somebody's goal, put them on 2-12. 2-12A was a refinement in listing from RIs and that is still with us. Everything you have learned is now valid. This is the first time this has ever happened on the Saint Hill Briefing Course – it's the first time. Everything on your checksheets you need; the checksheets don't need any changing. I'm going to give you a few more lectures and bulletins and so forth and consolidations on this sort of thing.

But it, in actual fact – it is merely consolidating information and replacing existing tapes and bulletins. And I'm afraid that's all that's going to happen that is very dramatic. We're in for the long haul here, you've got a lot of time to learn this, you understand. Some people will still be learning this a hundred years from now. I can tell you that with accuracy. But it needn't be you here on the Saint Hill Briefing Course. So, get busy with your... get busy with your checksheets and let's get away and at least get up into the W Unit, huh? All right.

Now, I've already given you a considerable amount of data here concerning 2-12, and so on, and 3M. But what I think I ought to talk to you about is the interrelationship of processes: what processes are for and what they do and all that sort of thing.

There's a new scale of processes out in a recent bulletin that tells you the valid processes which are done and taught in Academies. Now, there isn't any reason for me to have a list of these things in front of me because I know these things too well. And I'm going to go into these various processes and just tick them off one after the other. This is not necessarily in their order as given, but these are the valid processes which you ought to have a very, very good grip on, because you will need every single one of them. And first and foremost...
amongst these – listed, by the way, first, not because it's the easiest thing to run, but because it's the lowest grade of case will respond to it – is the CCHs.

Now, the CCHs, done the way they were being done in 1962 – okaying people's physical origins, you know, acknowledging physical origins; running these things not as a grind, but up to a flat point of about three and changing off to the next process and so forth – those are the CCHs. And they're CCHs 1, 2, 3, 4.

But there are also some variations of these CCHs that you would find very, very valuable. And you're going to find these extremely valuable someday. You realize that as you run "Spot the wall," and so on, on people and your meter there is... got a lot of tone arm action, see – you realize, don't you, that this person is so unaccustomed to the physical universe that they have an awful hard time trying to follow a direction.

Now, if you had a great deal of trouble with a case – now, I mean a great deal of trouble, you just... nothing can happen and so forth – you've got the CCHs. And what you do in essence, even though you don't run the CCHs on a meter, is run the tone arm action out of the CCHs. Now, you can do that by checking the pc from time to time on a tone arm to get his tone arm read.

What you're doing there is hauling this fellow up to a point where he's enough in present time that he can follow an auditing direction. Now, this in essence takes care of the case who cannot follow an auditing direction. And you as auditors are far, far too prone to underestimate the ability of a case to run. Now, I know this, because I've from time to time picked up cases that have been pronounced absolutely unrunnable; there's nothing can happen with these cases, you see? And I remember a psychotic girl, she was pronounced psychotic by one and all. Everybody was unanimous on this particular subject. And in actual fact she would comply with every auditing command I gave her. Now, that is all you want.

Here is not a condition of whether people are crazy or not crazy. We're not in that business. We're not in the business of whether people are crazy or not crazy. It's just a method of calling dirty names anyway. The psychiatrists have no idea who's crazy and who's sane, and so forth. It's just a matter of saying, "This fellow's no good, and the US government wants to get him out of the way so he's crazy." It's just a matter of expediency. It says en masse, "We don't agree with this particular person. He sees spiders on the ceiling and we don't. Therefore he's crazy." Has nothing to do with anything we are doing. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing. Just forget those classifications.

We don't care how potty this guy's ideas of the physical universe are, you know, he just might have come down here from the Martian scout command or something like this, and they probably have very, very odd ideas, you see? The quality, the significance of the fellow's ideas are no business of the auditor's. I couldn't try to give you a better rundown on it. I mean, I couldn't say it sufficiently emphatically. It's just no business of the auditor's. Fellow walks down the street saying, "Gibber-gibber-gibber-gibber-gibber-gibber-gibber," and talking to somebody that's over on his right. Well, yes, everybody agrees there's something very eccentric about this person's conduct. But actually the auditor has no business with that at all.

The whole test is whether or not this person will sit across the table from you and answer an auditing command that is asked him. That is the whole thing. Now, there isn't even
any wiggles on this. There's no getting away from this. You understand? Don't refine that one down! You see? You realize I'm talking rather incoherently because I myself have had difficulty getting this point across for many, many years. And it's an old point I'm trying to get across.

You know, they say, "Well, he says it to himself, and then he repeats a circuit which says it to him, and therefore he's not following the auditing command."

No, no, no, no. We say to this fellow, "Put your hand on the table," and the fellow puts his hand on the table. We don't care if it took him a while to do it, but he will put his hand on the table. We ask this person – we say to this person, "Who don't you like?" And the person thinks for a moment, we don't care much how long he thinks, or how clearly he says it, but he's on the subject, don't you see? And he says, "Oooh, uh-wuhwuwhuwhuh ... My brother George. I don't like him."

All right. Now, that's an answer to the auditing command. We don't care if he goes this way all the time he's doing it or picks bugs off of himself while he's doing it or if he acts with perfect sanity while he's doing it or says in a beautiful, mellifluous tone of voice while he answers it. No. He can actually answer that.

We say to him, "Who else don't you like?"

And he thinks for a moment and he says, "Well, my wife. I don't – I don't like my wife." And so on. That's all, see. That is our total requisite. It's not whether or not the fellow can hold the cans. Some fellows get shaky hands and so forth. If they get too shaky, why take his shoes off and strap them to the soles of his feet. We don't care about that either, you understand? It's can this fellow answer an auditing question?

Now, if he can answer a listing auditing question and if he can tell you what his goals are in life and we come right down the line on his goals in life, and we can get those and we can somehow or another read those on the meter, we actually have no business running anything but 3M on that fellow. You understand? That's the only honest thing to do, you understand? If we can get his goal – get his goal, list it, get it to fire and so forth. Make a Clear. You get that? There isn't any point doing anything else. If he can do it, you can do it.

Well now, let's take this fellow at the other end of the line. And we say to this fellow, "Now, who don't you like?"

And he says, "Gob, gob, gobble, gob-du-da-da-do-whoo, whooo."

And we say, "Well, is that somebody you don't like?"

"Oh, ga-ga, woo-woo."

You say, "Well, do you talk American? Or English? Or French? Or something like that?"

And he says, "Yes, yes, yeah, well, no, yeah. Who? Where?"

He's not answering the auditing question. You get the brutality with which I'm defining this thing?
Yeah, a lot of pcs sit there and say, "Let's see, who or what would 'to be a catfish' oppose? Let me see. Maybe it – maybe it's 'oppose a catfish.' Maybe it is – so on. Maybe I better answer it for a while, 'to oppose a catfish.' Let's see how that works out. Havingness is getting down. I think I better run a little Havingness."

People do that sort of thing when they're being audited by some auditor who is low on control. That character is perfectly auditable. Go ahead and clear him, get him in a brace, make him do it.

But we're talking now about this other fellow, and he says, "Who don't you like?"

And he says, "Gob-gob, gaa, ya, ya, ya." What are you going to do? You're going to do the CCHs. You got that? That's what it takes.

Now, also, there's another side test on this thing. If the individual, in giving you items or goals and so forth, just continuously doesn't get any tone arm action, you understand, and there is no way we can get tone arm action, we can't get our rudiments in or anything like that, and yet by making him spot the walls we can get a lot of tone arm action, you have another excuse for another type of process which is a CCH sort of process – and that's rudiments and Havingness. You get that? This fellow... he'll answer your auditing questions, but he never gets any tone arm action on a list and you can't really find anything and it's all very tough. You've got another class of process – rudiments and Havingness.

Now, let's go back to CCHs for a moment. That goes down into unconsciousness. You can find somebody in one of these states of coma that they talk about in the hospitals and we cure those or do something with them. I mustn't use the word cure because the American Medical Association objects to anybody curing anything. It has become illegal to cure anything. I hope you appreciate that. Because they can't, it's now illegal to do so. I don't mean to be bitter about these people, you understand. I'm just being factual. In fact I'm being rather kind.

Anyway, they've got this hospital nailed down, you see, and there's somebody there in a coma. Do you know that you can actually... By the way, never make a rash promise to a person like this, like, "I'll come back and see you tomorrow," when you don't know you can. Because do you know that if you don't come back and see them tomorrow they're liable to kick the bucket. It's happened. Get ahold of their hand. And you can actually get into complete communication with them. You say, "Squeeze my hand once for yes; twice for no." That's a good gag. You ought to try it sometime on an unconscious person. They can't talk, they're in a coma, they're an accident victim, something like this. You say, "Squeeze my hand once for yes; twice for no." And then ask them two or three simple questions. "Are you in pain?" You see, and they'll go... give you a signal, yes or no, or something like this, and you can go on in a rather interesting communication line. That's with somebody who is incurably gone. Which is quite interesting to me.

You can get into communication with these people. They can't talk. In other words, they've lost control of their vocal chords, but they can get some kind of a muscular response going. It takes you a little while to get into communication with them sometimes, but they will get more and more in communication with them... with you, and you can go on from there.
Now, there's a type of CCH which is like 8-C, only you monitor the person's hand. And you can monitor it around on the bed, you know. You can put it up here on the pillow and on the sheet and on the blanket and on the side table, and so on. You say, "Touch the side table," and they touch the side table. You're monitoring their hand. And oddly enough it'll give them an orientation which will bring them out of their coma.

Don't go changing processes. It's a rather heartbreaking affair. Go along on the same process until you have stabilized a bit of a change, take the other hand, perhaps. You're playing it off the cuff, you understand? You're making up your own CCHs. Because this person is unconscious in bed and you can't contact them vocally and you can't check up on your auditing command, vocally; you've got to be smart.

So how many CCHs can you work out? Well, you can... The way to work out how you would do it is to do something like this: Take a doll and put it down on a bed and the doll isn't going to respond either and you're going to – how many CCHs can you run on this doll that's lying in the bed?

Now, there is a level above that. There's a person who cannot talk, who's totally inarticulate, who can't get around in life, you know, workaday world and that sort of thing. These are heartbreakers. They're spastics, people of this particular character, idiots. Very, very rough to do. I wouldn't kid you on this level; they're very, very tough to handle. You do regular CCHs with these people and just carry on, acknowledging them real well and so forth. But above all, never lose your temper, never become impatient and flatten what you start and don't run things that are flat too long, and you'll have some wonderful success with these cases. But you have to stay in communication with them.

Now, remember this: The worse off a case is, the easier it is to have an adverse effect upon the case. The old Effect Scale, see. Now, that's very important because that tells you that an unconscious person may very well – who is in a coma, let us say, for two weeks or something – expire on the breaking of one auditor promise. It has happened.

I'll give you an idea. This girl said, "I'll come back and see you every day at this hour. And also I'll come back and see you tomorrow. And I'll stay with this with you until you've recovered." And the medicos – well, I don't know if they had medicos or monkeys in charge of this hospital; there's not much difference. And the medicos wouldn't let this auditor back into the hospital the next day. The patient was recovering although still in coma. The coma got much lighter. Much lighter. And the person was beginning to heal, beginning to straighten out and the medicos barred the person out. The auditor had promised to be back the next day. Wasn't permitted to go into the room and the person lingered around for a day or so and died. The person was recovering, and died. A broken promise. That's all it amounted to. I have other evidence on that, not just that.

Now, that's how little it takes to have an adverse effect upon an unconscious person. Now, how about a spastic? Or a person who is classified as a moron? The common concept of these people is they don't know anything. Ah! But the thing which you do every day out here in auditing – just that moment of, you know, something on the order of the guy says no the session hasn't started for him and you say, "Oh, well, we'll take it up in the rudiments." Something like that. Look, that's too steep for a moron. You'd just blow him to pieces.
Now, it isn't that a case is bad off who is blown to pieces by this, but this would really, really ruin him. An auditor's frown, a tiny impatience – you just have worked and worked and worked and worked and worked to get this guy to lift his hand, you know, and put it in yours, and so forth, and he looks a little petulant for a moment. And you yourself become impatient and you say, "Oh, damn it, give me that hand!" You've ruined him. Bye-bye case! You understand? The worse off a case is, the easier it is to affect them adversely. If you run by that rule, you will also see that at those times when a normal, usual, run-of-the-mill pc is being a bit bzzh – and they all go bzzh at one time or another in session – at that moment, when he apparently is able to stand up to anything because he's maybe being cross with the auditor, he's being nasty or he's being this, remember that at that moment he is the most easily affected – in the most easily affected state. That effect is very heavy. Extremely heavy.

All you have to do is frown at him and he practically spins in. Well, you've got a reality on that. Well, it works similarly. The worse off, the more introverted, the more upset the case is, the more careful and cautious the auditor has to be about maintaining a good, even, friendly discipline toward the pc.

Now, on an assist, all this applies. Now, there are various kinds of assists. There are as many kinds of assists as there are Dianetic auditing and everything else. You ought to have seen an old HDA running a child's somatic out here a few weeks ago – of course I'm talking about Mary Sue. Diana's nanny got a little bit enthusiastic and shoved Diana around and actually chipped a tooth. Now, Mary Sue was quite worried about this, as you can see, since it was a permanent tooth, and she used about four or five varieties of assist and finally blew the somatic. Finally blew it 100 percent. She decided that she'd better blow it 100 percent so that the tooth could grow back a bit of enamel, see?

Well, how many – how many assists were there? Well, the first thing, was she withholding anything about it. And then touch it, touch it, touch it, touch it and oh, I don't know, any one of the infinite variety of contact and communication assists. And next day, second session, took the child down to the exact place that it happened, made the child touch the tooth to the porcelain bathtub where it had been cracked, see. Oh, boy, that kid was very gingery. Took her to the actual spot, see. All of a sudden, blew the thing high, wide and handsome.

Oh, yes, and another sequence of it – she made the child scan through the whole incident. Lock scanning, of all things! And got through the incident a lot of times – through and through and through and through and through and through. And then contact on the bathtub, and then pow! There goes the somatic.

Well, anyway, on assist almost anything goes. But this doesn't go: Sticking somebody in something with too great an enthusiasm when the person is in bad condition. Let's take an auto accident case, and this auto accident case is just about gone; he's in a comatose state and so forth. Now, trying to get too much done in too little time with that case will give you a lose. About the best thing you can do – about the best thing you can do is put the case in some sort of contact with the environment. And give the case a then-now. In other words, the automobile accident was then and you're now in now.
But even so, to lay a hard and fast rule down about this is difficult. Because I know of a case that was run through the engram of being hit and run over while riding a bicycle – car ran over a boy – a little boy, on a bicycle. His father stood there and while the child was unconscious, ran him through the engram over and over and over, and finally the kid that had a fractured skull and everything else opened his eyes and brightened up, and the father ran him through it a few more times and the kid was all right. That sounds adventurous, doesn't it? Well, it probably was adventurous. But remember, auditing in that way, is what you can get away with.

So there's any of these varieties of assists. But assist is something that directly attacks the condition in which the person is. Now, we know right away that attacking a specific condition is, well, it's fraught with many perils. Let me put it that way. It's not always a smooth road.

This fellow has a cold. You say with great enthusiasm, "All right, I'll cure your cold." See? Well, all right, you use some system or method or something of the sort. Any of the old processes. And you just lay an egg, that's all. You just didn't get there. Cold is still on, he's snoring and having an awful time. A few days later you uncover another person, he's got a much worse cold and you do the same thing and the cold goes off just right now and doesn't reappear, see? Well, that's the liability of it. It's whether or not the GPM is keyed in to that thing. That's the whole thing. If it's keyed in on that cold you haven't got a prayer. In other words, you'd have to run a GPM item to get the cold off.

But I ran into a girl on TV one time – I told you this story before – and just with one question of Straightwire blew the cold, you see? And I think it was "Who's left you in the last few days?" or something like this, and "Oh, my boyfriend, George!" Ta-bang! and off went the cold, see. I'd noticed that when loved ones are parted they normally come down with colds. Missing terminal in front of them, you know.

Anyway, assist, assists – these are the – these are the wide, wild horizon. They normally consist of contact and getting a person out of something and into present time. And that's more or less the definition of an assist. It's something that uses some type of contact, whether contact with the bank or with the physical universe, or both, and it uses... or it uses the mechanism of time track, to try to get the person up to present time. Well, sometimes he comes right up to present time and the rest of it drops away and sometimes you have to hit the point where he's stuck and bring it up. But the more you hit a subjective process, the more you use subjective processes in an assist, the less successful you will be. You get that? The objective process, just on an assist level, is more productive, so that if you... now, you can split them up. You can use 75 percent objective and 25 percent subjective, you see?

Let's get... the fellow's, "Oh, I have an awful time. I've got my hand caught in the door, and here it is, it still hurts. And here it is, two days later and it still hurts."

And you say, "Well, I'm going to help you out on this. Do you remember the door?" and so forth, and get him, you know, into it. And then use a lot of "get him out of it." See? As much get... use about three to one, actually. A little bit of "get him into it" and a lot to "get him out of it." You see that? That characterizes the assist. And you'll have very successful assists if you do that.
You say, "Now, what door was it?"

"Oh, well, let's see, what door was it? My bedroom. No, it was the front... no, it was the bedroom... front – front door. Yes, it was the front door. The front door."

You say, "Good! Now, how's your hand?"

"Well," he says, "well, it hurts right across there."

You say, "All right. Now, take your other hand and touch the places it hurts. Now, that's good, touch that place and that place and that place and that place and that place. Good. Now..." You always balance up assists. "Touch the other hand," see. Get that hand going. I'll bet you forgot that one, Mary Sue, on your – I'll bet you didn't take the tooth on the other side.

Female voice: Oh, yes. I did.

Oh, yes, she did, she did. Hah! Leave it to a Dianeticist! Anyway, so it's touch this hand and then touch that hand and touch this hand. "Now, what about that door? What about time of day was it, and when was it?"

"Well, it was Tuesday, I guess, about four o'clock... Oh, no, Wednesday. Oh, no, it was Monday." See, they're lost on the time track. He finally says, "Yeah, it was Tuesday! It was Tuesday. About four o'clock in the afternoon."

And you say, "All right. Well, good. Touch that hand and touch that hand," and so forth. And, "Touch that hand," you know. "How you doing now?"

"Well, just the little pains across there," so forth.

"Well, now, what – was there anybody around when that happened?"

"Oh, no, no, house was empty. There wasn't anybody present – except my wife. Well, yeah, my wife was present. She was standing right there as a matter of fact."

And you say, "All right. Well, thank you very much. All right. Touch that hand and touch that hand, and that..." you know. Give it... get the idea, see? Spring him and give him some Havingness.

And we get up to the next level, which is rudiments and Havingness. Now, what can – actually can you do with rudiments and Havingness? Well, I'm here to tell you, you better learn how to run rudiments and Havingness as a valuable process because you're going to need it on every raw meat process you ever do. Because the guy isn't in... is insufficiently educated to be processed at the time you pick him up. How's that? Oh, you're going to be good enough as an auditor to get somebody to reel off a list. But along about the time you've got him reeling off the list left and right, why, he isn't answering the auditing question and he thinks he's got to go home now and he gets up out of the chair and he leaves – that isn't a very safe way to go about it.

If you gave somebody a couple of rudiments and Havingness sessions – I'm not talking about you doing a private practice, in the HGC or something like that – give this person a couple of rudiments and Havingness sessions. Just any kind of rudiments. Doesn't much matter what. Things he actually could tell you. Clean up the problem rudiment for instance. You
know? Just clean that up good. And then give him some Havingness. And then clean up the
problems at the end of the game.

Well, that would do a lot for him, but actually you want this fellow to be able to run the
mid ruds and you want him to be able to run Havingness. So, I'm talking now about what's
therapeutic in rudiments and Havingness. Well, you clean up the problems rudiment, and give
him some Havingness, and clean up the problems rudiment and close the session. That'd be
very valuable.

But you're trying to get this fellow drilled in so that he can be audited and so that he's
getting used to it. In other words, most people aren't used to being audited, if you would ever
notice this. And although they break into it rather easily — and most of you, being good audi-
tors, have not ever had much trouble with this — the pc finds it rather strange. And a rudiments
and Havingness session, one or two, when you're going on a long haul like clearing, breaks
the pc into it. The pc's capable now of doing things that he was not... didn't think he could do
before. He can remember something, he can confront a problem. He can look at the walls. He
can feel better. Do you see that? That's the practical use of the rudiments and Havingness.

You can always make somebody feel better if you use the one rudiment of problems
and run his Havingness and then clean up his problems and then maybe run some more Hav-
ingness, and then close down the session. Something like that. I don't care what model you
put this thing on. It rather runs the pattern of an assist when you're using it therapeutically.
Don't discount it as a valuable process, because it is all by itself a valuable process.

But you wind up at the other end with an educated pc. He's educated just to this de-
gree: He knows that he's got to sit there; he isn't wrestling with his own bank while he's find-
ing out about auditing. Now, do I make my point?

He isn't — he isn't wondering, "What's this fellow going to do? What's this fellow going
to do?" And at the same time you're asking him some of the most challenging, overwhelming
questions you ever heard of. Well, the kind thing to do is just, you know, take up his problem
and find out about it, not a chatty thing, see. We want this to be a disciplined session. Because
what you're trying to teach him is discipline. And you want him to squeeze the cans and you
want him to answer up, and when you say, "What's that?" You know?

He says, "What's what?"

And you say, "Well, I got a read right here. What's that problem you're thinking
about?"

"Oh," he says to himself, "hey, what do you know! I think this, and he sees it on the
meter there. What do you know! Probably pretty good, you know. Wow!"

You know, he's thinking all these things to himself. Well, gosh, you know, if you're
trying to check out somebody's goal or find an item or a 2-12 item or something like this, and
this guy is all involved with the physical universe and he's all involved with his bank and at
the same time he says, "What's the meter? I mean, what's he doing with the meter?" Two and
a half hours, somebody reported, was taken to clean up the E-Meter in an end-session rudi-
ments, some time ago, and the fellow came around and wanted to know what was an E-Meter.
That was the main thing.
Now, in other words, familiarization. You can use rudiments and Havingness with familiarization, putting in the big mid ruds for a period of time. Put them in for "Since yesterday" or something like that, you see. And then run his Havingness and put in the big mid ruds again and close the session, something like that. This is also known as short-sessioning.

If you have got the idea that a session takes place per day, you're nuts. A session takes place during that period which elapses between start of session and end of session and that's the only thing there is to a session. That's how long a session is and that's what makes a session and that is actually the basic session. So that you can actually run a couple of sessions on somebody, or three or four sessions if you're doing an HGC. You can run two sessions in the morning and two sessions in the afternoon.

I myself, if I were just breaking in a new pc, would run two sessions in the morning, on rudiments and Havingness. As easy as that, you see. And in the afternoon, why, start listing something, like his goals. By this time he knows all about what I'm doing. And he's not going to be upset with me or the form of auditing. You see this value to rudiments and Havingness? Because it really exists as a value.

Now, Havingness processes are rather boiled down lately. You can get almost any process... any pc there is on "Touch that object" or "Feel that object" or "Notice that object." Very few pcs fall outside this category of Havingness. There is just those three. It's very funny, but they seem to reach almost any pc pretty well. You ought to put those up to the front of your list as the first three tested and then get fancy with the other ones afterwards. And you normally will succeed with the first or second one. Makes it very easy.

But the point is, you want to get a result. You want to get a result with your rudiments and Havingness. The main result you want with raw meat is the person becomes disciplined to sitting there and receiving auditing. And it's pretty crazy, trying to give somebody a high-level process – as I think it was Motts over in New York mentioned this to me, from the New York organization. And he said something to the effect of you're laying the pearls of Ophir out in front of this pc and they don't know anything about it at all, you know. You're doing a high-level process and they haven't even learned they're supposed to answer the auditing command. So that's very valuable in rudiments and Havingness. Very valuable to indoctrinate the pc a little bit with auditing and they also serve as a Problems Intensive varied over to where you only clear the problem. And don't just think that's a practice drill, because it isn't.

Now, there's another practice drill called ARC Straightwire. What's this ARC Straightwire? Well, it's the first time I ever turned off a neurosis – was with ARC Straightwire or some equivalent of it. It wasn't called ARC Straightwire then, but as time went on it became ARC Straightwire and I still was able to turn off two neuroses with it.

Now, we're talking carelessly when we're saying neurosis. What do we mean neurosis? Well, let's put it just this way. The fellow feels he's getting – he's going to get worse and worse and worse, and it's all going to get worse and worse and worse, and there's no bottom to it. You know, he's just going to keep going down forever. Well, you run an adequate amount – session or two – of ARC Straightwire and the person becomes aware of the fact that something is stopping him from getting worse. And in view of the fact that something is stopping him from getting worse, his hope resurges.
But I have seen people, you know, strictly on the bugs – pulling bugs off themselves – turn sane right in front of my eyes on ARC Straightwire. What are the – what's the commands? The same command as in the end of *Self Analysis*. Needn't be any vast change about it.

You could work out, from the cause angle, better commands and so forth, perhaps. You could say, "Recall a time you communicated with something or somebody. Recall a time you felt some affinity for something or somebody. Recall a time you thought something or somebody was real." Or, you know, that type of command. But it isn't so much the command; it's confrontingness. It's a confrontingness on the three principal buttons that make up life and understanding. And an individual will suddenly understand a little bit more about himself.

That has a ceiling, of course; you can't run this for days and days and weeks and weeks and expect to get very much out of it. It's one of these one-shot propositions. Somebody is feeling pretty spinny, run a little ARC Straightwire on them, and they feel a lot better. But it's something that stops the spin more than anything else. It isn't universally workable, it isn't an unlimited process that goes on forever, but it is a valuable process, and it jolly well better not be dropped out of the lineup, because it's valuable. Has its uses.

Also it has a very good training use. You can run this thing and run it and run it. It's unlimited to the degree that it can be run forever, but it won't produce results forever. You get the idea? It goes up to a flat spot and that's that. But you can keep on running it and the guy recalls the same things.

Only one thing I'd like to make a remark on is once in a while in Academies and so forth, you see ARC Straightwire being run in this particular line. This is really crazy. The guy says, "Recall something that's really real to you."

And the pc says, "Yes."

And "Recall a time you felt some affinity."

Pc says, "Yes."

And the auditor says, "All right..."

Hey, what's all this, you know? You find out after a while this guy starts stacking up with missed withholds and things. And he starts going out of communication and he starts getting upset. So you have to remember, when you're running a process like that, not to take these "yes" answers. The guy says, "Yes." Well, of course the question actually didn't demand he say anything but "yes." So you have to ask the second question. You say, "What was that?"

"Oh, that was my mother."

All right. You say, "That's good."

In other words, find out what. Stay in communication with the pc without nagging the pc.

Now, there's another type of assist has loomed over the horizon in the last few months, has been what we will call primary buttons – Suppress, Invalidate. And it comes under the heading of a Prepcheck assist. And all you do is flatten Suppress and Invalidate. They're just
the two buttons. And you'll find out that if you were giving a five-hour intensive (if you can imagine such a thing) to somebody who had been all loused up like fire drill, why, if you just flattened these two buttons in those five hours, you would have done a lot for the pc. Those are primary rudiments. They're one and two. Just Suppress and Invalidate. And they work wonders. They really do. I mean, you can just take those two.

For instance, I find increasingly today, when I'm trying to get the pc to go on listing, I just give him Suppress and Invalidate, and don't give him anything else. And before he can get Invalidate clear he's listing again, so the devil with it, why put in the rest of them?

So those are primary as far as the rudiments are concerned, are Suppress and Invalidate. And they make an intensive. But it gives us Prepcheck. And we enter into the level of what... this whole category called Prepchecking.

Now, what is Prepchecking? Well, it's preparatory to clearing, and you will always find it's preparatory to clearing, you'll always have to do it as preparatory to clearing or somewhere in clearing you've got to do it, so it becomes a very necessary skill. And there you see it, a Prepcheck assist, in its most fundamental form. You say, "Start of session. Since yesterday has anything been suppressed?" You flatten that permissively, repetitively, then clean it on the meter or don't clean it at all. It'll just depend on the pc. And then you go on and hit Invalidate and get that as long as the pc will answer that. And you say, "All right. Fine. End of session," or whatever you care to. You find out you have quite a remarkable effect. But that's sort of an assist sort of a proposition.

Well, that's actually all Prepchecking consists of, is just cleaning up these buttons. Prepchecking is different than fast checking. And the only thing that you repetitively use in fast checking is Suppress. You always get that in repetitively without consulting the meter. Unless of course, you're really trying to unload a goal, and then you take your last three left-hand buttons. (This is a trick you didn't know.) You take your three buttons over here, on the left, Suppress, Fail to reveal and Careful of. Those are your basic suppress type of buttons. They'll prevent the read. Everything else – well, there's a couple of them are middle ground – but the rest of them create a read, or steal a read. But these things Just make the read disappear entirely and they don't even come up. You don't even see it on the button sometimes. In other words, you can have a Suppress, you don't even see a Suppress read, and so on. So you clean those three repetitively on the goal. You see, or on the list or something.

You want this thing to read, you see, you can't get this item to read, you know this item ought to read. And you've seen it read, and so forth. Well, just ignore your right-hand buttons. You want to do a fast job, why, do a Prepcheck. You understand, it's different than a fast check. Suppress, Suppress, Suppress. No attention to the meter, see. All prepchecked. Suppress, Suppress, Suppress, Suppress, and he finally runs out of answers. You get any answers you can now find on the meter.

And then, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal – Prepcheck, see? Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal, Fail to reveal. And he finally runs out of answers and you find another one on the meter; clear that. And then Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of, Careful of. And bang! He says, "Well, that's all over here."
And you say, "All right." And you check that on the meter. And then you read this, "to be a catfish." *Psheww!* It's quite remarkable. That's a very, very – that's a quickie, see. That's a quickie. That's a Saint Hill Goals Prepcheck. You can make almost anything read, if it's ever going to be made to read, by going over and over and over those buttons, just ...

Well, you've got this item in the session and you saw it read, yesterday. And now you're going to list it. And you've got to get the thing firing before you list it, so you say, "Catfish." And it says, "Tsk." Huh! You say, "What have you been doing? You been doing anything?"

"Oh, no, no, nothing."

"Catfish." – *tsk!*

Oh, boy, you had it rocket reading half a dial. Well, the best way to do it is just get in these left-hand buttons, one, two, three. Each one prepchecked. And you come back and you read this. And you say, "Catfish." *Psheww!* It's a remarkable performance you can make an item put up and it's well worth knowing.

Well, that's your lowest level of Prepcheck. But how many ways can you use Prepcheck? Now, I've shown you Prepcheck as an assist, and I've shown you a Prepcheck in order to get goals to read, and I've shown you a Prepcheck which only uses the left-hand button. Well, all right... the left-hand buttons. And now let's go over and take a look at further Prepchecks. We can choose – you can choose any period of time and get in the eighteen-button Prepcheck, and when you include a goal it gives... you also get the counter-button to the goal. Any period of time. "Since you was a little boy, has anything been suppressed?" Rather indefinite, but it still gives you a Prepcheck. And of course, it's done within the ramifications of a session. You prepcheck the thing out. It means repetitive, repetitive, repetitive, repetitive, no consultation with the meter till the pc runs out of answers. Then you consult the meter. That's all there is to a Prepcheck. No matter how you use this auditing mechanism, there it is.

All right. There's unit-of-time Prepcheck. Eighteen buttons. All right, that's pretty remarkable, but how about a specific item? "On your mother-in-law..." see? You can do an eighteen-button Prepcheck "on your mother-in-law," and produce some rather remarkable results, too. And you – it's all Repetitive Prepcheck.

And how many other ways can you use this thing. Well, you can combine the two. And you get a Problems Intensive. And you find a specific item that you're looking for, which is the problem, the greatest change of his lifetime, and then you take a period a month earlier than that and you prepcheck on that date. But actually you're prepchecking at a problem, but you're prepchecking by command on time. Getting your eighteen buttons on the thing. All the same way. Marvelous results.

Now, you can take "On listing ____," "In auditing on the goal ____," "In listing on the goal _____." Doesn't matter how you phrase this sort of thing, you get these different varieties of Prepcheck.

Now, that's a whole category of processes right up to there and they're totally adequate for the education of an HCA. Totally adequate. Now, when we start running up into higher level, Class II and Class III skills, we have 2-12, the original version modified only as you list
from RIs, reliable items. We've got 2-12 and that's a... you'll find out the way you were doing it at first – you were finding items and all that sort of thing – well, you just go around finding items that way. Take the biggest, great, big, wide rock slam that you can pick off the list someplace, and oppose it and run it around into a four-way package, use 2-12A only to govern your listing and it'll always be the last rock slamming item on the list. Use this and you won't have a case that you've fixed their sciatica and you can... it's visibly fixed; everything is going along fine. You cured him, or something, you know. And then they say, "Well, I don't know whether auditing works or not. You know, Scientology might work and might not work. . ." so forth.

They get up, they've thrown their crutches away and so forth and walk out the door still nattering about how awful you are as an auditor. Well, that's a rock slam sort of a proposition, you see. That person's a rock slammer.

And you take a specialized list and you just find the biggest, widest R/S on that pre-listed list, and take it. Make a four-way package out of it. Then when you cure their sciatica they say, "Gee! My sciatica's cured." See? In other words, the person has reached mentally instead of resisting you.

In other words, that keeps the person... it's something like rudiments and Havingness, don't you see, at a much higher level. You give them rudiments and Havingness to get used to auditing; well, you give them 2-12 so they can appreciate it. They actually will never get well unless you do something like that. You wouldn't be able to find their goal or anything. I doubt it very much that you could crack through such a case.

So that's a marvelous thing to have. And now we take 3M, you've got the créme de la créme. You've worked it up, now. You've worked the case up along the line, you'd get that case in a state where you could knock these goals off and get rocket reading goals, and find the pc's goal by any method that you find the pc's goal. And list it on out on 3M and find your items and don't go knuckleheaded on picking the wrong item, wrong way to or something like that and it all runs off, and by golly you wind up with a Clear.

Now, that's your ramification of processes. And as far as I'm concerned, that's it. I don't need any more processes – you may think you do, but I don't – because I've been fooled too often by HGC staff auditors and things like that. They come in and they want a wonderful, wonderful new process from me see. I think them up marvelous, wonderful new processes – I used to, before I learned better – and they go off and they don't do them.

And now here's a series of processes that I know by great subjective reality, by excellent objective reality as an auditor, by consistent and continual reports out through the world of one kind and another, from here and there and so forth. I know all these things work. And whereas undoubtedly there could be a great fund of processes that remain utterly undiscovered, well, frankly, they can go on and remain undiscovered as far as I'm concerned, because we don't need them. We don't need them.

Processes are what they are because they depend upon the cooperation and participation of the preclear and his communication with the auditor. Now, therefore we'll never have processes whereby we tell the guy to drop his pants and we shoot him in the gluteus maximus with a horse needle and he becomes Clear. That will never happen! Because it absolutely vio-
lates the basic principles of self-determinism and cause. It won't ever happen! All right. So what do we need? We need a gradient whereby he can accept cause. And in the processes I have given you in this lecture, we have got that gradient whereby we can accept cause. He can accept cause and he can come on up the line and therefore he can be cleared. And we can get everything out of the road that keeps him from being at cause. What more do you want?

Well, there's ramifications of it, and I'm sure that auditing styles will change from time to time. Those of you who just passed Model Session, today, will be cheered to know that I have just issued a brand-new release this afternoon. You've got to put up with me to this degree. Actually, I codified a Goal Finder's Model Session into a much smoother package that puts the pc in-session a bit better by reversing a couple of things in it. It's actually not much different than anything else you had before.

But you will see there's little points like this get adjusted as we go. Fashions change. E-Meters will all get painted black at some period or other, you can be sure of that. You can be certain that auditing rooms must be at the temperature of 79.6 in America and 59.1 in England. You can sure that codifications of this kind of thing will be released. Auditing above the altitude of 6,800 feet is not beneficial, you know, big discoveries can be made from here on out.

But I've done my job because of this: Twenty-five hundred years ago there was a bloke by the name of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha. Now, whether he did or did not become bodhi and whether he was a first- or second-goal Clear, I don't know. As far as I know it has not happened on this planet. I'm very certain that it hasn't happened on this planet for twenty-five hundred years, or somebody would have found out something about it.

I see most of the material raised at that time has been booby-trapped. All right. Twenty-five hundred years after the fact, we've done it. Now, we've done it much more easily and much more understandably and much more applicable than it was ever done before, because I haven't been worried about number one. I've been worried about you and nearly all of our technology is directed toward training it or applying it to the other guy. Not sitting on a mountain contemplating one's navel till he blows out of his silly head, you see? So it's a very practical address to the situation. And the whole thing is tailor-made on this kind of an address. It's for you to do to him, you see, that's the whole address to the problem. Every bit of its research has come up along this line and so forth.

So there it is. There's been no breakthrough in the intervening centuries. We've come up to that point and we have made this breakthrough.

Now, because we are a very tight organization, a very tight, close-woven network of data and that sort of thing, it's interesting that within days, actually, within days of releasing this information, at Saint Hill, Clears were being made in Washington, DC. Now, how fast do you think this is going to go? It's going to go plenty fast. We've got an organization, we have the technology, we have the methods of training people as we go along the line. All right. We've arrived all at one and the same time. I kind of figured we would, but that's the way it is.

And there's the technology. And I've just outlined it to you. Now, if you're sitting around waiting for more technology to be developed and more technology to be developed and for somebody with a twenty-two-inch horse needle to jam into you and hit the plunger so
that you can get Clear, then you better apply someplace else because we don't do it that way. Our clearing doesn't put it all on you as a responsibility by a long ways, but it says that you must become cause before you are Clear. I think that's a very worthwhile thing.

All right. That's a rundown of processes and where we have gotten to.

And thank you very much. And good night.
TV DEMO: FINDING RRs

An auditing demonstration given on 20 February 1963

**LRH:** The main reason for this demonstration is the rocket reads. We are very, very interested in how they are doing in the Z Unit and we want to see some items fire, that's what we're mainly interested in. And see how precise their sessioning is. That's our main worry. Now, I don't know – nod, auditor, if you've got your earphones on.

**Auditor:** Yes, coming. Coming up. All right.

**LRH:** All right. Now, what we want is simply to get the session started and just see some rocket reads.

**Auditor:** Good. Thank you.

**LRH:** All right. Now, what we are going to do is, we are going to check out your last item again and see that we get a rocket read on it and I am going to precheck it for three buttons. Okay?

**PC:** Yeah.

**Auditor:** Good. Going to plug you in. Please squeeze the cans. All right. Please squeeze the cans. Okay. And again. Thank you very much. There is a third-of-a-dial drop at sensitivity 3 at 2 tone arm.

**PC:** Thank you.

**Auditor:** Good. Is it all right if I start this demonstration now?

**PC:** Yep.

**Auditor:** Good. Start of demonstration. Has it started for you?

**PC:** Yep.

**Auditor:** Very good. What goals would you like to set for this demonstration?

**PC:** To get the item firing.

**Auditor:** Very good. Any other goal?

**PC:** Well, to be willing to look at anything that comes up.

**Auditor:** Good. Okay, Allen. Now, your tone arm is now exactly where it was this morning so I am not going to put any mid ruds in. I'll go straight in on the item, prechecking it. All right.

On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Not that I know of.

**Auditor:** Okay. Very good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There's a read, what was it? There. There. There.

**PC:** Well, I suppressed thinking about it. Suppressed doing any self-auditing on it.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, there's a few somatics and a bit of a headache come on. It's been ever since we worked out the
heading of the question. I sort of would like to list. That's about all.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? I'd like to check that again, I am not quite sure about it. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There is another read, what was it? There. There.

**PC:** Yeah. Well, when you started you went straight into the Prep-check, I wondered if you were going to try and find out if it would read or not, so I don't know whether it's reading or what it's doing.

**Auditor:** All right, thank you. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Just items that oppose it. I've tried not to look at them but you gave me the question and it's - so I am trapped into keeping them away from me.

**Auditor:** Okay, thank you. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? That was equivocal, I'll check it again. On this item, has anything been suppressed? There's another read, what was it?

**PC:** Well...  

**Auditor:** There.

**PC:** ... I sort of cognited today that I have now got my goal and I've sort of gone over the hump. And my items are no longer going to be – like the terminal side, are going to be so degrading as they were earlier. They're getting better.

**Auditor:** All right, Allen. Thank you. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? That was equivocal, I'll check it again. On this item, has anything been suppressed? There's another read on there. What was it? There.

**LRH:** Ask him if he is protesting that.

**Auditor:** Yeah.
Are you protesting the question, Allen?

PC: Yeah, I'm having a bit of trouble seeing anything on it.

Auditor: I didn't get that.

PC: I am having trouble seeing anything on it.

Auditor: Okay. Good. I'll check it again now. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There is another read, what was it? There.

PC: Well, I think I – I'm suppressing... Yeah, it is a protest. I protest about messing about with any of these items.

Auditor: All right.

PC: Just want to go straight on and oppose them.

Auditor: All right. Now, I don't quite get what is the suppression here?

PC: I was suppressing the protest.

Auditor: Good. Thank you. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There's another read, what was it? There.

PC: The exact opposition to it.

Auditor: Thank you. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Yeah. Not to go onto any audit on it. Not to think about the item. Not to try and do anything with it – just have the item as it is.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. On this item, is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Hm. Wondering about it.

Auditor: Good. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Talking about it. Actually, I had practically forgotten it until the session again tonight.

Auditor: Okay. Now, Allen, I don't quite get what the thing that you have been careful of.

PC: Well, I have been careful not to talk about it and I've been... the item...
– you forget your items very easy, as they blow.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. Oh, sorry, did I chop you here?

**PC:** No, I was just going to say that the main thing is I am careful not to talk about them too much.

**Auditor:** All right.

**PC:** That's all.

**Auditor:** Good, thank you. I'll check that on the meter then. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that's clean?

**PC:** Yep.

**Auditor:** Good. Very good. On this item "a careful person," is there anything you have failed to reveal?

**PC:** Well, it's not so much on the item but it's part of it. Uh – my goal is – one was just to be the first person completely cleared on 3MX. And after dinner I think I will be.

**Auditor:** Okay.

**PC:** That's about all I've failed to reveal.

**Auditor:** All right, thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's a read on there, what was it?

**PC:** Opposition items. That's all.

**Auditor:** Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have failed to reveal? I'd like to check that again; I'm not sure about the read. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have failed to reveal? You agree that's clean?

**PC:** Yeah.

**Auditor:** Good. A feeling person. A feeling person. A feeling person. A feeling person. All right. I had one rocket read here, I just want to give it to you.

**LRH:** There was no rocket read on that.

**Auditor:** All right.

**LRH:** That item is not firing, so run through and get the item to fire any way you can.

**Auditor:** All right, good. Ron said the item wasn't firing so we go through the buttons again.

**LRH:** There was no rocket read on that, don't – don't be ...

**PC:** All right!

**Auditor:** All right. I have a bit of difficulties here.

**LRH:** That thing didn't fire at all. It didn't even have a click on it. There is something wrong with this line plot.

**Auditor:** All right. I am going again through the buttons.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suppressed?

**PC:** Oh, really confronting the item.

**Auditor:** Good. On – on this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suppressed?

**PC:** Well, being a feeling person. I haven't... I'm sort of not being the item, not that I know of. Not really looking at it. Just answering the... sort of being
exterior to it. Looking at the item myself. That's all.

**Auditor:** Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suppressed? Allen, I want to check that again.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suppressed? That's clean. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have been careful of? ... I'm asking you.

**PC:** Hm. I'm just trying to look.

**Auditor:** Good.

**PC:** I'm careful to look. Careful to give up anything that's on it. I am still careful not to try... ah – bring up any other items – the opposition items to it. And you started me more or less on the list of it when you worked out the question. That's all.

**Auditor:** Thank you.

**LRH:** You've got to get right-hand buttons, too, you know.

**Auditor:** All right. I am going – I'm going to check the right-hand buttons too.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have invalidated?

**PC:** As far as I know you just checked Careful of and never checked it on the meter, huh? I just invalidated that.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. On this item "a careful person," is there anything you have invalidated?

**PC:** No. Not that I know of.

**Auditor:** Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a careful person," is there anything you have invalidated?

**PC:** Yeah. You are calling the wrong item. It's "a feeling person."

**Auditor:** I am sorry, Allen, I gave you the wrong item here, I goofed here. I am giving it to you correctly. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have invalidated? There's a read, what was it?

**PC:** Oh, invalidating having my attention taken back to this item now that it has gone onto the other list. That's about all.

**Auditor:** Thank you. I'll check that. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested?

**PC:** Well, I just suggested that you didn't clean the Careful of button up and I also suggested you were calling the wrong item.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested? There's a read, what was it?

**PC:** I think... my attention went out there when Reg opened the door.

**Auditor:** Okay. I'll give it to you
again. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested? There's a read, what was it? There.

PC: Well, I suggested – when the item was called out to me, I suggested it was my item. Ah – when Brian checked it. And I also cognized that "an ironic person" is the one that opposes it and I thought, "Well, what's the use of being ironic if you don't have anyone's feeling to hurt?" That's all.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. I'll check that. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested? I'd like to check it again. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested? There's another read. What was it? There. There. There.

PC: Well, yeah. It's not so much on that item but there's two oppterm items missing off my line plot. And I have been suggesting for two days now that the – one of them is "a decent person" and the other one is "a mediocre person" and I felt they had been bypassed.

Auditor: All right. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that. Is there any protest going, Allen?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have suggested? There's another read, what was it? There. There. There.

PC: That's, ah – well, those last two items – I've now suggested it out loud that ah – they've been bypassed, so I have told everyone about it now.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suggested? There's another read, what was it?

PC: Well, when Ron said there was no rocket read on that – uh – it's a sort of a suggestion that that's not the right item.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: And I disagree with that.

Auditor: Thank you. On this item, has anything been suggested?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suggested? There's another read, what was it? There. That.

LRH: The right-hand buttons, by the way, are not done repetitive.

Auditor: There.

PC: Yeah, well, when you called the item out when it first came up in the lists, that was the last thing I thought the item would have been. So when you called it, of course, it suggests that that's the item. And that – that's the only suggestion I could think of there.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item, has anything been suggested? I'll have to check it again. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suggested? That's clean. A feeling person. A feeling person. All right. On this item, has any mistake been made? There's a read, what was it? There.
PC: I am having trouble confronting the item as my attention is on the other list. So that's all.

Auditor: Uh – I don't quite get what uh – you mean by the other list.

PC: You started the list running on me when you asked me, "Who or what would oppose a feeling person," I think it was.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: And I sort of have trouble jerking my attention back to look at the item "a feeling person."

Auditor: Okay.

PC: And that's a sort of mistake, I feel.

Auditor: All right, Allen, thank you. On this item, has any mistake been made? There's a read, what was it? There. There.

PC: Yeah. You never cleaned the Careful of button.

Auditor: All right, thank you. On this item "a feeling person," has any mistake been made? There's another read. There.

PC: Mm. When you said there's a rocket read there, there wasn't one there. That was a mistake.

Auditor: Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item, has any mistake been made? There's another read here. There. There.

PC: I think it's a mistake to mess around with them once they've been checked.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Now, Allen, before that – before I check that, is there any protest going?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. Thank you. I'll check that now. On this item "a feeling person," has any mistake been made? There's another read. What was it? There.

PC: The more you quote it the more my head aches or the somatic on my nose gets heavier and the mass seems to move in on me.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

PC: That's all. And so it's a mistake sort of, I feel, prepchecking this item. It is not making me feel better, it's making me feel a bit sicker.

Auditor: All right, Allen, thank you. On this item "a feeling person," has any mistake been made? Do you agree that's clean?

PC: Yes.

Auditor: Good. A feeling person. A feeling person. A feeling person. On this item, is there anything you have been anxious about? That reads.

PC: Anxious to have it read. That's about all. I sort of feel that the item is finished with now. It's the other list that is more important. What opposes it. I'm sort of anxious that they don't take the item away from me if it's not reading.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. On this item, is there anything you have been anxious about?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," is there anything you have been anxious about? A feeling person. A feeling person. On this item, has any-
thing been invalidated? There's another read. What was it? There. There.

PC: I just don't seem to be able to look at the item. Uh – just can't seem to take the viewpoint of the item and I just can't get there and I sort of am invalidating having to do it.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. I'll check that. On this item, has anything been invalidated? There's another read, what was it?

PC: I'm sort of invalidating you trying to make me do it, too.

Auditor: I didn't get that.

PC: I'm invalidating you slightly trying to make me do it. That... in – look at that item again.

Auditor: All right. Thank you. On this item, has anything been invalidated? There's another read, what was it? There.

PC: Yeah. I'm invalidating my attention going off to the opposed list to this item. It's making me feel terribly uncomfortable.

Auditor: All right, Allen, thank you. I'll check that. On this item, has anything been invalidated? A feeling person. A feeling person. On this item, has anything been suppressed?


Auditor: Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. On this item, has anything been suppressed? There's a read, what was it? There.

PC: Annoyance at having to go backwards to the item. That's all.

Auditor: Thank you. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

PC: No.

Auditor: Good. I'll check that on the meter. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There's another read, Allen, what was it?

PC: Well, I was suppressing a protest I think, about the question reading.

Auditor: All right.

PC: And the item not.

Auditor: Okay. Thank you. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Not that I know of.

Auditor: All right. I'll check that on the meter now. On this item "a feeling person," has anything been suppressed? There is another read, Allen. What was it?

PC: Being sick, sen, feeling adi... agitated, bit – bit heavy, feel heavy.

Auditor: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right, get him off the buttons on this item. Read his goal. Let's see if you can make his goal fire.

Auditor: All right, Allen. We are not going to carry on with that. Ron just told me to stop the item Prepcheck and all I am going to do – I call out your goal and we see if that fires. Right?

PC: Okay, yep. [chuckles]

Auditor: Anything you want to say?

PC: I just suddenly noticed how my interest came back into the session.

Auditor: Okay. Very good. To be certain. To be certain. To be certain. To be certain. To be certain. Okay, we haven't got a rocket read here.
LRH: Now, you see why your item isn't firing, because your goal isn't firing. That's all. Close the session down.

Auditor: Okay, Allen. Good. Now, have you made any parts – ah – have you made any parts of your goals for this session?

PC: What were they?

Auditor: To get the item to fire.

PC: Well apparently, no.

Auditor: Good. To be willing to look at what comes up.

PC: Yeah. I was willing to look.

Auditor: Very good. Now, I'd just like to check – get a can squeeze.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Please squeeze the cans. Okay, I just want to get a few commands of Havingness in. Just put the cans down.

PC: Right.

Auditor: Here's the first command. Point out something.

PC: A TV camera.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: One up there.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Wall.

Auditor: Good. Point out something.

PC: And that part of that wall.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: Ceiling.

Auditor: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: That door.

Auditor: Fine. Pick up the cans. All right, please squeeze the cans. Very good. Thank you. Now, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this demonstration?

PC: No.

Auditor: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this demonstration now?

PC: Yep.

Auditor: Good. Now, here it is: End of demonstration. Has the demonstration ended for you?

PC: Yep.

Auditor: Very good. Thank you.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. We have an example there of the situation when the goal isn't firing, we can't get an item to fire and there is either something wrong with this pc's line plot, which looking it over it is – everything is "blank" person, a person, a person. Probably something wrong with his line plot. There is probably some earlier item firing here and certainly the goal is not now firing, so this thing has been suppressed or listed wrong way to someplace, or mucked up and it will have to be straightened out. Now there, you did not see a rocket read there tonight. Okay. And here we have May auditing Dick and what we want to have happen here is we want to see this new goal fire. This goal was just found today and may not have a lot of fire in it, but we want to see this goal fire. Pick up your earphones there, May. Got them? All right. Good enough. And all
we want to do is see this goal fire very nicely and if it fires without a Tiger Drill, well for heaven's sakes, don't tiger drill it. Okay?

Auditor: Okay. All right. Take hold of the cans please. Thank you. How are you doing here?

PC: Hmm. Not too bad. I thought I'd be as scared as hell.

Auditor: Okay. Anything you'd like to say?

PC: No. Let's get on with it.

Auditor: Good. All right. Give the cans a squeeze. Thank you. Okay. The tone arm is at 2.5 on a third-of-a-dial drop.

PC: Hm.

Auditor: Okay? All right, what we are going to be doing here is a Prepcheck session on your goal. Using the goal finder's Model Session.

PC: Okay.

Auditor: All right. We are just going to prepcheck the first three buttons on the left, Suppress, Careful of, Failed to reveal.

PC: Righto.

Auditor: And do it just until the goal fires.

PC: Righto.

Auditor: Good. Is it all right to audit in this room?

PC: Oh, sure.

Auditor: Good.

PC: Apart from the TV.

Auditor: Okay. Is it all right if I begin this session now?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. Start of session. Has this session started for you?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: Well, get the goal to fire.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: And uh – feel easy about the TV.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Any other goals for this session?

PC: No.

Auditor: Thank you. All right. I'll check the needle here a moment. Okay. The needle seems to be reasonably clean so I am just going to start in directly with the buttons on the goal.

PC: Good.

Auditor: Okay? Good.

PC: Suits me!

Auditor: All right. On the goal "to be able," has anything been ...

PC: I'm sorry, May.

Auditor: Oh, I goofed.

PC: Not my goal.

Auditor: Okay. That was bad.

PC: Oh yeah, well. Well, I can understand how you feel because that's two of us. I think.

Auditor: Okay. All right, it's all right that I goofed?

PC: Sure.

Auditor: Good. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

PC: Well, sort of always had a feeling that I couldn't be right, so I was
sort of suppressing achieving it or that I could achieve it.

**Auditor:** Okay. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Hmm. Hmm. Well, I can't think of anything at the moment. I – I feel there's something. But I – I couldn't get it connected up. Sort of had the feeling of sort of being in – like – like being in – sitting in a – let's say, in a bomber and you have bombed some city or something and it's not right. And you just have the... you know it's not right, but you want to be right. It's as though you've got to suppress being right to do things like that. Phew!

**Auditor:** Okay.

**PC:** That all sort of feels heavy.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Okay. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I had a vague idea there about being criticized by teachers. It sort of makes you feel wrong. And you want to be right. And you want to be right. Ummh – being right like – it's sort of like holding onto a – a postulate that's uh... and all around you, people are sort of suppressing you or overwhelming you and pushing you back in. So, that seems like a suppression to me. That's sort of thinking of it as an overwhelming. That's all.

**Auditor:** Thank you. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** Okay. I'll check that on the meter. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed? That reads, what was it? There.

**PC:** When – when you said the goal "to be right" then, just, you know, in doing that command I sort of felt it hit. And then I sort of suppressed any reaction to it following.

**Auditor:** Thank you. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, I had decided to go out and see another fellow's wife one night and all the time that I was making this decision I – I could feel this, "It's not right" and I was suppressing being right, in order to make that decision.

**Auditor:** Thank you. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** Okay. I'll check that on the meter. On the goal "to be right," has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that is clean?
PC: Mm.

Auditor: Thank you. Okay. I am going to check the goal now and give it to you, right?

PC: Right.

Auditor: To be right. To be right. To be right. Okay, it isn't giving a good fire now but it is reading.

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Okay?

PC: Makes me wince a bit.

Auditor: Thank you. All right, now I'm going to precheck the next button.

PC: Righto.

Auditor: Careful of. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Careful to be right a lot of the times! And careful to insist, too, I am right when I know I am right.

Auditor: Good. On the – did you have a thought there?

PC: I think there was something else coming up there.

Auditor: Okay. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: I have a feeling I have been careful to go somewhere away from where I had been working in order to find a – a better place to be right in.

Auditor: Thank you. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Well, yeah, I have sort of been careful to act right in Scientology so that Ron would know I was being right.

Auditor: Good. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Um – I have been careful to take note of other people's ah – opinions about my behavior; careful to see how they, uh – look at me, to know then if I am doing right. If I am being right, rather.

Auditor: Good. On the goal – did you have another thought there?

PC: Hey, yeah, that sort of uh – sort of gets you outside your – sort of being here, looking out from here, sort of gets you to – puts you outside yourself looking – try to look through everybody else's eyes.

Auditor: Okay. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: No.

Auditor: Okay. I'll check that on the meter. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of? That reads, what was it? There. There.

PC: To appear calm. It's – it's – it's right to behave in a calm, relaxed manner. I'm quite careful that way. It is sometimes difficult to answer the question now because there are a lot of things one is careful of. Just – just careful of as apart from on the goal "to be right." But still, a lot of one's behavior has to do with being right. Mores and all that.

Auditor: Okay. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: That seems to be all at the moment.

Auditor: Okay, I'll check it on the meter. On the goal "to be right," is there
anything you have been careful of? That reads, what was it? There.

**PC:** Well, I have a bit of a trembling in the little finger here and I was careful not to let it get out of hand.

**Auditor:** Thank you. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** I have always been careful to, uh – to track down any answer to any question when an auditor says, "That reads," because it's right!

**Auditor:** Thank you. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** Careful not to sell this goal.

**Auditor:** Good. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** Oh, I was at a concert once and I was careful not to cough during the – while the orchestra was playing.

**Auditor:** Good. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** That's all.

**Auditor:** Okay. I'll check it on the meter. On the goal "to be right," is there anything you have been careful of? Do you agree that that is clean?

**PC:** Hm.

**Auditor:** Okay. Again, I'm going to read the goal.

**PC:** Hm.

**Auditor:** Okay? All right. To be right. To be right. To be right. The goal is reading, but not firing. Okay?

**PC:** Okay.

**Auditor:** All right. We're going to continue the buttons now with Failed to reveal.

**PC:** Ah. Yeah.

**LRH:** Ease it off and close the session.

**Auditor:** Okay.

**PC:** Oh, you had some instructions.

**Auditor:** I have uh – just been told here that it isn't necessary to go on any farther with this because it isn't uh – coming up as it should here in the television area. Okay?

**PC:** Yeah.

**Auditor:** All right. Is it all right with you if we leave off this Prep... I goofed. Is it all right with you if I end - if we end off this Prepcheck now?

**PC:** Yep.

**Auditor:** Thank you.

**PC:** Shucks. Huh.

**Auditor:** Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I do so?

**PC:** Mmm. Oh, I did wonder if there were any fires while you were saying the Prepcheck questions to me. I never asked you that.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Are you asking me that now?

**PC:** No, no.

**Auditor:** Okay. All right. End of Prepcheck.

**PC:** Hmm.

**Auditor:** Okay, have you made any part of your goals for this session?
PC: Well, I certainly feel easier about being on TV.

Auditor: Okay.

PC: It's not such a — ordeal as I thought.

Auditor: Good. Have you made any other gains in this session that you'd care to mention?

PC: Hmmm. Yeah. I had looked at some of my past behavior in alignment with this girl and uh — it adds up a bit.

Auditor: Okay. All right. Okay. Please squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans down. Thank you.

PC: Sorry.

Auditor: Going to run a few commands of "Feel that." Okay? All right. Feel that table top.

PC: Mm-hm.

Auditor: Thank you. Feel the chair you are sitting on.

PC: Yep.

Auditor: Thank you. Feel the top of your head. Thank you. Feel the back of that E-Meter.

PC: Hmm.

Auditor: Thank you. Feel that end of the table. Thank you. Feel that end of the table. Thank you. Take hold of the cans. Thank you. Okay. Squeeze the cans. Good. That was the last command.

PC: Hmm.

Auditor: All right. Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: Hmm, how much did we get there?

Auditor: Well, it was over a third of a dial, this time, definitely. Okay?

PC: All right.

Auditor: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: Yeah.

Auditor: Good. Here it is. End of session. Has this session ended for you?

PC: Yep.

Auditor: Good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing me.

Auditor: Good.

PC: Thanks, May.

Auditor: Okay.

... [PC and auditor walking off]

Auditor: There you are. Been in here lately?

PC: Hmm?

Auditor: Have you been in here lately?

PC: I was in here about three nights ago, four nights ago -something like that.

Auditor: All right. Take the cans. All right. Good.

LRH: All right. All we want to do here is turn on a rocket read. Now, one or another of these items found on this pc or the goal will rocket read. And I see by your auditor's report here that the pc's in the middle of a bug list that didn't turn out with an item, so therefore that thing probably won't rocket read, but turn on a rocket read at least with his goal or with something. Okay?
Auditor: All right. Now, is it all right to audit in this room?
PC: Hmm.
Auditor: All right. Good. Now, squeeze the cans. Very good. Now, have you got your normal grip there? Hmm?
PC: Hmm. Yep.
Auditor: All right. Squeeze the cans. Very good. How's my voice to you? Is it soft, loud or ... ?
PC: It's all right.
Auditor: All right. I'm getting a bit of a flashback through these things. Okay. Very good. We've got about half-a-dial drop. TA is 3.4.
PC: That's not bad, but the havingness is down is peculiar. The cans feel peculiar.
Auditor: Mm. Mm. All right. Now, what we are going to do is get a rocket read in this session.
PC: Lots of luck.
Auditor: Ah, the first thing we're going to take up is the item we were attempting to get an opposition from ... 
PC: Hm.
Auditor: ...this afternoon. And we'll give that a working over.
PC: Mm-hm.
Auditor: And if we don't easily get a rocket read on that, we'll have a go at the goal or any of the other items.
PC: Mm-hm. "A commander."
Auditor: What's that?
PC: "A commander."
Auditor: Okay. All right. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?
PC: Mm. Yeah.
Auditor: Okay. Start of session. Has the session started for you?
PC: Mm.
Auditor: Good. What goals would you like to set for this session?
PC: Oh well, a simple one: Get a rocket read.
Auditor: All right. Any others?
PC: No. I think that's all that's necessary for this session.
Auditor: Okay. Very good. Well now, let's take a look at this item we've got here. Perverting an agreement. All right. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. All right, I'm not getting any instant responses on that. There's a latent fall on it. All right. Now we'll prepcheck this with Suppress.
PC: Hmm.
Auditor: On the item "perverting an agreement," has anything been suppressed?
PC: Well, I haven't looked at the fact that I don't like the idea of being in a position or a condition where I would go about perverting an agreement. Or perverting agreements.
Auditor: Hmm.
PC: And yet when we first came across it I think you will recall I told you that uh - it's very peculiar: I see it over there and yet I know that I do these things.
Auditor: Hmm.
PC: I'll make an agreement and then I'll sort of weasel out of it a little bit.
**Auditor:** Good.

**PC:** Maybe more than a little.

**Auditor:** All right. On the item "perverting an agreement," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Consideration and concern about what others would think about me if they knew that I had this as an item. I mean it's not an admirable item.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, there was a lot of worry and a lot of concern when Ron first came out with the datum that the first item up, if it were, let's say degrading, it probably was the terminal side. And for a long period of time I was concerned about this and wondering and wondering and wondering. I kept on wondering and then I'd suppress the wonder, then I'd wonder some more and suppress the wonder. He'd give another lecture, I'd uh – suppress some more.

**Auditor:** All right. Okay. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, a little concern because we seem to be going down on one side. If you remember it went down the one channel that we had the prime cause coming up.

**Auditor:** Yep.

**PC:** And I was wondering, and suppressed it a little bit and still wonder, if I just didn't back down that "Spiral Staircase" so that the oppterm would be a prime cause.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** And it came out to be something similar to that so far.

**Auditor:** Yes, yes. All right. Good. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, probably – to a great deal, the times that I have more or less perverted agreements where I would agree to one thing and then gradually I changed my mind. And I justify it by saying that as I change, my attitudes would change, my outlook on life would change and so how could I find myself in agreement.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** You know, it's a weasel way.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** Hm.

**Auditor:** Very good. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Well, a big concern I had today about why it was we couldn't get an item – that would match up with it. Why it was that I went into that – I can't really call it an ARC break, it was a sort of a despondency.

**Auditor:** Yep.

**PC:** ... in trying to match it up against the oppterm. Now, that might have been a misemotion from the oppterm or something, I don't know. It could be a missed item, I don't know. But all the considerations about it I sort of suppress – I figure that's your headache.

**Auditor:** Okay. Good. On this item "perverting an agreement," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I've suppressed looking to see exactly what do I mean by "perverting an agreement." You know, I really haven't examined that. When I gave it I
had a sort of a flash idea of what I meant by it. And of course, I was putting the blame over there, you know, oppterm ...

**Auditor:** Yep.

**PC:** ...and oppterm characteristics. I haven't really explored thoroughly exactly what perverting an agreement entails. So, what I've suppressed is the examination of the item to find out just what it means.

**Auditor:** Good. On this item "perverting an agreement," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I think a little bit of the feeling of unwillingness to look and see what it is that I'm opposing – that is, as a perverter of agreements.

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** There's a sort of a hesitancy to look and see what I've been attempting to destroy, damage, commit overts against. That sort of thing.

**Auditor:** Good. All right. On this item, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I don't get anything directly.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. I'll check this on the meter. Perverting an agreement. On this item, has anything been suppressed? All right. I'm going to check that again. On this item, has anything been suppressed? Do you agree that is clean?

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. All right. Now, on this item "perverting an agreement," is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Hmm. The who's involved. That is the individuals involved on the other side.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. Did you want to say something further?

**PC:** No, what I am doing is I'm wandering around. You know, taking a look at different aspects here based on the question.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. Now, on this item "perverting an agreement," is there anything you have failed to reveal?

**PC:** Hmmmm. The who's involved. That is the individuals involved on the other side.

**Auditor:** Good. On this item, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

**PC:** No. But I just took a look – earlier today I gave "a dependent" as an item – and you'll remember it stayed in for a little bit.
**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** And I said, even though it stayed in it was not a proper item for staying in, you know. But I just realized that it is my daughter...

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** ... who I haven't seen for some period of time. And I sort of have a tacit agreement with her that what I am going to do is audit her, clear her, and I'm just wondering if this being away from her, not communicating with her, is a perversion of an agreement.

**Auditor:** Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Well, some kind of a self-flagellation you might say because of, uh – these tendencies or things that I have done that I am ashamed of.

**Auditor:** Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Yeah, I've got a good one: um – starting to get a headache, a pressure headache, just talking about it.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** A sort of uncertainty about the item as such. That is, it may rocket read and all well and good, it may check out. But still to me it seems like an awfully nebulous thing. It's awfully nebulous to talk about, uh – perverting an agreement. An agreement is something that is more or less understood, but then when you modify it, it's modifying something that is understood. It's, um – sort of altering an idea or - well, like I say, it's nebulous. It's a nebulous thing.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Hmm. That I'd feel better if it was something I could point to, hold onto, you know – if it had mass.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** No, it goes back to the same thing of the times that I feel that I have actually perverted an agreement, because there are definite times when I do know that I have.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** And I've justified.

**Auditor:** All right. Good. On this item, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** I think that's about it.

**Auditor:** Okay. I'll check this on the meter. On the item "perverting an agreement," is there anything you have failed to reveal? Do you agree that that's clean?

**PC:** Mm.

**Auditor:** Good. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. Perverting an agreement. It's rather dead at the moment. Occasional little tick latently. All right. Now, we'll work over the Careful of button here.

**PC:** Mm.

**Auditor:** On this item "perverting an agreement," is there anything you have been careful of?

**LRH:** Get over onto his goal. Give us a rocket read here.

**PC:** I'm sorry I missed that. I
got blown out.

**Auditor:** All right. Now, we've got an unanswered auditing question there, I believe. I'll give it to you again. On this item, is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** Well, the simple one is I've been careful to justify any time that I have perverted an agreement, but that's a generalized answer.

**Auditor:** All right. Very good. Thank you. Okay. What we're going to do now, we're going to leave this item and work on your goal.

**PC:** Fine.

**Auditor:** How's that seem?

**PC:** Well, that seems like a good idea, only now, based on the way things are going, I'm wondering if it's my goal or the opperem's goal.

**Auditor:** All right. Okay. Well now, we can work on this ...

**PC:** Mm.

**Auditor:** ... go flat out on it and see if we can get some rocket reads on it.

**PC:** Fine.

**Auditor:** Okay?

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** All right. I'm just going to make a brief note here. Okay. I'm going to check your goal.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** To be a complete entity. To be a complete entity. All right. We are getting a reaction on the meter.

**PC:** Mm.

**Auditor:** On this goal, we got a fall and then a sort of a roughed up needle on it, so it's reading. We are getting some sort of a read on it. It's reading more than the last thing we were working on.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** All right. Now, let's tiger drill this. I'll use the phrase repetitively right now. On the goal "to be a complete entity," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I've sort of tended to suppress ownership on the goal lately. Especially since we started down on these various steps, you know – the move over to goal oppose or whatever the version was.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** So, I've not really looked at it. But I've started looking at these various identities, whatever they happened to be.

**Auditor:** Right.

**PC:** So there's that suppression of the goal itself...

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** ... and, um – oh, for a period of time after the goal was actually checked out, I sort of suppressed listing, you know, based on the questions we had at the time, the various lines. Gee, there was another suppress I had in mind there. Suppressing listing and then just plain suppressing the goal itself because for a period of time there – because of the lines, the configuration of the lines and based on me, whatever the "me" is at that particular case

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** ... all I started doing was getting a higher and higher tone arm, you know, more and more mass, more and
more crunch.

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** So, I tended to invalidate the hell out of the goal.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** Because if this was what is happening to me because of the goal, who needed it?

**Auditor:** Yep.

**PC:** You know, I'd just as soon stay aberrated.

**Auditor:** All right.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Auditor:** On the goal "to be a complete entity," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** One thing I have suppressed is the – the longing – that's a good word for it – the longing, uh – implicit in the goal, you know, for reaching a particular state, or reaching a particular level of communication, beingness, doingness, havingness, all these things – I pretty much suppress that all the time, actually. Otherwise I would be walking around with my insides torn out.

**Auditor:** Yep. Okay. On the goal "to be a complete entity," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Sort of the grief involved in the failure. The grief involved and the degradation involved in ways that I have prevented others from accomplishing the same thing, which seems to be at variance with the, uh – with this first item.

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** I've got a weird mix-up here. I have a particular drive and then I have a terminal that has a different drive entirely, so I start thinking what the hell am I doing?

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** You know, it's the raging insanity that you go through – I go through.

**Auditor:** All right. On this goal, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** To a great degree ownership actually, because I don't know – I must be relinquishing ownership, because I don't know when I set it, what the conditions of setting it were, what I was attempting to accomplish by setting this goal, or what I was trying to overcome by setting the goal. The various steps in the degradation of the goal, the alter-is-ness of the goal, the modifications from being a complete entity to being a completely individuated individual.

**Auditor:** Mm.

**PC:** The individuality.

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** So there's this, um – uh – suppressed, mostly unknowingly, but to some degree knowingly also, the origination of the goal itself.

**Auditor:** Good. On this goal, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Sort of a peculiar type of suppression. I've suppressed telling other people they've got to have this goal because it's a good one.

**Auditor:** Okay. On this goal, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Anger, because it took such a long time to get to nowhere after I got the goal. Six weeks, eight weeks, steadily climbing tone arm, as a high-tone
preclear – 5.2, something like that. That.

**Auditor:** Good. On this goal, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Concern every time it was tested. Concern even now, when you call it. That is: Is it going to read? Isn't it going to read? Is it really my goal? Or isn't it my goal? You know?

**Auditor:** Good. On this goal, has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** No, I think that's about the size of it.

**Auditor:** All right. I'll check this on the meter. On the goal "to be a complete entity," has anything been suppressed? All right. To be a complete entity. Thank you. To be a complete entity. Thank you. To be a complete entity. Thank you. I got two ticks and a final null on that. All right. Now, I'm going to check some other buttons on this. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal? That reads. What was it?

**PC:** I'm sorry, I don't – I don't get an answer there.

**Auditor:** All right.

**PC:** All I do is just pull a blank.

**Auditor:** Very good. All right. Now, I'll steer you on this. On this goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. Uh – I didn't get a read that time.

**PC:** Well, there you go.

**Auditor:** Okay. All right. Very good. To be a complete entity. Okay. Now, on this goal, is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What was it?

**PC:** Has something to do with uh – in listing, listing the items, I've been careful to look and see in order to give you items.

**Auditor:** Right.

**PC:** That doesn't really relate to the goal, I believe, so items derive from the goal.

**Auditor:** All right. On the goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you have been careful of?

**PC:** Not that I know of.

**Auditor:** All right. Very good. On this goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Now, is there something being suppressed in this session?

**PC:** I'm just interested. I noticed before when you put down the tone arm reading there was – at 3.4. And when we ended session it was about – what? – 4.5 or something like that?

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** So apparently whatever ridge that was in during all that period of time of, ah, mislisting, whatever you want to call it, you know, listing the wrong way to and all this, that ridge apparently is gone.

**Auditor:** Yeah.

**PC:** Now, I don't feel tremendously different but there is a difference. And every once in a while I just think proudly, "Ah, my tone arm is down."

**Auditor:** All right. Okay. Very good. On the goal "to be a complete entity," has anything – I'll give you that again: On the goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. There's a read there.
PC: I'm careful to – I don't know how to – how to put this – to avoid putting up something or not putting up something, when you call the goal, in order to not prevent it from reading.

Auditor: All right.

PC: In other words, I'm – I'm careful to – not to do something. So, see, I'm careful in not doing something.

Auditor: Good. Okay. All right. To be a complete entity. To be a complete entity. On this goal, is there anything you have been careful of? All right. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. On this goal, has any mistake been made? Okay. To be a complete entity. All right. On this goal, is there anything you have been anxious about? Okay. On this goal, has anything been decided? I want to give that again. On this goal, has anything been decided? That reads: What was it?

PC: Well, I've decided to find the basis for the goal whatever the basis may be on the prime motivation for the goal. Find out what the intent was.

Auditor: Good. All right. On this goal, has anything been decided? That reads. What was it?

PC: That as it comes down the descending spiral – I don't mean the "Spiral Staircase" in this case – as it comes down the descending spiral, the tendency is to lead to absolute individuation. See? A complete entity means one thing. That is, to be a complete entity would mean to have total awareness and total recall, all your abilities and all this. When you start looking at it, a complete entity is one which requires no more inflow or outflow so becomes individuated.

Auditor: Yeah.

PC: So – what was your question? I got lost in my description.

Auditor: All right. We're on "decide."

PC: Hmm. Well, I decided that it may be a nice goal in concept but in practice it's pretty poor.

Auditor: All right. Good. Now, I'll check this question. On this goal, has anything been decided? All right. To be a complete entity. To be a complete entity. On this goal, has anything been suppressed? All right. On this goal, is there anything you've been careful of? All right. Tell you what: we're going to prepcheck these buttons.

PC: Hmm.

Auditor: We'll take up Failed to reveal right now.

PC: Hmm.

Auditor: Now. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: Annoyance, when I first started listing, at the fact that there was no tone arm action, that I didn't seem to cognize, that I didn't seem to get any recall. And I sort of suppressed this. I didn't want to make my auditor feel bad.

Auditor: All right. Good. Okay. On this goal, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

PC: A fundamental invalidation on the checkout when an "id" was added – id.

Auditor: Hmm.

PC: And it became "identity" instead of "entity," and it checked out! And so I always carry this niggling little doubt:
Well, if they could check out "identity" and it could read and you could check out "entity" and it would read, well, how well do I know what the hell I am doing? Is there some basic resonance here or what? Just what is my goal?

Auditor: Yep. Right. Good. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: Well, the hope that I could become a better person for blowing the goal, for doing what I want to do without having some compulsive reason for doing it.

Auditor: Good. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: Oh, something I haven't revealed to you lately, maybe. That when this was checked out I didn't get a great deal of pain. I got some few nigglings pains and stuff like that. But I haven't had any of these sharp, deep sword wounds that pass through me – through the chest, or where the head's blown off or anything like that.

Auditor: Yep.

PC: Nothing dramatic, you know.

Auditor: All right.

PC: I had a little pain in the toe or my finger would hurt or something like that.

Auditor: Okay. All right. On this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: Yes. I always ask my auditor if she would let me watch it rocket read. And she said she would let me do it someday. She never did. Id like to see it rocket read.

Auditor: All right.

PC: I never have.

Auditor: Okay. On the goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: No, I think I've covered all the points we did with one auditor or another and the idea that – I've known this – this is a basic urge, basic drive – very fundamental mode – whatever you want to call it...

Auditor: Yeah.

PC: ... for years and years and years. So when I was finally listening to those and I suddenly cognited on what they wanted. I cognited on what they wanted. It wasn't that – a case of what goal, what goal, what goal. I found – finally understood what they wanted from me so I gave it to them.

Auditor: Yeah.

PC: I mean, that's the way a goal is, really. I mean, that's my understanding of it.

Auditor: Yeah, yeah.

PC: Once a preclear cognites on what you're asking for they give it to you because they know.

Auditor: Hmm. All right. Very good. To be a complete entity. On this goal, is there anything you've failed to reveal? All right. To be a complete entity. To be a complete entity. To be a complete entity. Okay, it's affecting the meter. We haven't got a rocket on it at this time. Now, let's get – take up Careful of. On this goal "to be a complete entity," is there anything you've been careful of?

PC: I've been careful to not push it that other people are being superior to their goals because their goals involved
what I consider short track and the fact of the matter is I've ...

**LRH:** Okay, close it off and close your session now.

**Auditor:** All right. Very good. Okay. Now, if it's all right with you we're going to leave that there.

**PC:** Leave what?

**Auditor:** The question ...

**PC:** Oh.

**Auditor:** ... and we're going to start terminating the session right now.

**PC:** Fine.

**Auditor:** All right. Anything you'd care to say or ask before we end this part of the session?

**PC:** No rocket read?

**Auditor:** All right. No rocket read. Anything else?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** All right. Did you make any part of your goals in this session?

**PC:** I only made one goal there.

**Auditor:** To get a rocket read?

**PC:** Yeah. No, no dice.

**Auditor:** All right. Very good. I'll check your havingness. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Is that the same grip as you started with?

**PC:** Yeah.

**Auditor:** All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, that's down a little bit. Put the cans down, I'll run some Havingness. Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** That uh – camera right up there.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** The shelf in the corner.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** The stool, the bench – little bench.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** The all-seeing eye.

**Auditor:** All right. Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** Let's see. Your necktie.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** The earphones.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Point out something.

**PC:** Microphone.

**Auditor:** Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Now, squeeze the cans. All right. That's higher than when we started. That was the last command. End of the Havingness Process.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**Auditor:** Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?

**PC:** No.

**Auditor:** All right. Is it all right if I end the session now?

**PC:** It's desirable.

**Auditor:** Okay. Here it is. End of session. Has the session ended for you?

**PC:** Yes. It has.

**LRH:** All right. Take a ten-minute break and I'll give you a few words
on these sessions. Okay?
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And we'll have a rundown now on these demonstrations.

Well, now, the first session you saw there was – there was a lot of noise and confusion and upset right there at the start. That was a very messy session start. The proper sequence of a session start does not include upsetting the pc. If you want to get a rocket read, keep the pc calm, show him pictures of pretty girls, smooth him out. But don't start banging cans around and so forth.

What you do, is you adjust the pc's chair, you clear the room with the pc, you say it's all right to audit in this room, you don't meter that, and then you get a can squeeze, and then you put in the well-known R-factor and then you start the session. And that sequence is never varied.

Now, as far as the meter reading is concerned here, you called a clean on an equivocal read. Auditor did that a couple of times, and of course the next time you call it, it's very often wrong. Now, I notice that you're doing something here which is quite interesting to me and which I myself abandoned some long time ago. It runs like this: You say, "On this list, has anything been suppressed?" Bang, you see. "On this list has anything been suppressed?" Finally the pc says, "No." And you say, "All right, I will check that on the meter," and you check it on the meter, if you get a read, you ask the pc again.

Now, the way you're doing it is a way that – I know you haven't been told this, so it's not your fault – for once it's not your fault. I mean, you want to mark this day down as the – a golden day in the history of the Briefing Course, because today we have found something that wasn't your fault, it was my fault. Of course I'm getting Clear, now, you see, and, already first-goal Clear, practically second-goal Clear, so you see I can afford the tremendous majesty of being wrong! You can't afford that yet, see. So this wasn't your fault.

But the actual right way to do this, so as not to upset the pc, is simply to repetitive, repetitive, repetitive, repetitive until he says no, and then say, "All right, I will check it on the meter," take it over to the meter, and stay on the meter. Don't go off on to repetitive again.

You see, you've got repetitive rudiments mixed up with Prepchecking.

Now, you ordinarily can expect over a long period of time in a Problems Intensive, something like that – you can expect a great deal of this kind of nonsense, you see. You can expect the pc to have a brand-new stream of answers and so forth.

So when you prepcheck, as you would be doing in the Y Unit, why, for sure, go back and say, "All right, anything been suppressed, been suppressed, been suppressed, been sup-
pressed, I'll check that on the meter," check it on the meter, still dirty, "All right," come off of it, "been suppressed, been suppressed, been suppressed," check it on the meter, and so forth. Because you've got tons of answers back of this kind of thing.

But not – not when you're running him on rudiments. When you say, "been suppressed," and he said no, you say, "All right, I'll check that on the meter," and just ride it with the meter from there on out, from there on out it's a fast check. You see? That will make life much simpler to you. And it'll save you a lot of auditing time, and it'll save you all of this nonsense about reads and not reads, and you'll stay with the meter and it'll upset you less. And I think you'll find out that's a very good way to handle it.

Now, this auditor – I hope you don't mind my mentioning this – actually you look like a bundle of nerves on – on there. Your presence, smooth it out, man, smooth it out. Get those overt's off, or something like that, because an auditor should look smooth and calm and inspire a great calm in the pc, do you see? That's much to be desired. And, work on your auditor presence there a little bit and get your overt's off on this, that and the other thing and you'll be doing better. Okay? No offense meant, I'm just trying to help you be a good auditor.

Now, the reason the item didn't fire here, probably, was because the goal wasn't firing. Now, the... if a goal isn't firing, the item fires rather poorly. And while it is true that if a goal is firing badly, or not at all, you get reads on the list and can check out RIs and that sort of thing, actually when the goal is not firing at all, the read is vastly inhibited. And, that doesn't say that if the goal isn't firing you won't get a read on an RI, you understand, because you could actually have a read on an RI with a goal not firing. But if you want to speed up this fire on the RI and have your list fire better and so forth, keep your goal cleaned up.

Now, in actual fact, in 3M the goal starts in, fires very sporadically at first, and then starts firing beautifully, oh, gorgeously. Big stuff. And then goes into one rocket read and two rock slams, and three rocket slams, and two rocket reads and one rock slam. You understand? Rock slam gets mixed up in this, you tiger drill it a bit, put in your big mid ruds, actually, on it, which is much better to make a goal read, and you'll find out those rock slams turn back into rocket reads again.

Now, you go a little bit further and the goal will start rocket reading again. Pow, pow, pow, it's reading fine, providing your listing is all right and not backwards and upside down. And the setup here, in brief, is that a goal goes from very, very hard to make it fire – a lot of prep checking and so forth, and it reads and then it's – pc sneezes and it doesn't read, and so forth – into bad read on the list but reading a bit better, reading more consistently – you're not paying attention to the goal, don't you see, but keep listing items, not wrong way to items and so forth, but right way to items, your goal will fire better and better, and better and then finally turns into rock slam, and in... versus, rock slam one time, rocket read – that's in the same call – you see. "To be a catfish" – rock slam, "To be a catfish" – rocket read, "To be a catfish" – rock slam. That goes from that phase, the chrysalis phase of the goal-it goes from there on down to fires well and then it begins to fire early and late.

You say, "To be a..." rocket read "... catfish," you see. "To be a catfish"... rocket read, you see. It starts firing way offbeat. That's by the time you've gotten three-quarters of its items off of it. And then when you've finally moved down to the line, your goal starts firing auto-
matically, and you'll find some item sometime, and that goal, particularly the first goal, starts
going pow, pow, pow, pow, and your tone arm is coming down, and you're not even saying it.
Just – the meter is just rocket reading itself on down.

Very interesting phenomenon, and it goes from there into no read at all, and that doesn't mean all the items are off of it. You find one more item, and the goal rocket reads, and then doesn't rocket read, and you'll find maybe one more item, or patching up the line plot, and for a moment the goal rocket reads, and then after that it is dead, you can't get anything out of it with a whip. There's nothing, nothing there.

And, speaking about getting something out of a goal with a whip, let's take up this next session. Now, May is... you're much better these days. I... your auditor presence is much better and fine. I'd cure myself of this glases trick, if I were you. You can't hypnotize him with those shiny lenses, you know? I know you're probably – got some kind of a glass that you can't see the pc well, but it's a mannerism you can do without.

All right. Now, this goal that was being checked out on Dick, has rocket read a couple of times, and is actually just being in the process of being prepchecked and checked out, and a goal in that queasy a condition probably is in no state to be shown on TV, so once more we didn't get a rocket read.

Now, I won't say the goal is it or isn't it, but I notice, with some horror, looking over this pc's 2-12 history, that the dance that was being played was to find an... write a list, and abandon it. And write a list, and abandon it, and write a list and abandon it. I don't know how many of this – times this has been done, but it'd been done – almost – something ridiculous, like about twenty times, something like that. And then they finally found an item, "Who would oppose being Clear?" something like that, and it did beautifully! Let's see, what's that item? Give me that list over there.

Female voice: It's, "A person who wants to do the right thing."

Yeah, the item was, "A person who wants to do the right thing." And I think after they listed 8,765 pages, they decided the pc was turning black, so they didn't do anything about it. Well, that's an exaggeration, they only listed 20 or 30 pages, you see. Pure idiocy! I mean, you'd get the last R/S you see on the list, and you go 50 items beyond it, and if your tone arm is flat during that period, or if it isn't flat, just that – that's it, take it!

Now, that actually should be completed on this pc. That thing is... should be packaged up. Now, if you can't find the R/Sing item on that oppose list to this, or this opposing, well do it the other – other way to, and find the item which opposes it. Because I see, very peculiarly, that the goal is being checked is, "To be right," and the item here is "A person who wants to do the right thing." I think they're so mixed up that you're going to have an awful time trying to check the thing out. So I think you ought to get a four-way package on that pc, and then check out the goal, that's the easy way to do it.

Now, if you can get the... an oppterm, a proper and correct oppterm, you can actually list goals against this oppterm the way we were doing it with 3GA Criss Cross. "If that were..." "If you were the oppterm, why, what goal couldn't you have?" And you'll come up with that pc's goal like that. Those are trick ways of finding goals.
However, you still apparently could keep on listing. This goals list is only about a thousand long, and you could go right on listing this goals list from there on, watching your meter very carefully, and you would see that some goal would fire on the thing. There have been RRs on the goals list, in spite of all that.

Now, what I was getting around to is you can't make a rocket read read better by shouting the goal to the pc. This must be in a calm, even tone of voice. You don't want... honestly, the meter doesn't respond better, the louder! As a matter of fact, quite the contrary. Look over your Effect Scale. And if you say the item in a normal tone of voice, you're much more likely to get a read. So, don't say it in a conversational tone of voice, say it in a crisp tone of voice. Like, "To be a catfish. To be a catfish." Now, this is something that auditors do that I'd better call to your attention. They say, "To be catfish." Didn't read, you see. So, then they say — they say, "To be a catfish!" And that didn't read either. "To be a catfish!"

You know? I caught myself doing it once, and I thought I'd better warn you. I didn't do it again, so you don't have to either. But there is no point in calling the goal louder, it won't make the read come on better. So on.

Well, I think May is doing fine, there. I think the pc — I think the pc, with all those lists — how do you survive them? But anyway, they've got a fine item there, and all it needs is to be opposed and a four-way package run on the thing and the pc will feel fine. As far as rocket reads are concerned, as I say, you could go right on with the list and list the things out.

Now we come to this last session and aside from a missed suppressed read, and a couple of other things like that, Peter's auditor's presence there is very good, he has very good control of it, and so forth; I think he did fine. I have actually no comment to make beyond a couple of fluky reads, on the auditor's auditing.

But I do have a great deal to say about how he didn't get a rocket read on this one! Now, he didn't get a rocket read on this one because — well, the pc is listening to this so I — I'll ask the rest of you to listen and I'll only talk over on the right side of the room, all right? Your — the right side of your room there. I'm only going to talk over there, and then the pc, he can listen over on your left! All right?

Now, this pc has done a sales talk, apparently, and everything that comes up — he was even bringing it up in the lecture tonight — I mean in the demonstration — he has a whole stream of oppterms here which are all the baddies. There isn't a single creditable oppterm, from the top to the bottom. And all of his terminals here are all creditable.

You mean that pc's goal never deteriorated, is that what we're trying to say here? And of course that goal won't read. There's at least two or three of these items — one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten — ten items, perhaps as many as five of them been listed backwards. And that's very, very certain to knock the goal out.

Now, the way — the way you straighten up a line plot like this, you've got over here on the original line plot the oppterms, baddie, the terminal, good. Bad oppterm, terminal good. Bad oppterm, you get the idea? Now, the pc of course wants to keep up his social caste. And so, naturally, he will try to give you an offbeat on that kind of thing. But in actual fact, he's doing himself in. You don't care, really, about the significance of things, but you can take one
of these line plots. You can take one of these things and look it over and find out why the case is blowing up. And it's blowing up because at the top of your line plot, on the terminal, you have at the beginning of one of these things, at the top, it comes right on down the line from discreditable, halfway down the plot, sort of neutral, and all the way down at the bottom, very germane to the goal. Very germane.

Quite opposite at the top of the terminals list, you see. Not germane to the goal. And that's the way it goes. That's the cycle. It starts in from degraded... Some fellow the other day, picked up the high-toned one and said, well, it was really degraded; the auditor bought it. Auditor evidently doesn't believe in the mechanical test that you make. Mechanical tests are what's important. This is what you do as an Instructor when you're looking these things over. You just make your mechanical tests each time, and you'll be there. Your mechanical tests consist of reading the line question, one way oppose and then the other way oppose. Read it one way three times, read it the other way three times, see which one turns on the most mass or so forth. The one that turned on the most upset isn't it.

Now, on the oppterm side you get the exact reverse cycle. You get a high-toned oppterm as your first oppterm and then that dwindles down halfway down the list, to maybe ten oppterms later, or something like that. That is turned into a very opposite thing to the goal. It's now completely opposite to the goal. So, and in the middle ground there, why, maybe five, six oppterms from the top of the plot, and you will find that it's a neutral thing. So you have a sort of a neutral versus a neutral there in the middle of the graph, and then it goes down and it becomes very opposite to the goal. Not necessarily degraded.

One shouldn't use the idea of degraded terminal if you don't understand it. It is – it is the idea of a counter-button, really. It's counter to the goal's sense and meaning. That's what we get. Now, that's what's wrong with that pc and that's why you didn't see that, but of course he was reading an item that had already been listed.

Just take up this last item here. This thing will have to be straightened out and this auditor has only one fault, and some of you... don't tell him I said this, don't tell him I said this, because I'll leave that up to somebody screaming it in his ear with a foghorn one of these days. He just won't list twenty-five items beyond the last R/S or RR. And also he's having an awful hard time telling whether something rocket read or not. And, looky here, now, now...

Don't pull this one: This really is not proper. Because your face gets so far away – gets so far away from the meter face that you can't see it. Now, here is what the HPA aspirant, in the course, in Darwin – this is the way he does it: He comes over here, and he's got the E-Meter over here, see. So he looks over here and he looks over here, and he lists over here, and
he looks back here, and so forth. In other words – too far apart. The way you want that is that paper – *bang!* See, you understand? Right there, up against that meter. You see that? And slide it up as you go. And you'll find your eye, you see your eye course here, is looking right straight across that meter face, right across the meter face.

And you're – you're always writing with the meter face – you understand, your paper moves up, not your pencil down, you understand. You move your paper up. And in that way you get yourself a sight across the meter face.

Now, you try that the next time you're auditing, and you'll be – you'll be much better off. I know you can't see something like that, you can't – you can't see anything better than this, you can't see anything with that meter downstairs, because of course the meter's way out in front of somebody and a person is listing this way. It's perfectly all right. The meter has to be placed that way so that you can see the meter. And the only way you could do that is get the meter propped up and slide this paper underneath the corner of it and keep it going forward. You could do something like that.

But look at – look at the point. As long as you have a meter face over here and your list over here, see, here you are on your list and you say, "lawp, dwa, raw, wy, daw zaw – well, I missed that one, so here's a question mark RR and is it something happened there, and I can't quite see it..." and so forth, so, question mark, question mark.

Oh, you're not going to get anywhere, man! Keep that together. And this is wrong, in front of the meter here, that's wrong, don't bother with that. Get it right over here at the side. I've been watching an expert do it that way, so I know it works; I myself have been doing it that way. And by the way, by the way, just to give you another good point here, you have some trouble with this colliding with this corner, because that's flat on the table. And you know these rubber feet, that come on the bottom of the meter – if you'll screw one of those rubber feet down here at the lower edge of the meter, the meter tips up and leaves a gap – see? There's a little bit gap left in there, and your paper can shove up through the gap. You got the idea? Pretty good.

No, you've got to keep your eye in line with that meter face, while you're writing. If you don't you have all of these other difficulties and you've got to go fifty beyond your last R/S, I don't care if the tone arm is what you call flat or not. It – you've got to go at least fifty, you've got to go twenty-five beyond those RRs and fifty beyond the last RR or R/S, on the source list. And you've just got to do that. You'll continue to lay eggs if you don't do that.

I notice on... that two RRs gave a tiny read. Now, please! What does that tell you? It tells you the list is incomplete. All right, he comes back later and tries to complete the list. But in actual fact, there is a question mark RR here, a question mark RR on this list, which is...

*Female voice:* Twenty.

...only twenty items from the end where the pc – where the auditor stopped listing and then he continued the list and, of course, the tone arm now is high on a continued list and that sort of thing.
I don't believe the pc's very much in-session. I should think the pc would be getting his head knocked off with all of these things backwards.

You know, as a pc, you ought to... any one of you as a pc, where it comes to these items, don't get so socially conscious and go out on a big sell. It's what the auditor says it is, and you just answer up to the tests and you'll do much, much better. We got two auditors as pcs out in the Z Unit who always march forward to the hard sell. The second an item comes up we've got a hard sell going. They hire Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn to sell this item, and so forth. We got another pc out there, that it doesn't matter where it occurs, and if it RRs, why, apparently it's some other thing on the list. Well, the auditor, of course, sensibly takes the read and carries on and he'll probably find out that there's an item which is doing this.

That's beside the point. Now, we didn't see any RRs tonight. Why? Well, you're just not going by the rules. The middle one, we can't expect that, because the middle session – middle demonstration, because the goal had not been found. The goal was being interfered with the item. Perhaps if that item were tiger drilled it might rocket read and she'd be away without a goal, you understand? If she's getting an occasional rocket read out of this all she might have to do is just tiger drill that R/S that was found and it will subside to a rocket read, and she is away. And she can do two or three – she can do two or three items there and then ask the pc what his goal is and she'll get it.

But the point I'm making here – the point I'm making here is your RRs aren't coming on, not because your rudiments are out, but because you're not following close enough in on the laws of Routine 3M. That's all there is to it. Well, let me tell you, if after you've got a half a dozen items, you haven't got a rocket read, oh man, if you haven't got a rocket read two or three inches long after you've got two or three packages off of one of these goals, you ought to quit.

The best way in the world to make a goal read is to get three right way to listed packages all going off according to the clock and then go back and read your goal. You'll be surprised. You haven't done it – tiger drilled it at all – you call it and it goes bang.

Well, I've taken a look here, and none of you have seen a rocket read. I meant to demonstrate one, so I said to Suzie, I said, "Would you like to go down and put me there in the pc's chair and read my last item up?" Of course, you're not going to get a – you're not going to get a rocket read on something that's been listed down. But, the last item I had doesn't happen to have been listed and it's about that long and it's one of these pow rocket reads. Most of my rocket reads on the second goal look like something that should be sent down to Cape Canaveral so that they can get their rocket program off the launching pad. Because your meter really starts functioning when you come out of the first goal area.

All right. Well, I thought your auditing was pretty good and nothing detrimental can be said about the auditing that has been done by this auditor on this pc. But the other two are simply suffering from just not being steered in the right direction with 3M – not going according to the rules.
Now, it took me about 150 hours so I could run something that vaguely looked like this — included all of the pilot work on Routine 2. And I really wasn't feeling comfortable about knowing how to run it until I'd done that much auditing on it.

Now, I allow you a certain leeway. I allow you a certain amount of fumble. But what I want to see is less fumble day by day and more accuracy day by day. And if I don't see some improvement I'll come to the conclusion that you're your own best opp term.

All I want to see is an improvement in what you're doing. And I think we can see that. If you don't understand 3M better on Wednesday than you did on Monday, and if you don't look and sound like a better auditor on Friday than you did on Wednesday, or getting more done, then I'd say you were wound up in some hopeless confusion back on the line someplace and you didn't know what you were doing in the first place and you better get your check-sheets passed. Because your progress as an auditor ought to be fairly rapid and you're not going to have anything shifting under your feet now. So there isn't much reason to do other than have good progress as an auditor.

Now, you'll run into problems as an auditor, problems of getting on an R/S which has disappeared. Now, that's a tough problem. I'm fighting that problem. All R/S to no R/S, you know, that kind of a — of a — of an action. And you have to get back and settle it and square it up. But it can be done and I expect that you'll hit these difficulties and carry on. But where you have a pc's goal and where you are finding items, honest, it's the most easy, certain, mechanical job you can do. And you just should be going on pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, and tonight I should have seen in two of those sessions all kinds of rocket reads. So I know that your Routine 3 is being done with a big fumble.

Now, get on the ball, learn how to do it, straighten it out, and you'll have pcs firing off as though they're being sent to the moon. As far as the quality of the auditing is concerned, as can be expected in Z Unit, the quality of the auditing is very good. I have no fault to find with it.

All right? There is your demonstration and thank you very, very much and let's give the auditors a big hand.

... Thank you. Now, let's give the pcs a big hand.

... Thank you.

All right. So here we are, that's the end of our Wednesday night demonstration, and good night, and see you tomorrow.
Okay, here we are. This is the what? Twenty-one February, AD 13. I know the year, anyway. And here we are with Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture.

Now, frankly, you're here to make it. We expect you to make it and you're not going to make it without data and – even though some of you are trying. You've got to keep up on your bulletins and keep up on your tapes and get your checksheets done and do a good job of auditing, because the better job of auditing you do, the better auditing you're going to get, that's for sure.

In auditor assignments we have a very nasty habit of pairing off the poorer auditors against each other and the better auditors against each other. So the better job of auditing you do, the better auditor you get. It's all these little persuasions. And while you're still in the universe, why, we have to use some of the laws of the universe to get you going and push you along. We don't like to use these laws but that is persuasion and duress and other things of that character are definitely indicated in some of these cases.

In other words, we – we're not against you. We're just against the bank. And if you get along, why, it's because you've overcome your bank. First thing I want to tell you in this lecture tonight is I've received quite a few congratulations on being Clear, and so forth. Actually, I'm just a first-goal Clear but – and almost a second-goal Clear, I've got so many items left on the second goal. But I've received quite a few congratulations and all of them very warm. But I'm also receiving here and there in the minority, some distinct shocks from people. They, "Aha, what do you know! Well, I thought you were seven times as Clear as anybody else ever would be," and so forth, and they're very shocked to find out that I have gone Clear. Well, for a long time my needle's been free, sporadically, and I very often use E-Meters or use my Clear read, that's been for years, to check out an E-Meter. I'm sure there are people around here have seen me do it.

I'd say that E-Meter's not right because it isn't reading at 3. I take a hold of it and so forth. But that's beside the point. Those that have, have sort of missed the story. They – the people are shocked about this, they – they've missed the story. This idea of somebody full-armed from the brow of Jove or something like that, coming down and helping man, and so on, that's an old story. That isn't even news. But somebody by his own bootstraps even as you, pulling himself up through this thing, that is news. And whatever you have done and been on the whole track, or whatever I have done and been on the whole track, it still amounts to the fact that a guy just like you made this. And has made it, and also "physician heal thyself," has been broken all ways from the middle. Because it never happened before. That's what's news.
I suppose my bank to a large degree's been keyed out but over a period of time has been keying in harder and harder and about knocked my head off, and I was working out technology by which you could get Clear, and I hadn't had any auditing to amount to anything for a couple of years, actually. Mary Sue rolled up her sleeves and there we went and here we are. And this is a very satisfactory, well, I won't say an end to the story, because the story is a long way from ended. But I will say it's a very satisfactory denouement on the question, "Can one lift himself by his own bootstraps and beat all the laws of God and men in this whole universe from one corner to the other?" And the answer, of course, is yes.

Now, where you have a will, why you don't always have a way, but a way can be worked out. I was very interested to hear today from Louise who left here some little time ago, a Saint Hill grad, and she was telling me what she'd been doing, and it's the wildest story I think I've read in a long time. This girl, without any training on 2-12 but having learned how to study and audit here, has been banging into cases where she is at the present time and has apparently divined the fact that as long as a pc is ARC breaking and screaming and feeling bad and so forth, it just must be that the list isn't complete. And so she's gone on and on and on and on and nulled and looked and nulled and gone on and listed, and she's not been abandoning lists. And she finally turned on great big rock slamming items and so forth on each one of these pcs and they've come up really smiling. And she's having some resounding success with 2-12, and probably all she's equipped with is simply the original 2-12 bulletin. And with what she already knows about auditing and 3D Criss Cross and the rest of it, why, she's been able to somehow or another sweat her way through this, and she doesn't even know about the four-way package. But she's been having some enormous success.

She isn't abandoning lists. She says, "Well, this list is running and it's making a change on the pc, and I can possibly see the tone arm moving, and so somehow or another there is something on this list and I mean to find it. And she has been going on in that fashion. Rather interesting approach, a sort of a dogged, persistent approach. And she's been getting some rather fantastic changes in cases. And it shows you that the school of, well, "List half a page and it didn't work, and abandon that, and list another half a page on something else and it didn't work and abandon that, and list half another page on something else and abandon that," that school isn't succeeding. That's definitely a losing school.

I myself am up against this in auditing right now and I just mean to push on through on the list which gave us trouble originally, and I'm going to finish up that list.

Now, when 2-12A came out, I gave you some data that you should go back and repair some of these lists. I should have said at that time, "On those cases which were having trouble, go back and find the widest rock slam which has been seen on the pc and finish off a set of packages with that and you'll be far better off." Well, that's true. That's true. On cases you're having trouble with.

But let me tell you something now. And this – this lecture is mostly about R2 and R3, and current auditing on these. And also I'm going to give you a step by step of how you do R3M.

But let's take this now, and let's observe something here. That the more you monkey around with what's been done on the pc, the worse luck you're going to have. Do you under-
stand that? You've got this pc up here to about his fourth list and he's getting someplace, and it's going along not too badly, and you all of a sudden decide to duck back to the first list that you did on the pc and examine that and redo that and do it some other way and start patching up a case, crashity-crashity-crash, by going back, going back.

Now, it's true that the error always lies behind you. But taking a case that can be continued in the run and going back is very bad. Now, that is something you should pay some attention to. In other words, if there's any way to keep the case running, if there's any way to continue to get new items on the case, if there's any way at all to continue the forward progress of the case, then you continue the forward progress of the case. You understand that?

Because the more you go back and patch up yesterday, the more items you invalidate for the pc. Let's say you have ten on a line plot. We saw one last night, and I was commenting on this. Actually, I owe that pc a bit of an apology. He may have gotten the idea I invalidated all of his items. I didn't. I merely said that somebody is putting the items down on the wrong side of the line plot, and this is causing trouble. And the pc was in trouble. But I didn't mean then that that pc should scrap all those items.

Now, listen, any item that reads is the pc's item. I don't care whether you can – whether it's matched or packaged or not. If the item reads and continues to read, it's a... and it isn't a represent of a rock slamming or rocket reading item, if that item is reading, it is the pc's item. And you can find opposition to it and so forth. That's true of all items.

Now, let's say that we listed something early on the case wrong way to and we listed the item "will-o'-the-wisp" early on the thing, and we treated it as a terminal and we eventually find out it's still banging like mad, and we have to list it again. But when we listed it as a terminal, when it was actually an oppterm, why, we got an item, "whippersnapper." Well, now, that is the pc's item, and it does have something to do with will-o'-the-wisp, even though it was listed backwards. Do you understand, this is no excuse for listing it backwards, but it just says just this and no more: Don't throw away this item you found, "whippersnapper." Don't throw it away and say... give the pc the big idea that now because it's been listed backwards he's got a wrong reliable item. He hasn't. That belongs someplace on the line plot. And you just put it there and keep on going.

So even those items found by something being listed backwards are valid. They're valid items. And you'll find out eventually they'll fit into the line plot. So you don't scrub all of a pc's items and go back and dodge around and patch up and this sort of thing. The best patch-up for Routine 3MX – or 3M – rather, the best patch-up that you can do is when you've run out, fresh out, of rocket reading reliable items, which produce no rocket reading reliable item. You know, you've got it – rocket reading reliable item – it tells you that in the original R3M, by the way – you are fresh out, you can't find one from this reliable item. Everything just evaporates and it doesn't matter what you do to it.

You go back and do another goal oppose. And it'll land you right where you should have been. It'll give you the item in sequence. But just because it's goal oppose doesn't mean it gives you an oppterm. It doesn't. It gives you a terminal or an oppterm. You have to test it out just the same.
Don't go scrubbing everything you have found on a pc because you find something is backwards. That's the message here, see? If you found something off of it, by doing it backwards, inadvertently, that's still an item and it still belongs to the pc and it still fits in on the line plot. Do you understand? So it isn't a matter of scrubbing everything.

But you shouldn't go into a wild wing-ding of trying to make nothing out of the line plot by scrubbing it all, just because you have to do something in reverse. That's the whole message I'm giving you here. And if you have a cycle of action which is continuing and you can do something with it, you continue that and you do something with it. Don't keep monkeying. Get something done. It's very discouraging to a pc.

Now, I had an example of this last night. We socked into one and did it wrong way to. I notice, by the way, that basic case changes – is something can be done wrong way to and upside down and my recovery level from this is very rapid. It's getting very rapid. You could list me backwards for, well, you could take one of these first Saint Hill V Unit lists, you know, a hundred and ninety-five pages because they wanted to know if the original item that was coming from had ever rock slammed, you know?

One of these arduous endless pieces of nonsense. And so it'll practically spin you in, see, and formerly, why, I just would have hung on with me for days. And now, I notice – oh, a few days ago I was noticing that a bum steer or something like that, I would be all over it the following morning when I woke up. It'd be gone. And now I'm noticing that it evaporates in about half an hour after the session. You see what I mean? Recovery is getting better. Resilience, bounce back, that sort of thing, that is one of the most marked improvements which I have noticed.

Some of you will be wondering what happens to weight. Weight goes down, but it rather goes down relatively slowly on 3MX, and may or may not go down at all on 2-12. You may get a lowering of weight on 2-12, and you may not. But you certainly get a lowering of weight on R3M. The more you do R3M, the more of it you do, why, the more weight drops off. But it starts dropping off very slowly at first. And whenever you do one wrong way to on the pc, he loses his weight ground. You get the idea? I mean, you've gotten six items now, and – on the spiral staircase, and the pc has lost something very small, like three and a half pounds, something like that. And then you take item seven, and it is "a beautiful – a beautiful guardian angel who is pleasant and sweet and loved by everybody," you know? And the pc goes on one of these hard sells, and says, "Oh, that's me! Oh, that's me! Oh, ho, that's me. Oh, ho, that's me. Oh, ho, that's me. Oh, yeah." And the auditor, not being an auditor, you see, just – you see, the auditor's there because he can think, see, and if he doesn't figure this out for himself, he's not being an auditor. He's just being an automaton.

So he buys this hard sell, and of course the thing is an oppterm. So he'll list this thing, this beautiful angel that is loved by everybody, you know, and – and you list this thing as a terminal, and the pc's getting blacker and blacker. It helps to be observant as an auditor, you know. I just wanted to get that in, get that in just as a little tip. And the pc goes blacker and blacker and blacker and blacker and blacker, and then, there he is. There he is. All the problems of racial consciousness and everything else on his head.
And by this time you say, "I wonder if that terminal is false? See, the needle tightened up, mass pulled in on him, he went black. Let's see now, there was no tone arm action from the beginning of the list to the end, and I didn't get an item off of it. And it's still – the item, a guardian angel who is beautiful and sweet and loved by everyone – is still rocket reading half a dial. Do you suppose that it could possibly have been an oppterm?"

Well, that's pretty good. I mean, even if the conclusion is that stupid and drawn out and so forth, it still – the guy came up with the right answer. So you list it as an oppterm, and this time you... of course, you kind of mucked it up, so it doesn't behave just right. You know, the tone arm action isn't good, and the needle frees up slowly. Actually, for the first 15 or 20 items he – he's having an awful time listing at all, you know?

Then all of a sudden you get it listed out and you find your item. Well, even though that's packaged up, you put your pc on the scale, you find out he's just lost that three and a half pounds gain. In other words he weighs three and a half pounds more. He's right back to where he started. Do you see that? I mean, he's lost three and a half pounds by your earlier packages but when you got up to item seven you listed one in reverse. Well, you cancelled out his win, and he'll go back up and weigh the same as he did before you found the first package.

But then he gets a rather fast recovery, and you go on down the line, and he starts losing weight more rapidly than he did before. In other words, you don't ruin his ability to lose weight but you simply gain back by alter-ised mass the weight which you already had taken off the pc.

This is interesting. Very, very thin people at this stage, of course are going to worry. Very thin people are going to worry at this stage. And I will tell them a little fib. I don't know this, but I will tell them a little fib and say I hope that an optimum amount of weight is put on by reducing the GPM. Very probably is but we have nothing on – no test data on it at all.

But we do know about the more weighty side of it. Now, in other words, you make a goof, and you undo some of your gain. But even then you don't completely ruin the pc.

In the area and zone of case repair, one of the favorite actions that people undertake is to find a pair of items and then decide to go back and patch up something. And it's all relatively unsuccessful, and then they come back to the pair they've just found and take the last one, it's still rocket reading more or less, and then list that, and they find out that all the time they've been fooling around, the pc's been sitting in the somatics of the pair that were last found. You see that? I mean, finding a pair of items, number, well, let's be mathematical about it, numbers 11 and 12 on the line plot, term and oppterm, and then going back and straightening out wrong way to number 3 and wrong way to number 5, and then coming back to 11 and 12, you'll be rather struck to find that your big upsurge comes when you simply oppose what you should have opposed, which is number 12 and get number 13. And all the somatics that you started looking for on 3 and 5 actually were sitting right there on 12. Even though they were backwards opposed.

That doesn't say don't straighten out a line plot, but only straighten out a line plot if you have to. Now, what do you mean, have to? Well, if after you've found all of the whole GPM and all the packages in it, it doesn't blow free and won't prepcheck out, you'd better go back and patch up all of the – all of the misaligned items. That's more or less the time to do it.
How do you patch up one of these 3M cases? Interesting technique here, is February the 1st, I think first one out, this was about 26 January, something like that. Hasn't been out any length of time at all and we're talking about how you repair one. Some commentary, isn't it?

Actually, the best way to repair one that isn't running right, you've just run fresh out of – you've just run out of items, I mean, you... the pc lists down what you've got and he can't find anything, and he lists down what you've got. I know I told you goal oppose, but I'm talking now about a severe case, now. You just can't seem to get your hands on anything, and you don't know where you are or what you're doing, and so forth. You have a choice here. One method is just do another goal oppose and you will land there right side up with the next consecutive item, always, whether it's a term or an oppterm.

But maybe the pc's sort of ARC breaky and maybe he doesn't take kindly to all this and so forth. Well, your other method is to go over the line plot and read every one of them, and give each one of them – of the items on that thing – a big mid ruds Prepcheck very rapid, and just give them a big mid ruds Prepcheck on each one of these items. And you'll find that one of these things is reading madly. In other words, the whole case is tied up in one of these items.

Actually, you have to continue to list every item that fires – if you want to do a patch-up. If you find that there's still a dirty read on item number 7, what's the proper thing? It doesn't mean that it was wrong way to listed. It just means it can be listed again, and another item found on it. Now, how is that?

Well, every time you do a wrong way to on the GPM, it upsets the frequency of the GPM and loops the whole thing over and puts it down into a good solid bing-bang pack, see? In other words, let's say this – say, here's your lineal GPM, see? All right. And you list one wrong way to, and you get something like this. And it'll tie something up down here, see. And then you list another one wrong way to and you get something like this.

Now, now what happens? Well, every time you list something, you get something down here. And then you could list the same item again and get something here. And eventually you've got to undo the ball-up that you've done. Well, you haven't worsened the case by doing this, it just makes the frequency with which you get the items wrong, so they don't appear in the right sequence on the line plot.

In other words, after you've listed something wrong way to, you've upset the frequency because you have jammed up the GPM, see? So that anything you get here, now, is getting something up here, when actually it should have been getting something here, don't you see? So, you – you've balled the thing up. And you can't expect your frequencies to work.

So sometimes you list an item, let's say number 7, you list number 7, and you get a cat whisker, or something like that. And that's fine, and you list that and that's fine, and you oppose that, and that's fine, and then all of a sudden you're out in thin air and you don't quite know what to do. Funny part of it is you go back and read number 7 again, and it has an additional fire on it now. You've got to list it the same way you listed it before, it wasn't done backwards if it's just got a dirty read. Backwards gives you the full read back, you understand. So just your little dirty needle on number 7, you just do another list on number 7. And you'll
find up... you'll come up with the consecutive one that you should have found by listing down number 11, see? That's when you've already looped the GPM. The thing to do is don't loop it.

But after you have, why, then you have a little bit of a picnic. You have trouble. And you just have to remember these things. The rules actually aren't upset. The frequency of listing rules, and all that sort of thing, that isn't upset, it's the sequence by which they go on the line plot that is upset. And you sometimes have to list one twice, you know? I mean, you list number 7, it appears to be clean and everything is fine, you get down here to number 11 and you all of a sudden can't find an item. The thing to do is to go back over the whole line plot and test each one of the items on the line plot and see which one is now firing.

Now, take your biggest read as the one you fix up. You got a big rocket read, the probability is it was listed backwards in the first place. So list it the other way to. You understand? That's just conditional. You test it again. It's no guarantee it's backwards, it may be frontwards. But you understand, you got – you take your biggest rocket read that is on the list, and if it's as big – if it's a good, big strong powerful rocket read, the chances are the item was listed in reverse in the first place. That's no guarantee that it was, but just the chances are.

It also may be listed the same way and pick up a brand new item, and behave exactly as though it had never been listed. You understand? Well, that's the first one that you take. You make sure, just apply all your tests again. Just treat it as though you've just found an RI, you got the idea? You just found a new RI.

"Well, where'd you find it?"
"Well, I found it on the line plot. Yeah."

Well, he'd just found an RI. It'd already been listed and everything else, but there it is, firing, so we'll just treat it as though we just found an RI. We have to find out if it's a terminal or it's an oppterm, and we list it again.

Now, these little, little fellows, the dirty reads that pick up as you go through there, you can continue your biggest dirty read just as you did before. It'd be a mistake to do it in reverse. It isn't in reverse, it - it just... because of this looped up character of the bank, which I was showing you, the thing now can be listed another step. Yet another list. And it'll go 25 items beyond the last RR and R/S, or – plus the no tone arm action, and you – you'll wind up with a brand-new item. And mysteriously this brand-new item fits right down here as opposing number 11. Very mysterious.

Now, you can go back and run a goal oppose list, see that it'll just avoid all that, and go back and run a goal oppose list, and you will wind up with the item which opposes number 11. Or you will wind up with the item that opposes that great big rocket read that's left on the list.

In other words, I'm giving you – there's a number of ways to enter this thing. But if when you're entering it you have the idea, or your pc gets the idea that you're just going to take his whole line plot and tear it up, and all fifteen items which have already been found are all invalid and no good any more and so forth, because they were all from a wrong way to list, or something like that, boy, you want to get an upset or ARC broke pc? Actually, you can just
take a pc and say... and tell him halfway through one of – "And I don't think this up here is very valid. And I'm going to change all this."

And all you have to do is cross out the old GPM, after you got the new GPM written and he'll blow up. Just the action of invalidating his items by saying we're writing a new line plot, is enough to knock a pc off his base. That's interesting, isn't it?

Well, sometimes, as we had to do today on one of the cases, the first demonstration last night, go over the line plot and look it over and find out what on the line plot is still firing. And we found the first item found on this pc was still firing, and I looked at the line plot and it didn't look right to me, and today, why, they went back and found the first item had never been opposed properly, and they just handled that as though that was the RI which they'd found and proceeded from there, and that case will be in good shape. That's why you didn't see a rocket read last night. Do you understand?

Our rocket reads don't disappear like that. They... you should be able to see a rocket read during a Tiger Drill – just tiger drilling. So, you're tiger drilling, and, on Suppress, you know? You say, "On the item 'a happy schoolgirl' has anything been suppressed?" – Pssww! See?

You see those on a real live item on an actual RI or something like that, or a goal, you will see on the buttons, you will see these fires. And in 2-12 you will see the buttons do a rock slam. You see, what's happened is the buttons have stolen the read, and then you gradually get back and put it on.

Once in a blue moon – now, it's on another subject, on 3M – you'll find that you get an R/Sing item. And one of the items which R/Sed when it went down on the list is the item. That's interesting, and worth knowing – once in a blue moon. That will come from a shattered up wrong way to listed GPM, or something. And by tiger... it's the only item on the list and it appears on the right place on the list, and you read the RR and it didn't fire, well, for heaven sakes read the last R/S, see. And if the last R/S fired and nothing else fires, then you start on that and put in your big mid ruds on that item and it'll turn into a rocket read. That's quite interesting to know.

That's only after a bank's been clobbered and run backwards that it starts to misbehave. You want a perfectly behaving bank, do everything perfectly and don't bust the rules anywhere along the line, oppose everything right way to, you'll never have any trouble at all. It'll go off with perfect frequency.

But where you've done something wrong way to, you've left one of the items rocket reading like mad and there's no telling exactly what's – what's what. It doesn't mean that the rules of listing are now disobeyed. They're not. You do the same rules of listing. But it means that you start finding terminals which have no apparent oppterm, and you start doing a line plot that has holes in it. And then you will come down from the top of a line plot, and all of a sudden, as you're finishing up the case, you think, you'll find out you've been going backwards up the line plot to join what you had already found, and then you are left out on a limb because it all joins and you have nothing left to oppose. Well, then you go over your line plot, find something firing, oppose that thing, properly again, and it'll put you in business again and
then you start down the line plot. That's because somebody has got the line plot all jammed up.

The way to do it is to do it right in the first place. Now, it is, however, easy to do wrong. Very easy. All you've got to do is – well, aside from such crimes as faking a read, you know, saying you saw something and didn't, or losing an item which is actually on the list, and you know, I speak of these as corny errors, see. Just corny. Aside from that I'm talking about a proper and valid error. The biggest stumbling block in R3, the one that you'll have most trouble with now, is differentiating between a terminal and an oppterm. And that's the most trouble you're going to have.

We used to have a rule by which, before we said the list was complete and stopped listing, we read the source item. Do you remember that rule? Well, you'd better invoke that rule. And every time you want to know if the list is complete, you read the question of the list back to the pc and then read the item the list is proceeding from.

Let's say we're getting a list "Who or what would oppose a will-o'-the-wisp?" Well, before we hand the pc any items or consider our list complete or do anything else that-a-way, we had better read the "Who or what would oppose a will-o'-the-wisp," and "will-o'-the-wisp." I'm not saying you've got to drill them and all that sort of thing. If it's got a little dirty read on it, you continue your list, you understand? And you will be in lots less trouble if you start that type of thing. And if after you've listed it a considerable distance, and you've listed it to a flat TA, and you read it and it rocket reads, that list is wrong way to, so you just abandon it. Don't do a thing with it. Because it'll upset the frequency of the GPM if you throw the item into relief. And quickly list it right way to and you'll be much better off.

Pc ARC breaks, go back on the other list and give him an item off of it. But the point I'm making is, is you should test the item that you are listing down. And if it rocket reads, it's – after you've more or less completed the list – you know very well that it was backwards. So don't monkey with it, just turn around and list it the other way quick. And if it does a little dirty read, why, you continue it.

Now look, that you get a dirty read on an item is significant. It means something very definite. It means that the list is not complete. You got that? I mean, that – that's the long and short of it. But that it is clean is not a test. Do you understand, the reverse is not true. Just because you get a clean needle you don't – you don't have a test. It's not a valid test. Just because you get a clean needle doesn't mean in R2 or R3 today that your list is complete. It simply means that the test of 50 items on a source list, for both R2 and R3, and 25 items on a – an opposed RI list in R3, no tone arm action, tone arm action ceased and you listed 25, about 5 deep into the 25, you had a rocket read so you promptly started in and counted 25 from that rocket read. In other words you had to add 5 to your count. Make sure, always, that you have 25 beyond that R/S, the last R/S or last RR, or in R2-12, 50.

And read the item that you're listing from. Read that item. And if that's got a dirty read, continue your list and start testing against that. Now, you know very well that you will get a complete list. And if it rocket reads like crazy, after you ostensibly have completed the list and before you've given the pc anything, if the item you're proceeding from still rocket reads, naw! Naw, you've got a wrong way to oppose. So oppose it the other way quick like a
bunny. And if it doesn't work the other way, well, I guess you better assume that the list – the item you got the list from, or something crazy, was all wrong. But you will find out that one way or the other, you will get the charge off of it.

Now, any item in the bank is the pc's item if you can get it to behave like an RI, providing it doesn't come from the representation of a rock slamming item. Let me pound that home. That's very important. Any – any item you find is the pc's item, will fit someplace in his line plot, I don't care how screwy the thing sounds. The only thing that happens here occasionally is after you've listed out the whole GPM, it's all gone free, it's all gone Clear, and then you continue to oppose items, you'll go over into the second goal.

That's inevitable. That happened to me. And the second GPM is much rougher than the first GPM. That's much rougher. Probably has more items in it, much tougher, has more mass on it, and of course you're much better able to – to brush the tide, and you'll find out your pc by that time is behaving much better on the meter, and so you can get through it easily. Actually, it's easier to audit, but more formidable at a glance, than the first GPM. That's worth knowing, that after you get to be a first-goal Clear, why, then you start up the mountains. That's a grim foresight. Actually, it's much easier done on the second GPM than it is on the first one.

Now, what – what are the steps? What are the steps of 3M today? Well, let's go into these very rapidly, and I'm not taking these off of a sheet or anything like that, so I'll just give it to you off the cuff as though I were auditing it.

First thing we'd want to have straightened out on this pc is we want this pc capable of getting an RR and R/S. Well, we depend on 2-12 to hand us that. We want to know if this pc's reading on the meter, and so forth, so that we can tell whether or not there is an RR or an R/S capable on the thing. That's probably more im... less important than I'm giving it stress. That probably is not very important. The thing about it is to find a goal. Well, the old 3GA methods of finding a goal are quite valid, except you don't have to represent the rock slamming item. You can take any R2 material, any oppterm, and so forth, and list goals against it as in 3G.

How do you mean that? Well, "What goal of yours would be an overt against (whatever the oppterm was)," see? You can list "If you were (whatever the oppterm is you choose, that's been still reading like mad), If you were (oppterm), what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?" There are a list of about ten, ten goal categories. Well, that's possible to find a goal with those, and using any of the 2-12 material which you have on a 2-12 line plot.

And it's also possible just to sit down, and taking your meter in hand, taking your meter in hand, just go on and list goals. Just go on and list goals and go on and list goals and go on and list goals and goals and goals and goals, watching for the rocket reads and very carefully putting down anything that rocket reads. You see that? You can just go on and list goals.

On some cases that is not tremendously successful, but those will be cases that you – you can't get an RR on and can't get an R/S on, and so forth. Those cases, however, do respond to this other 3GA Criss Cross method. With a 3GA method of finding the goal, you just do some 2-12 of some kind or another and you get a rock slam turned on on the case and find
one of those oppterms, and then list goals against the oppterm. And you'll wind up with some
goals that rocket read and so forth.

I've seen this, by the way, case after case, I've seen – work out like this so it's a very
good method of finding goals.

Your easiest one is just to list goals. It's the least time – maybe more time consuming
at first glance, but you list all the TA action out, and so forth, and pc, even if his goal's been
found before, will eventually put it down on the list and it'll go pow.

The worst goals to handle are the goals that have been found and been monkeyed up
or been neglected and don't fire anymore, and then you start doing this and that. So always go
over the pc's old goals. Use the beginning steps, in other words, of R3-21. Go over the pc's
old goals, look these things over, see what you've got.

But don't depend on a big mid rud Prepcheck to turn on a goal. Don't depend on that to
give you a rocket read. Because frankly, it won't always do it. In fact, there – I've seen goals
around that have been listed and so forth. The big mid ruds are run on it like mad, and what
did we have left? We had a no-firing goal. And then, I have used a method of finding some
items that we're now calling 2-12 and so forth, and then having found some items on the
thing, all of a sudden the old goal turns up and fires. And we've – we've done that several
times.

So there it is. You did the 3GA method of finding the goal, the pc will put his goal, old
goal, back on the list. He always will, and you get to it this time and it goes pssww! And nothing
else on the thing is firing.

Now, the liability is that there are some goals that will rocket read for about an hour
and a half, as long as that. There are some goals, particularly after the pc's goal has been
found, you can get one of these confounded things, and you start tiger drilling it and straighten-
ing it out, or big prepchecking, big mid rud prepchecking it, and the thing fires. And it'll go
on, you'll see several rocket reads on it, and then it expires.

Therefore, don't so much worry about this happening with a goal, just be very, very
chary indeed of proceeding on a goal channel. Be very, very chary of proceeding down the
line on your first goal opplist. And if you don't see any rocket reads on that list – there's no
item can be found on that list, and you see an R/S and you oppose the R/S, along about this
time you better start getting very, very leery of what's going on. If you don't get a rocket read
now, well, there's something wrong with this goal, that's all. I'd get very suspicious of the
goal. I wouldn't carry it too far. I'd start treating it as – don't abandon it – start treating it as a
2-12 subject. You understand? And I'd go ahead and make a four-way package out of the
thing, neat it all up, tie the strings around it very neatly, and go on with my business.

Otherwise, you're going to park the pc right on the track where you found it. The
chances are too, that this can happen – this can happen: You can take a wrong goal that has a
sporadic rocket read, you can list it down on goal oppose, you can find a rocket reading item
and you move right in to the GPM, but it isn't the goal. See, that's a possibility that can hap-
pen. Well, the thing to do with that, don't interfere with it, you're getting along, you've got
spiral staircase and so forth, the pc will start nattering about is it his goal. Well, let the pc give
you a few goals that it might be. And you're liable to find that – not just liable to find, I mean, I haven't seen this happen, I'm just saying it's a possibility; the pc actually has a different goal than the one he started in on.

In other words, you just used this goal, and you found an RI, and you started down the spiral staircase, and then the pc is nattery and unhappy about the goal and so forth. Let him give you a short goals list of what he thinks the goal really is. And you're liable to find that you're – you were offbeat with this goal. That's a possibility. That's only when the pc starts nattering and says, "It isn't my goal and I don't know anything about it."

Now, you start running too many RIs without the pc's goal, and you get an unhappy pc. He can't handle these things. You always want to equate the RR... RI on 3M against the pc's goal.

You say, "Well, does this have anything to do with your goal 'to catch catfish'?" You see? You find "a milliner." "Does this have anything to do with your goal to 'catch catfish'?"

And he says, "Oh, hm, no. Uh-uh."

If that sort of thing keeps up, you'd better do a little goals list and find out where the devil you're sitting. Because it might not be the pc's goal that you're running, you see? You might have something that led you into the GPM but isn't the pc's goal. That's a faint possibility.

Your usual response is, you get something like "milliner," and the pc's goal is "to be a bird," you know? And you say, "All right, does this have anything" – you always ask him this about an RI, and you say, "Does this have anything to do with your goal?"

"Oh, I don't know. Oh, well, hell, yes! Hell yes, hell yes. You look at these women's hats, and these big peacock feathers, and so forth, yes! Yes! Definitely an oppterm. Oh, they're terrible people, milliners. Terrible people. They pull out your tail, and so forth."

He'll cognite, see. Always give the pc the chance to orient that RI against this goal. Don't pester him with it, just call it to his attention. And then you always give a pc a chance by saying, "Would the item" – you've just found a terminal, you see – "Would an item 'game warden' oppose the item we've just found, 'fisherman'?"

And the pc says, "Yes, yes, yes, oh yes, yes, hmm."

In other words, does the item have anything to do with his goal and does it oppose or couple up with the package that you're finding? And you ask the pc to do this and he'll blow a lot of mass and so forth. It's coaxing a pc to look at it, don't you see? Sometimes a pc doesn't. Pc says, "Oh, that's marvelous. Millinery. Yeah, that's fine." And you go on down the line, and the pc is just not really in as high a tone as he could be in. So call his attention to the packaging, ask him, you know, "Does it oppose," or "Is it opposed by," and call his attention, "Does it have anything to do with the goal?"

There's, those – there's... are your provisos. But as far as steps are concerned, the ordinary step, not looking for trouble, we just take somebody in off the street and we list goals on the meter and list goals on the meter and goals on the meter and goals on the meter and goals
on the meter, and then we get a rocket read every once in a while and we mark down the rocket read, and we keep listing goals, listing goals, and we mark these things down.

Then we go back, when we've got the tone arm action out, and we check these rocket reads, one after the other, and we're going to find out one of them fires like mad, and we prove this thing out and we're all set. Let's say we've done that, see? All right, we've got a goal now that rocket reads, we get it checked out by somebody and everybody agrees that this thing rocket reads and so forth. And we now list it on goal oppose.

Now, we've got to sort out with the pc – is whether or not it's "Who or what would somebody or something with the goal to catch catfish...," or is it "Who or what would the goal to catch catfish...," or "Who or what would to catch catfish oppose?" See? We've got to sort that out. One of these things you'll find reading, if you care to take a little summary and the – possibly there are other wordings, such as "catching catfish," "Who or what would catching catfish oppose?" You take such readings and you check them off. Do a little assessment on them, you see, and one of them reads nicely, and the others don't. Well, that's what you list.

And you've got to clear the command with the pc. The pc sometimes will not be able to answer one and so therefore he will protest it, and you get your read on protest and so forth, and you're all messed up before you begin. No, you've got to clear a command with the pc. Please clear it intelligently but also clear it on the meter. Because pcs go on a hard sell sometimes, and give you a bum steer.

Now, we list this thing, and we list it down to a still TA, unless the pc is jumping around, and so forth. And if we've got too much jump-around and we can't tell what a still TA is, and we have a large argument about whether or not there can be a still TA, and all of that. Well, the thing to do with all of this is to take it beyond the last RR or R/S. Whichever it is, it's the last RR or R/S, see? It's a... there's the last read on the list, big read, is an R/S, we take it 50 beyond that R/S, see, and it also must be 50. That's not in addition to that 50, but it's also 50 from the stillness of the TA. But if we can't even tell if the TA is still or not and it's all kind of gluey and the pc is doing this and that and he's running Havingness on himself while eating striped candy or something, you know, I mean, there could be reasons why the TA isn't motionless. We still only continue that far – 50 beyond.

And that's for R3M, that also is to – true of R2, when we're listing stuff. Fifty beyond that item.

Listen; don't you go on overlisting endlessly till the pc goes black, purple, green and pink, you understand? Because that's – that's just being 1.1, see? Just knock that off because there's no sense in it. The time to extend the list is this next step.

Now, we go back and we test this thing. We say – we got 50 beyond this. Now, we don't do anything with the pc, see, we just say to the pc, "Who or what would catching catfish oppose?", whatever it was, see? And it goes tick, dirty read. And we're not sure, so maybe we drill it for a moment or two. "On this has anything been suppressed? Invalidated?" and so on. Rapidly, though, rapidly, lightly, you know, not the rest of the day and next week and next month and next August, you know. I mean, this is a three-minute operation, see, at the most, absolute outside.
And we find out the confounded thing still has got a dirty read on it. All right, that's fine. Let's continue our list. And you'll find out you're going to get a new R/S, or you're going to get a new RR, see? And then go 50 beyond that and test this thing again. And this time you're beyond it, the thing isn't reading, everything is fine.

Now, the hell of it is, the read can be any one of the RRs on that list. You don't pay any attention to the R/Ses. If there were RRs on it... Mind you now, you can have a goal oppose list with a perfectly valid goal which has no RRs on it. You know, it has nothing but R/Ses on it. But you test that, and you test every one of those RRs, every one of those R/Ses.

Now, if you don't find it – bang, then you go on this over and under, see? You read the next one above and the next one below each R/S or RR. And the next one above, the next one below, the next one above, the next one below. You understand? And you're going to find that item.

And you get that item, it could be an R/S. You put in the big mid ruds properly, it'll probably RR. But you remember your goal is fresh, your goal isn't firing well, it hasn't been unburdened very much, so don't expect too much of it. If you can't get it to fire, RR, you still determine whether or not this item you have found off that source list is a terminal or oppterm, and you now oppose it accordingly.

You understand, it can be an R/S or an RR, because there won't be two R/Ses or an R/S and an RR, or two RRs firing on that list. If there are, the list is not complete. Simple. So you complete the list.

Now, you've gotten this item, that is the pc's first RI. And don't keep mucking around with it and deciding it's this and deciding it's that and taking a week to find it out. It takes me about five minutes, so you better take no longer than ten, you hear me? I'm getting cross, actually, about this. I really am, I'm getting cross, because I tell you, man, it doesn't take a week, it doesn't take a session to find out if it's somebody's item, you know? That's just corny. Because you're going to kill the item. The pc gets so damned tired of this, he goes on a protest, you actually can't get anything to read at all, see? That's just monkeying.

Look; if you were listing well – if you were listing well, reading down across your meter, with this alongside of your meter like I was showing you last night, you know, put that paper alongside of the meter and get your eye so it goes right straight down across the meter face to the paper and keep shoving the paper forward with your other paw as you write, and with your sensitivity down here at about 4, you're going to see all the RRs and R/Ses you want to see. And those things should be clearly marked on your paper and they should be legible.

Now, you've got those things, they're clearly marked RRs or R/Ses, it's a very, very fast job to go back over and just read off each one of those. That's a source list you do this with. Just read off each one of those things, bang-bang- bang-bang-bang, on down the line. The chances are if you have any degree of accuracy in listing at all, you're going to find it just now, bang. You say, bang, that's it. You've read several more, they didn't read, so it's the only one that's doing it on the list, well, bang, that's it. You understand? I mean, there isn't any reason now to fool with it. What are you going to do with it? Paint a wall with it or something?
No. All you're going to do is ask the pc if – what his goal would have to do with it or some-
thing like that and there it is. You got your item.

Now, what's – what's the matter with you? Haven't you got some new paper or some-
thing, you can put a new sheet of paper under there, and get all ready with your RI list – see?
Stop wasting time. Do you know that you can find in a – five and a half hours of auditing, do
you know that you can find R... nine RIs off a goal? Nine! That's not one a week. That's not
one every fifteen hours of auditing. You understand? And it is all in the speed with which you
do it.

Now, look, the more competence you have, the more speed you operate with, the more
positive you are in what you do, the better you know what's doing, the less nonsense and time
you're going to spend. Also, on those sessions where you've made a gruesome error, you're
going to waste the whole session. So it's worth time not to make gruesome errors. But what do
you mean by time? Well, take time to test the thing, in other words; that doesn't mean drill
forever.

Some of you people are getting in Tiger Drill and then big mid ruds, and then Prep-
check, and so forth. All for what? The thing is reading like crazy; all of a sudden it doesn't
read any more. Why? It wasn't the item that wore out, it was the pc. Now, you go right on
down the line, here. And let's get going on this, man, you haven't got forever. It takes 31 hours
to clear the first goal. I'll let you have 50. That – that's right. It doesn't take any longer than
that. Do you realize that if a goal is found out here on Monday, the guy ought to be his first-
goal Clear two weeks later? Well, where's the – where's the thing going? I mean, where are
you losing your time? You're losing your time by goofing, and you're losing your time by just
plain foolishness. Monkey business, all the wa y along the line. You've got the thing firing,
you've got everything going, just keep on listing, man, keep on listing. Take those things, get
the next one. Get... take that, get the next one. And just not get so sloppy. Let's not go – this,
"Well, the TA moved a hundredth of an inch, and so forth, when the pc coughed, so therefore
we have to list 20 more pages..."

Who are you trying to prove wrong, huh? Now, you just adhere to this other rule and
just get your 50, test the item to see if it still dirty reads and don't continue it if it doesn't read.
And you'll get those items. And get them! And then start opposing them. All right, what's
your next step here? You just start opposing. You have to decide whether the thing is a termi-
nal or oppterm. Well, there are many tests by which you do this, amongst these things, and
I'm not going to go over these tests because these things are very lengthy to list, the number of
ways you can tell. But look-a-here: you read it, you read the list question. Forget "consider
overts" and "commit overts," and that sort of thing, forget that. Just read the list question:
"Who or what would oppose a catfish? Who or what would a catfish oppose?" see? And it's
going to read better one way than the other.

That's still not a complete guarantee but it gives you an awful good indicator. It reads
like mad, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" Therefore the chances are the thing's a ter-
minal, you see? It just – it's just the chances are the thing is a terminal.

Now, when you start listing, when you start listing this thing, "Who or what would a
catfish oppose," the pc says, "Hey, mass is pulling in on me." Take a look at the pc. You
know, the pc – I'll show you where the pc is. The pc's across the table from you. And you can find him, and you can look at his face. See, you can take your face up off the meter.

Now, the pc... an auditor will sometimes say, "Well, I'm so busy writing, I'm so busy writing, I haven't got any time to look at the pc, I keep watching the meter." Well, I don't know, my pcs are usually in control, and I say, "Well, that's good, thank you, thank you," and the pc... guy sort of slows down, and you can sometimes smell his brakes smoking. But I say, "I want to take a look at you, and see how it's all right, how's it going?"

"Well, it's going all right," and so on.

"Anything happening there?"

"Everything's going along fine."

Take a look at the shadows underneath his eyes. Are they darkening? Does the pc look worse and so forth? All right. So, you say, "Well, you'll interrupt the pc and you'll interrupt his listing." Sure, he kicks. Who cares about a pc kicking?

"Yes, aw, I... you just threw me off! I had some wonderful ideas."

You say, "All right, I'm awful sorry, yes, yes."

Actually, I'd rather throw a pc off than list him reverse way to. What is the record around here? Eight hundred seventy-five pages beyond the last R/S? I – beyond doing something stupid and corny, see, I would rather stop the pc and actually put him in-session and start and stop him in session. You understand now? That's the best thing to do, is be careful.

Now, the fact that you had a satisfactory answer still is no test that it was absolutely right. After you've gone down here a page or so, you ask the pc the question, "Who or what would oppose catfish?" Or "a catfish oppose?" And you see this thing, it goes ppsww! "Ha-ha-ha-ha-wha-wha-what the hell? What the hell? What's this? What's this? What's this? You mean you've listed a couple of pages and this thing is still firing?" We'd better ask the pc some searching questions as to what this is all about and turn around and list it the other way for a while and find out if that fire disappears. It might. You might have had it right the first time. But don't take chances on these backwards lists, you understand?

All right, so we take that, we go twenty-five items beyond our last RR or R/S. You'll see there's – it's twenty-five, no tone arm action and so forth. There it is, read that item, read the list question again, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" Dirty needle – continue the list. And then you read it again, aw, it's a dirty needle, you say, "Are you protesting this?" and the pc says, "No, I'm really not protesting this, Christ-almighty, I... rrrrr."

Well, use your head. He's probably protesting it so give it the big mid ruds. Now it doesn't read. And you say, "Fine, that's all right, that's the end of the list." All right, read him the last R/Sing item, read him the next to the last rocket reading item, and then read him the last rocket reading item on the list. Bang! It should fire, just like that – bang! And you say, "All right, that is your item."

Now, don't do anything else at that point. Just look at the pc. But if it doesn't fire, if it doesn't fire, go the over and under. Read the one above and the one below. And if they don't fire, read the one above those and the one below those. And I don't mean the one RR above it
or the RR below it, I mean exclusively and extensively just the item above it, because you might not have got it on the same one.

The furthest away I've seen one is 3 below. In other words, the pc had it in mind all the time he was listing the other three, see. And it's the furthest away I've seen one of these things occur.

All right, there's your – there's your item. You say, "All right, that's your item. It fired." Well, you know the others didn't fire, you say, "That's your item, that fires, that's fine." You say, "All right."

Now, don't do anything. The pc sits there and he thinks so and so on bwa, bwi, gaa, wuudrup, he says, "Yeah, yeah, well, yeah, yeah, yeah, fishhook. Ha-ha! It sure would oppose a catfish!"

You say, "All right, that's good. Now, what's that have to do with your goal?"

"Oh, uh-huh, well, what – you kidding? You kidding? That one has a lot to do with the goal," and so on.

And you say, "All right, that's good. Now, would a catfish oppose a fishhook?"

"Oh, yes! Yes! Oh, boy! Sure would oppose a fishhook!"

And you say, "Well, that is all fine. All right. Now, we're going to take fishhook, and here we go!" see? We're going to take fishhook, we're going to establish by test whether or not it's a terminal or oppterm to the best of our ability, and then we're going to write it down there, and we're going to find out that it happened to be, oddly enough, because we had the bank fairly straight, it's... was an oppterm. "Who or what would oppose a fishhook?" and so on, and here we are right back in the run again.

Does that sound like a two or three hour, next session, "We will take it up two or three days later?" Well, in this particular case I know you've got to get it checked up by an Instructor. That's all right. But it isn't going to take him any time to. All you've got to say is "fishhook," and it goes pssww! And you say, "Oh, boy, that's – that's right. All right, let's get back in there and get right to it again, and let's find another item."

Now, actually, the further you go, these lists tend to get shorter. The rocket reads appear earlier on them. And they get shorter and shorter and shorter. And the shortest they'll get, however, is about two and a half column pages. You won't see a list get much shorter than that. If they start getting shorter than that, why, you want to be kind of suspicious.

Now, the pc says, "Oh, well, my item is something else. I cognited on it, because actually it wouldn't be a fishhook."

You – just think to yourself, "Well, he would... I'd hate to have to confront a fishhook, too. It read on the meter, it's his item, and that's it."

And he says, "Well, actually, actually it's a fish market. It's a fish market. It's a fish market. I know, I've cognited on it," and so forth and so on.

You say, "Good, I'm awfully glad of that, I'm awfully glad of that."
But take this in point: He starts protesting items and saying they aren't it, then you've done something on a reverse oppose someplace or another, and you say, "Well, all right. All right. Catfish doesn't oppose a fishhook in this particular way, all right. You still have this item RI for a fishhook, that's still a valid item, and there it is, and we'll find out something else that opposes a catfish some other time. But we've still got this item, and we'll come back and we'll adjust that on the line plot. Now, that's very fine. Now, who or what would oppose a fishhook?" and here we go again. You understand? This is the way you do this thing.

Now, when the pc gets down along the line, he says -- he'll start... may start telling you, "Geez, you know, this is awful fundamental. This is awful fundamental."

And you better keep check by reading that goal every once in a while. You'll find out the goal goes through the cycle I described to you before. You'd better read that goal once in a while. That's the thing to do. See if it fires, and actually, a goal ought to fire better and better and better, and items ought to fire better and better and better, if you're just doing nothing but R3. You know, no mid ruds, nothing. It just fires better and better and better, you know, if it all is going well.

And all of a sudden it's fire-fire-fire-fire, and boom-boom-boom, and you - the goal sort of goes, and so forth -- and you find an item or two more, and all of a sudden the pc says, "Well, gee, that's it. That's it. To be a catfish, the first item's a catfish. There it is."

And you know, he opposes water, and that's it. And you check it up, and you check it up, and so forth, and you do a little Prepcheck on the goal, and -- a little one -- and you all of a sudden see you're sitting there with a free needle, go test all of your items, make sure that they are all straight, and you've got the line plotted, and you've got a first-goal Clear.

And it works the same way for the second goal, there's no difference in the operation. Well, that's the way you do it. That's the way you do it. And the more nonsense you put into it, and the more goofs you put into it, and the more figure-figure you put into it, and the more you try to be absolutely sure even though the pc is screaming and protesting and you've already gone 175 items beyond the last RR or R/S, and so forth, and pc has turned black, but you've got to be sure because somebody said the tone arm action is out, and imagine your embarrassment when you find out that it's because the knob is loose!

Now, that -- stop trying to think yourself to death! Listen. Let's just quit it! Quit it! And then just sit down and do it, huh? That's the thing, you know, I -- every time I turn around and see any trouble, some auditor's got it all figured out -- all figured out wrong. And they say, "Well, it really couldn't be his item, you see, he's not really an Indian." And they just never let him have this item "Indian" and so forth.

In other words, they aren't addressing the pure mechanics of the situation, pow-pow-pow-pow-pow. Well, the mechanics will get you through. Now, sometimes you can tell by certain indicators, like all the baddies are opp terms and all the goodies are terms. Bull! Never happened to anybody in the history of the universe. They've been bad and they've been good. And you see some disproportionate thing like this occurring, and you say something's wrong with this line plot. Or supposing everything that he puts down ends in "pad." Well, there isn't that much constancy on the line plot, that's all. "A burmapad, a catapad, a matapad, a bootapad, so forth." You say, "You know, there must be something wrong with this line plot
because I can't understand it." Well, the thing to do with it when you can't understand it is read all these items back and see if one rocket reads. One rocket reads like mad, it's been op-posed wrong way to, and there you are, oppose it right way to, and the case will get underway again. You've always got the trick of goal oppose.

Well now, as rough as I sound, as rough as I sound on that, my insistence and my roughness is only in the direction of trying to pound through one simple set of facts. They are mechanical facts. This is a very rapid technique. This is a rapid technique. This is not one that you find a rocket reading item once every two weeks and that's enough. You understand? That's because – I don't know how you do that. It's rapid, and you get there fastest if you do it the mostest.

Now, if you really don't understand what you're doing, don't go anyplace. And most of your difficulties and the longevity of time that you're putting in on this is because you're doing when you should be sitting back wondering what the hell you're doing. And you say, "Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. We've gone fifty, we've gone seventy-five, and this item up here is still reading. As a matter of fact it started out with a quarter of an inch rocket read and it's now got half-a-dial rocket read. And we've opposed it, and yet it's still got its firing on it. What do I do?"

Well, let me tell you, the wrong thing to do is to go on auditing. You hear me? That's the wrong thing. Trying to look good and that sort of thing. Give the pc a break! Go on outside and lean against the wall and smoke a cigarette or take a chew of tobacco if you're a lady. And think of this thing, "What the hell, now, what the hell, it's still rocket reading, and I've gone this far," and so forth.

And all of a sudden the lightning will strike. "My God, I've done it backwards!" And you go back in, and you say to the pc – now, don't let the – don't let the grass grow underneath your feet, you see. Now, let's do. Now, we know. Let's do and let's keep on doing unless all of a sudden this isn't working. The thing to do then is to give the pc a break, and go on outside and lean up against the wall and take a chew of tobacco and think it over again, you understand? "Now, what the hell's happened?"

Don't you sit in there trying to make do with the pc and trying to look interesting and interested to the pc, and so on, andreviling him and racking it up, because you don't know what you're doing and so forth, and what are these pieces of paper, and... Nothing drives a pc crazier, man. If you've got to shuffle paper, send him someplace else. You've got to redo his line plot because it's all wrong, don't sit across the table from him, redoing a lot of line plot, and so on, redoing all this line plot, and crossing it all out, and so forth, and saying, "Well, let's see, this item Dharmapad, I don't think that item ever existed, let's see, now, this one was wrong, oh God."

No, let him have a break. Because the next thing you know, he just becomes very very confused. Those are his items you're monkeying with, and that's what's made him crazy for a long time. So there he is. So give him a – give him a break. You figure it out, you do it, you do it accurately, and if you all of a sudden realize that it's not going right, don't keep on making a good show of it, but get rid of the pc or take a break or something like that, and figure out what the hell is going wrong.
And you'll find out that you'll be very speedy. This is very fast. This is a very fast way to approach things. The way to lose time is to go on and do something wrong because you don't know what you're doing, and you're not sure, and you keep on and make a bluff, and you keep on plunging, and you keep on plunging and you keep on getting things wrong. And the next thing you know, well, it just gets down to a point of where it's four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten weeks go by and you're still wrong all because you went on doing when you should have been out there taking a chew of tobacco.

Now, there's how to handle this technique, that's the kind of a technique it is and that's going to make Clears. And there's no sense in sitting around saying, "Well, it isn't going to make Clears, in my hands," or "It isn't that – and Ron is wrong." Because you'll never be able to convince me. You know, so you might as well, might as well just stop trying and succumb to the thing, because I have, you know? I've said, "Well, that's it. That's it." And I've got awful good subjective reality on this. I've got, maybe, about four items to go out of about, I don't know, there are about fifty items in this, this second GPM, and I've got about four to go. This goal's about ready to blow.

So, I say, you're never going to convince me, so you might as well stop making these mistakes because they're not impressed at all. So just go on and do it right, make some Clears, get going, because you're needed out in the field and you're needed Clear and you're needed so that you can clear. So let's just – let's wind it up and put it on a high whine, and start flying, huh? Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.
R3M:
Current Rundown By Steps

A lecture given on 26 February 1963

Well, how are you tonight? This, I think, is the 26th of February, AD 13. And Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture.

[part missing]

All right. The subject of this subject matter is very important to you. We've always had very precise technology, leaving as little as possible to chance in processing. But frankly, with the advent of Routine 3M, you move into a new level of precision. This is the type of a precision that if you don't do it, you get involved more than you possibly could imagine. All you've got to do is do this wrong and it is no longer precise.

Therefore, don't go plowing ahead with it until you can do it right. The other part of it is, is of course if you don't do it, you won't learn how to do it. There's the old gag, you know, about "My little boy Jimmy can't go swimming till he learns how." And I'm afraid that's the case here.

Well, the place to learn listing is in 2-12. And the place to learn auditing is in an Academy. And the place to learn the finishing touches of auditing is the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Once you've been over those jumps, why, you should be able to do 3M without too much trouble.

But in actual fact, Routine 3M is going to be done on an awful lot of people and by an awful lot of people and that means that you are going to be involved, actually, in straightening out a lot of cases. So, all you have to know to straighten out a case, in actual fact, is where wasn't Routine 3M done?

Now, right now I sympathize with you. You've been doing Routine 3M up until this time without an immediate step rundown of Routine 3M. And that's arduous. That's probably very difficult. Probably nothing more difficult than picking your information from several different bulletins and sources.

The rules of 12A, as far as listing are concerned, apply to Routine 3M and all the material has already been released. It has not, however, been assembled with tremendous precision until this exact moment. And we have HCO Bulletin of 22 February AD 13, which is "Routine 3M, Brief Rundown by Steps," as the first actual bulletin of this. This'll be in your hands shortly. But the... you notice that 23 February – well that's... pardon me, 22 February, you notice that that is a few days ago. This is the 26th. And it seldom takes me that long to write a bulletin. But in this particular case I've been going over this thing and throwing away all of the nonessentials.
You'll be quite interested how very simple, in actual fact, that Routine 3M turns out to be. It is only your idea of how complicated you ought to get that will keep you from doing 3M. In actual fact, the more figure-figure you do and the more figuring you do and the more worry-worry and this sort of thing you do, the less 3M you're going to get done.

3M will not compromise with the exact precise following of its steps. There's no compromise for this and when you don't follow its steps, you start to worry.

Now, 3M is a very rapid process and the only time that you'll find that it becomes a lengthy process is when you have not done it. And when you haven't done it, it will become very lengthy. I have already seen a whole session devoted to straightening up one goof; where in actual fact you should have been able – in that session – you should have... the auditor should have been able to find 3 or 4 RIs, actually, the whole session was just burned up with one goof. Didn't do what it was supposed to have done and then therefore it was worry, goof, upset and so forth.

Well, the way not to worry with this – because worry is something that will go along with this – the way not to worry with this, is to know it. And you do have these steps on HCOB 22 February, and there will be much more information out on this. But in actual fact I'd like to impress upon you that most of this other information is just in the line of keeping you from worrying.

I'll give you a piece of information that isn't in this bulletin so you can get the level of magnitude: Although the pc has represented a rocket reading item while listing – although the pc has done this, the appearance still of two rocket reading items on the list, or two R/Sing items on the list, means the list is incomplete.

Now, that's something you might worry about. Don't you see? You say, "Well, there's 'a big bad man' and 'a very terrible man.'" And the pc is trying to get across a concept there. And when it was listed, why, "a big bad man" read, and then immediately "a very terrible man," it also rocket read, and it's quite obvious there that he had the concept of a vicious being and he has given two titles to it.

Now, you go back to nulling. See, that's all right – two rocket reads – all the rocket reads you want on listing, you... that you see going down on your meter. I mean, that's the point.

But now you're nulling. Now you come to this item, "a big bad man," and it goes psheew! – rocket reads. And then you check it, "terrible man." You see, that was the next-to-the-last item. They lay both together. The next-to-the-last rocket reading item; you read that, it goes psheew! And then you get your next item, "a very terrible man," and you say, "Well, there's something wrong here."

But of course, that actually is a represent of one for the other. So you say to yourself, "Well, it's all right." So you read "a very terrible man" and it goes psheew! And the pc says, "Well, they're both the same item." And you buy this. You'll notice that it is a variation and a difference from your bulletin. It says there mustn't be two rocket reading items on the list.

Now, I've actually seen this, and I've actually tested it, and if two variations of the same item read, the list is incomplete. In other words, the rule does not get jumped. The only
thing that gets jumped there is you figure – you figure yourself into a hole. Well, actually, there aren't any of these figure-figures to be done. And that's one of the first things I'd like to impress on you: there aren't any to be done.

You say, "All right. Well, he said 'a big bad man,' and then, of course, he had this concept of this person. He said 'a very terrible man.' So therefore if he said 'a big bad man,' and then 'a very terrible man,' they, of course, would both rocket read. And when I read these two, then that, of course, is an exception to the rule." No, it isn't. It isn't an exception to the rule.

See, that's how – how bound in concrete this is. And that's why I made my opening remarks – you've been used to precision, but you've been used to exceptions to the rule. And there aren't any exceptions to these rules.

Something very fantastic has happened here. We actually have the total anatomy of the GPM. We have its frequency. We know what it's supposed to do, and what it – what it isn't supposed to do. And Routine 3M just parallels it, just like that. Goes right straight down. If it doesn't work just like that, you've goofed. That's all. You've done something in 3M that is wrong. And you go back and you look at it. You'll find out what it is. You didn't take the tone arm action out of the list, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" That's all. And there was wild tone arm action there, and you didn't complete the list, and you go over the list, and you find that the third rocket reading item from the end is the item. And it goes psheww! And it was the third from the end.

Well, that's a variation from the rules. And you say, "Well, I got a rocket reading item, so I went ahead and used it." And then you find out about two items later the whole basket folds up. That's it. It's gone. You haven't got any rocket reading RIs. And you list the list and nothing reads and you extend the list and nothing reads. And you sweat and swear and go into nervous prostration and have to get processed for ulcers, and what have you got? Well, you just haven't done it by the rules, so the rules don't apply. In fact, nothing applies.

In fact, it's a case of why did you ever get up that morning.? Because you actually will spend now... The time spent on 3M is when you haven't done it right. And then you will find, "Well, this week we'll try to get the pc straightened out. And we will prepcheck, and we will do this and that, and we will do another big goals oppose, and we will do this. And the pc is still ARC broke and we can't get anything much to read. Let's do something new. Yeah, let's – let's now find another goal. Let – let's go back to 2-12. Let – let's do something else, something new. Let – let's be wonderful. Let's invent something new. Let's – let's run him on O/W on a mouse. We had a mouse at some time."

No, that's the way not to do it. No, you just go back and you find out where 3M jumped the rails. And you pick it up at that point and you put it back on the rails. And it then will run.

And the only thing that happens is the frequency of the bank gets upset, whereas your twenty-five item plus, see, doesn't work. Every now and then from here on through that particular GPM – it'll fortunately only last that one GPM – you will confidently complete a list to twenty-five items beyond the last RR or R/S, and no TA action, you get it all complete. And you read the last rock slamming item. You read the next to the last rocket reading item. You
read the rocket reading item, *huh*, and it doesn't fire. And you read the one above it and it doesn't fire and you read the one below it and it doesn't fire. "Oh, my God, what have I done?"

Well, don't blow your brains out. You made a mistake someplace up the line, earlier, which you have corrected. But now, the frequency is thrown out and your whole action, as it tells you in this bulletin – when that sort of thing happens, you go back and make sure that something wasn't opposed backwards. That's your first step. And make sure that it wasn't the item above it and the item below it and two above it and two below it – that's item, not rocket reading item – make sure that you didn't goof there. Make sure it doesn't exist on there between that one that didn't read that was supposed to and the end of the list.

You can do all those things, but there's a test that gets you out of this. Read the item you're listing from. And if it gives the faintest tick, your list is not complete. It's all taken care of in here if you just do it right.

You get the idea? You get the idea? That's the only thing that'll happen. It won't upset the frequency of the bank to the point where it's no longer the last rocket reading item, you know? It's – always goes on being the last rocket reading item that you saw while listing. It's just that it shook things up and the pc now has to list further. You don't now add fifty on it or something stupid like that. You just have to cope with this. In other words, that's the only thing that goes wrong.

Another rule – another rule that goes throughout this – it's also stated in this bulletin – is when you've got your hands on an RI, you keep going. If you've got an RI you keep going. Now, strangely enough, that doesn't mean an RI that came from a list where five RIs came from. You understand? That means an actual RI gotten by the rules.

You've got this thing firing. I don't care whether it was goals oppose or otherwise. You've got this thing going. You've got it going. Well, there it is, it came up properly, it checks out, it gives you a nice rocket read, *bang*. Use it. As long as you've got one of those things, don't go getting one from the goal. You understand?

Now, you know what happens? You've got a beautiful RI and it goes *Psheww* every time. And you say, "Well, I don't know. I just don't know. It just came up a terminal when it should have come up an oppterm," and figure-figure yourself to death, see? You've already goofed someplace or another, and you upset the frequency of the bank. The other thing that upsets when you get the frequency is you sometimes start getting terminals when you should get oppterms, and so forth. That doesn't matter. You just go on and test them and use them.

Each RI that comes up can be a terminal or an oppterm, you always have to test it. It isn't how it was listed, it was how it tested. Always.

So, you say, "Well, that – that isn't so good." As a matter of fact, I got a cable this morning from somebody who just left here. And he got out to a very far place and he sent me a cable this morning. And he said, "I have just done a goals oppose list on a certain pc and the goals oppose list came out and the rocket read was only a half an inch long, so I think it's best that I go back and do another goals oppose list." Well, you know what he'll get from a new goals – that old goals oppose list if he does another one? He may or may not get the one that comes up next. He will get a fundamental and you probably could do goals oppose and get the
item and the next goals oppose and get the next item and another goals oppose and get the
next item and another goals oppose and get... But how tough do you want to make it?

Because, you see, the item can appear anywhere on a goals oppose list, and only ap-
pears as the last rocket reading item on an RI list. Goals oppose lists take longer.

In addition to that, it might not join up. And if it didn't join up, *huh-huh-huh-huh*! You're left there with two rocket reading reliable items. Well, now, the best-laid auditors can make themselves sick, gasping and so forth, worrying about all this. The point is, what do you do? Well, I'm afraid you take the biggest rocket read that you can get at any time. You under-
stand? When you make a choice, choose it by the length of the rocket read. You will make these goofs. They will occur. That's sure. What's inexcusable is not knowing when you have goofed and in not doing something about it to straighten it out.

So you do wind up with two RIs. Let's... here's one way to get them. This was done on
me by accident. One way to get two RIs is, you get right down to the end – the goal is "to
catch catfish" – and the last terminal that you get from the pc is "the goal to catch catfish." And the oppterm is "no catfish." And the pc says, "But that's it. That's it." As a matter of fact, if you happen to be looking at your meter, if you had looked at your meter that session, you would see the thing swinging with a free needle. Might only be free for a moment, but it
would have been free. And there it would be, a weird phenomena. A free needle. And he says,
"The goal 'to catch catfish' would oppose catching... 'no catfish.' Yeah, perfect."

You've already gotten about twenty items on this. You see, it's never the first two. You
got about twenty items, the pc says, "That's it, it's blown. It's – everything's disappeared. All
these catfish – can't smell a thing. Everything is beautiful. I mean, I'm... feels wonderful."

And you say, "Well, I'm not sure. Just to make sure, I better oppose this big beautiful
RI. I still have an RI on 'no catfish.'" It's not a mistake. It's not a mistake, because nothing bad
will happen. So you say, "Catfish," and you test it out, and you make it just exactly what it is. And you make it just exactly... It's an oppterm. And you say, "All right. We're going to list
now 'Who or what would oppose cat... who or what would catfish oppose – oppose catfish?'" Excuse me. Nice oppterm. We list this, "Who or what would oppose catfish?" And we go on
down the line, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa.

Pc says, "Some new mass is coming in." Well, look. Doesn't say anything about it in
here, so you just keep going. It's all right, so mass comes in. It's perfectly all right. Do it every
time. "Who or what would oppose catfish?" and "Who or what would oppose no catfish?" is
the right line.

And you land with a – "a horseshoe curve." And you say, "What happened? Horseshoe
curve?" Well, don't worry yourself to death, you've got the basic rule. The fundamental rule is
when you've got an RI, you determine if it's a terminal or an oppterm, and you oppose it. So
you determine this thing, "horseshoe curve." You determine that that happens to be a – it's
another oppterm. And you say, "Who or what would oppose a horseshoe curve?" And you
come up with "a blinking millionaire."

Where the hell are these catfish? Not a fish market in any direction. Pc smells differ-
ent, everything's different. Well, the rules say go on and oppose it, so you say, "A blinking
millionaire. All right." And it happens to be a terminal, so "Who or what would a blinking millionaire oppose?" And it winds up with "the whole wide world."

Boy, you never could have gotten further from catfish and you say to yourself, "Oh, my God. Look what I've done! I mean, I had a free needle. Had a free needle and I didn't prepcheck it. I didn't do anything at all and I didn't straighten it out, and I had a first-goal Clear, and he's gone. And – and now I've got this other thing, and I don't know what it's all about. And I don't know where I've gone and what it's done. And in this bulletin it says – it says – it says – uh ... Well, something in here someplace must cover the thing. Golly. 'When the needle goes free, just tell the pc and keep going, don't bother with a Prepcheck. Just keep doing steps 8 to 13 as long as you can. But realize that you are probably now – you are probably now on a new goal channel. When you have 2 or more RIs, that the pc knows, by step 13 above, do not fit the old goal, do a brief new goals list for an RR goal.' Oh, yeah, well, all right, uh-ha-ha. Hoooh!" You say, "All right..."

The pc's – the pc's been sitting there – and he doesn't know about this, you know – and you say, "What – what – what goal do those fit?" And the pc... this is how fast this takes. This is a ten or fifteen minute step, see. You say, "What goal does that fit?"

And he says, "Oh, to be rich. To have a lot of money. To be broke. To have nothing," – pshseww! – pshseww! pshseww! pshseww! So you take that down, and you right away put it down quick on the auditor's report and go right on with that next RI, you understand? And it's as easy as that. You can just work yourself to death. You can just worry yourself to death with this stuff. It looks terribly complicated.

Look. Don't kid yourself. You do it wrong and not follow this bulletin, you're not only going to worry yourself to death, you're going to cost the pc his next two hundred trillion, see? He's going to slog along in the horrible mess that he's in now. But as far as that's concerned, if you do it right, it's just bang-bang-bang. And don't go – don't go finding things to worry about.

Now, let's examine why, why auditors and even people... You know, by the way – by the way, do you know we had some staff members here the other day, administrative staff members who were trying to rejoin the human race? Can you imagine it? As if they'd have them, you know. Pretty wild. And they said, "In view of the fact that the administrative Scientologist is not a professional auditor, but only a Scientologist, why, I think we ought to be permitted to do a simple process."

You know, I received the shock of my life. That's the first time I ever heard that a Scientologist could exist that wasn't an auditor. A real Scientologist or somebody who had an HPA or an HCA that didn't consider himself capable of handling processes. He wanted a simple process. Well, this is a simple process. This is a very simple process. That's all right. We'll – we'll cut this out of the tape after this lecture, and so forth, so it won't go all over the world. I was ashamed of it myself, you know, I was ashamed of it. I – actually, Prepchecking is difficult compared to this.
Now, look-a-here: A pc has got a bank. First we called it the reactive mind. Then we found the anatomy of this reactive mind; it's the GPM. It's a whole sequence of GPMs which make up ze grande GPM. Each one of those things is fundamentally founded on a goal. And they're a conglomeration of identities which are counter-opposed. And these identities are hung up on the postulate-counter-postulate of a problem, and they're hung up with great delicacy. Actually, they're killing the pc, but they're hung up with great delicacy.

In two hundred trillion years he's had a very finite number of these things hang up. They aren't an infinite number. They're very finite. Some kind of a wild guesstimate of the number of rocket reading reliable items to be found in the first and second goal: seventy – seventy RIs. Wow, that's not very many. But that's because it's only this accidental hang-up that gives him this fantastic charge between one and the other. That's what you're trying to take apart.

I don't care whether you are doing general O/W or the CCHs or Prepchecking or anything else, you're trying to take the charge off of the case. And as long as that charge stays there, that case is going to go wog. And it is simply that charge. It isn't the knowingness of the pc. It isn't how the pc makes up his mind. It isn't the new postulates the pc recovers. It isn't this, it isn't that, it isn't anything. All it is, is get the charge off between those two. What happens? They're carefully balanced, postulate-counter-postulate, action-counter-action, mass-counter-mass. There they are – crush! And they hold this tremendous quantity of mass in suspension.

And you discharge that read between them, by finding them and opposing them, and finding a new one and opposing it, and finding a new one and opposing it. That's the whole action. And this charge will go posheww! And it can no longer maintain itself. It's impossible. It'd take him another two hundred trillion years to stack it up again. And let's hope after he's been a Scientologist he'd be smart enough not to. Let's hope he runs out his overts.

Well, what happens? It's just that mechanism in the bank. Here's a goal and this gives him something to do and he becomes a rrruph to do it. And the rrruph is opposed to this over here. But then this rraah that opposes him over here demands that he become a wikk, and then the wikk, of course, to get on in life, finds itself very involved with a splat. And there we are, bang-bang. It's got a spiral staircase. He lives from one type of identity to the next trying to achieve this goal and trying to get rid of its opposition. That's all he's doing.

Now, look, if you had it on the clock how long it – taken me to make that explanation to you, that is all there is. You understand? Now, out of this comes a fantastic complexity. Fantastic. Out of this we get locks and we get engrams and we get secondaries and we get the emotional Tone Scale and we get this and we get that, and we get the service facsimile and we get everything that we have ever had, out of that mechanism where it pertains to aberration. The other direction – like the Philadelphia Lectures, the examination of a thetan back in 52; postulates, counter – or just postulates, the anatomy of a thetan, as a thetan, just, you know; that's him, what he can do, what he consists of. That's truth. That isn't aberration.

But as far as we've handled mechanisms of aberration, we're still talking about the GPM, and we're just talking about this charge. Item A, item B – rrruh – the charge, one to the other. Oddly enough, you don't have to do a single thing to them. You don't have to run their
withholds off against each other. You don't have to do this, you don't have to do that. All you've got to do is get the charge off it, psheew! There's the charge, when you've got it off the meter and it's listed down, those things can't stay together anymore and you find the pc's no longer interested in them. He cognites and they're gone.

It isn't the cognition that makes them gone; it's the fact that you blew the charge. It's all it is. It's a totally mechanical operation. It's very interesting to the pc. He comes up with all kinds of phenomena.

In fact, an auditor, if he sat and went through the phenomena the pc comes up with, could practically go blahw! He could go mad trying to catch up with these phenomena. Because it's fantastic quantities of phenomena. But what he's trying to do is just get the charge off between item A and item B, item C, item D. Item E opposes item F. Item F is opposed by item G. So on and so on and so on and so on. It's the number of items you get, and they very mechanically surrender. One hundred percent surrender through Routine 3M.

Now, you list a pc too long without finding his goal, and he's going to start getting uncomfortable. He's going to wonder, "What has a blinking millionaire got to do with a horseshoe curve? What does this refer to?" He has no point of referral.

Oddly enough, although it pesters him and it upsets him, you possibly could go fifteen, twenty, thirty items, RI to RI to RI to RI. He'd be more and more upset, you understand, and his mass wouldn't be as-is-ing well and you'd have more trouble with it, without knowing his goal. And all of a sudden he says, Aaaaahh! He says, "To have nothing."

And you say, "What's that?"

"Well, that's the goal. That's – that's the goal of all this – 'to have nothing.'"

So, all right. And you'll see that you have been building a little bit of mass on the tone arm and this will now drop off You're operating without the goal, builds up mass, because if you know the goal, of course it helps as-is the mass.

But what you're into here is an action which is tremendously repetitive in its action. You do this and you do this and you do this. Now, as you – as you look this thing over, you say, "Well, there must be more to it than that." And that's one of your downfalls. No, there isn't more to it than that. There are certain rules of auditing and there are certain best ways to do it and there are some opinions about whether the auditor should smile graciously as he receives an item or smile grimly if he sees an item or not smile. You'll find schools developing along the line, but actually it doesn't matter. So there's a lot of figure-figure here that doesn't matter.

Now, why does an auditor do more than he's called on to do? Well, I'm afraid that he has a tendency, being human, for a while here, a short time... you want to take a last look at being human, by the way. I'd take a good look at being human. I'd go out and be human for a little while. You won't get a chance, very shortly.

And what's he doing? Well, let me tell you a law. The physical universe is built on a games condition and the optimum game in the physical universe is described by exactly these rules: minimum ease of entrance, followed by maximum involvement. That are the two steps
of a game. That's the physical universe idea of a game. That now, that isn't the ideas of a game in Scientology. I'm just telling you how the physical universe treats this thing.

In other words, if you have something that's no trouble to enter, no trouble at all to enter, and you've got – you've got with this "no difficulty of entrance," you've got an immediate involvement, which becomes more and more and more and more involved and there's just no way of getting out of it. And eventually you look around and it's just – we're all locked in here and there's no doors. There's a chicken that they... a guinea hen out in the Midwest that they used to capture because the chicken never looked down. And you could get it to pick corn off the ground right in through a tunnel. And as long as you had a box there that had a hole for them to walk in at the bottom, the guinea hen would never walk back out the hole again because they're just built that way. That's a total MEST universe bird. The bird would just look up after that, and be trapped. And you reach in through the hole and pick out the guinea hen. You see? That bird had been too well educated. The bird itself was cooperating with the involvement.

Now, these are just two steps. That's the only requisite to a successful (quote) MEST universe game (unquote). That's totally successful. You just have something that takes no trouble at all to enter and gives maximum continuing involvement after it's been entered, which has no end product, and you've got it?

Now, I was talking to Reg the other day, he – mentioned this to him and he says, "Huh!" He says, "Well," he says, "there's a good example of that." He says, "A fellow stops on the street and looks in the window of a store. And if that window is just all kinds of stuff piled all over the window, everything going up this way, the guy's sunk." Of course, it's a terrific involvement of his attention. He walks in.

Some other store, Tiffany's, something like that, why, there's a single pearl sitting on an ocean of black velvet and you never find anybody stopping. And if they do stop, they say, "Isn't that nice?" and walk on. No, Tiffany's involvement has to do with "Are you a member of the four hundred? Can you afford to pay far more than you should pay?" The involvement is, "Is your credit good enough?" You see, all of those. Those are all involvements, but they use a different type of involvement than some merchandising house that is a chain store. Macy's or something like that – you go by the window and here's some baby's pants and down here is a hot water bottle and then there's a machine gun peeking out from underneath a pair of lace-trimmed pedal pushers, you know? And there's a beach ball over there in the corner, and so forth, and back of the beach ball are live alligators. And isn't that intriguing, you see? And the guy looks. The next thing you know, he's walking into Macy's.

See, there's no difficulty in stopping in front of the window and he gets maximal involvement in the thing. Get the idea? Well, these are the rules by which you have... can measure any continuing game that is purely a MEST universe game.

Income tax. The ease with which governments entered in upon income tax. I swear, there's probably no slightest difficulty where it began, which is in Karl Marx's "From each according to his ability to pay. To each according to his need." That was the Marxian rule of taxation which has been written in all through the West, now.
About 1909, I think it was. And I swear, it – he probably had no difficulty whatsoever writing those words. He wrote them in German. No difficulty. There wasn't the slightest difficulty writing them. He probably threw himself off another bowl of hashish, or whatever he used to do and wrote those words. There was no difficulty there. There was no difficulty reading those words.

Finally a lot of people say, "Oh, that's -- that's very easy. There's nothing to that," and they amended a few constitutions and passed some laws. And the years went along and you had this thing called income tax and everybody got... started to get poorer because you didn't dare make a profit because you'd pay it out in tax. And – and then the government started hiring more and more people and more and more people. They – finally they got one income tax collector per citizen, which was the optimum ratio. And then they finally involved in income increment of increase profits return. That's filed in addition to a "form 6892B-hup." And then that, of course, has to be filed only by the professional accountant. The unprofessional accountant files "1682-44ump." That's the form he files, you see. Only that has to be then refilled because it is always kept on the other file. And finally, do you know, nobody can pay an income tax.

They talk about tax evasion. It isn't tax evasion. It's just impossible to pay an income tax. You say "Impossible," you say, "It's easy. You go down and pay an income tax." If you work nine till five and have your pay deducted by your employer, he's got all the difficulty. If you yourself are making your own coffee and cakes and the government can't put the bee on some employer or something like that, you're in trouble the whole way. You talk about involvement!

Now, just try and walk down to an income tax office and say, "Here's my income tax. Give me a quitclaim for all taxes." If you did that, you'd probably precipitate a complete investigation of your affairs going back to why your grandmother had to marry. And it just is impossible.

You pay a tax of this year. Therefore, you've got to pay next year another type of tax, but more tax because you paid the tax this year, and so on. You finally -- guys get so desperate, they can't pay the tax, don't you see? It's all a total involvement. So then they start tax evasion because if they pay the tax, then they're hooked. Not just hooked, but you can't pay the tax, so they had better evade not tax paying, but tax collection. And they're evading an involvement of tax collection. You see that idea?

Now, you look over any one of these corny games that has gone on and on, and you say, "Isn't the world mad! You know, the world has gone utterly mad!" No, the world hasn't gone utterly mad, the world has gone utterly MEST universe. And the lower on the scale a thetan gets, the more he starts approximating the laws of the MEST universe. That's... you can count on that -- the more he acts like the laws of MEST. And the only time you're going to get anything done with anybody as a thetan and so forth, is somebody who still has some section that doesn't act according to the laws of MEST. He can still think. MEST does not think.

But this law of involvement is definitely there and it waits as a trap for the unwary auditor. And he's liable to follow it; unconsciously and unknowingly, he is liable to follow it. The ease of entrance. You know, get any old goal. The pc's apparently happy. Everything is
fine and then you get any old goal and you list this goal and you list the goal on down. It's perfectly easy for the pc to have sat there in the chair, you see.

And then the auditor unconsciously starts following a dramatization of the law of involvement. And he just starts throwing new things into the session. You see, it's anything but this goals list. See, he didn't really check out the goal. He didn't do this, he didn't do that. He's involving – it was very easy for him to become involved; it's very easy for the pc to become involved, so this will become more and more involved. And the immediate impulse of the auditor is to do something new and more involved. You understand that? That's a MEST characteristic of a game. Becomes more involved and more involved and more involved and more involved. And we go on and on and on. And you'll find out that a very bad auditor who's pretty "mesty" will just keep involving the pc more deeply.

Every time he does something wrong, he will do something else that is new and do something wrong with it and then do something else that is new and then do something wrong with it and then do something else that is new and do something wrong with... You get the involvement? And the next thing you know, the pc is going, "Ohhh-owwww..."

Fortunately for us, 3M is sufficiently strong that all you have to do is go back and take the earliest step of 3M that was done – which is probably in this case, as I was just describing to you, a goals list – get that list listed down properly and do it right and all the liability comes off it.

Supposing you had the pc's right goal and got a wrong item off the source list because somebody was a real knucklehead, and so forth, you only have to find the right item off that. I don't care if 3M was done for seventy-five consecutive hours by a complete knucklehead that wrapped the pc around not only telephone poles but fireplugs – we don't care about that – you go right back to the earliest wrong area that you can find and work out in that area 3M. Wherever you can get into that area and get the proper 3M action, the rest of it straightens out.

Because we've whipped this game of the MEST universe. But there's still to some degree, here and there, more frequently than you would believe at first glance, going to be some impulse to just involve the pc more deeply. You see that? You... just a dramatization, you understand? You'll see somebody sitting down and the person just isn't thinking right and they just will think in the direction of deeper involvement. Not straightening out anything. "Let's just do something new. Let's just do something different. Let's just do something wrong. Let's do this."

And that involves the pc more and more deeply and more and more deeply and more deeply and more deeply and more deeply, and it involves the auditor in more and more worry, and more and more worry and more and more worry. And eventually the pc's running a fever of 190 and the auditor is running ulcers that are a foot in diameter, and so on. That's... just recognize it. Just recognize it. You've taken a very powerful technique which is addressed to an individual and you've followed the MEST universe curve of a game, which is ease of entrance and increasing involvement.

The thing to do is go back and put 3M on the road. Now, 3M at first glance appears to go along this line, and that's a fooler. And that's why it's going to be very successful. It's very easy to start it, you just say to somebody, "What's your goal?"
"Oh-ho, what's my goal? Oh, boy. Oh, gee," you know, and he'll answer.

One of the ways of involving him is get him all interested in what his goal is, and then write out 8,642 goals and get a whole long, overlisted list – the tone arm's a long time been stuck on the goals list and so forth – and then get him all *blah* and so on, and then lose the goals list. Don't expect me to say you're a good boy if you do that. Don't expect me to do anything about that but swear.

I, by the way, have recovered several languages in which to swear. So you better be... watch out.

Anyhow, the crux of the situation is that as you go along this line, there appears to be a deeper and deeper and deeper involvement. Yeah, the pc is getting good and involved. And you can start worrying about how deeply the pc is involved while the case is running perfectly all right. Now, get that. See, there's the other danger. See, not only can the case run all wrong and the auditor sit there with total complacency, but you can get a reverse of this, of the case is running beautifully, you're getting RIs, the pc's going, "Oh, my God!" You know. "Ahhh. What a terrible mass that is!" You know, and then he gets another RI and so on, and he changes his mind about it and he goes on and he's getting lighter colored and that sort of thing.

But the tone arm starts going up. "Oho-ho! Oho-oo-oo! Oho-oo-oo! The tone arm's – oh, it's up to 5 – 5, and the blowdown on the new RI was only to 4.75. Oooooooh! Oh, God! And-and-and-and the new RI – as we list the thing, the tone arm goes to 5.75. Oh, God, so we go on, here, and we've got a blowdown to 5.6. Ahhhhhhh." This is something to worry about, see. You look at the pc; pc's all right. He's going along quite hap... But look at that tone arm, man.

"And we get the next item and it goes to 5.75 and there's no tone arm action at all. Ahhhhh. And-and-and we get only a blowdown of 5.6."

Say anything about it in here? No. Then what you worrying for? You understand? What you worrying for?

It says a blowdown when you get the RI. How much is a blowdown? Well, it's as much as a blowdown is. How long is a piece of string? Let me tell you something: This is pure phenomena. You don't need it desperately but it'll keep you from worrying. Most of the stuff you see released now will just be in the direction of keeping you from worrying. Because I know what you – what you'll worry about.

Every – every single one of these GPMs goes a cycle. Every single one of them goes a cycle. The pc starts in down here, and he usually rides around 3.25. And it's perfectly all right. He goes up, and he gets a little bit of a 3.75, and it blows back to 3.25. And then your next couple, three, four RI lists that you get, the thing has been going up to 4 and has been blowing down to 3.5. And you get a couple of more, and it goes up to 5 and it blows down to 4.5. And then it will go up to 5 and it will blow down to 3... to 4.75. And it'll go up to 5, and it'll blow down to 3.5. And then it will go up, up-up-up-up-up to 4.75, and it'll blow down to 3.25. And then the next RI – three or four – you get, it will go up to 4.25 and it'll blow down to 2. And then it will come up here and as you list, go up to 3.25 and then blow down to 3. And then it
goes up to 3.75 as you list, and then when you find that RI, it blows down to 3. And then it sits there and you list and it sits at 3. And it blows down to 3 from 3. And you say, "God, I'm not getting any blowdown." There's – there's one you could worry about, you know. "It's just sitting on Clear read and I'm not getting a blowdown. And the needle – oh, God!" Go up to the D of T, "Oh, my God, do you – do you – do – I can't read the needle now. It just keeps going floppity-floppity-flop from one side to the other. Can't read it. Can't even get the rudiments in on the pc and all the pc does is sit there and grin. Hmmm!"

You'll do it. You – you'll say to this girl or something, "Look. You cleared him."

"Oh?"

So, she says, "That's fine." So she gets into the next GPM, see? Same cycle repeats. The tone arm goes up, and it blows down, and it goes up higher, and it blows down less, and it goes up higher and it blows down less, and it goes up higher, goes up higher, and even higher than you've seen it before. I don't know – and then finally blows down, and then starts to blow down closer and closer to Clear read. Item after item behavior.

In other words, there's a point in any GPM where you've got a high, stuck, mean tone arm that doesn't blow down much. What you worrying for? It's just phenomena. You're going to sweat yourself to death on a lot of things. You say, "This pc – this pc's eyes – black, black, black, you know. Oh, my God, the pc's eyes are black. Every morning she'd come in, black! Black! Black as the ace of spades. Every morning!" By God, I found out she was using mascara. Honest, she can't run out mascara until the person's a fourth- or fifth-goal Clear. You're going to find all kinds of things to worry about.

But I'll tell you what you'd better worry about. I'll tell you what you'd better worry about, and this is a fact: You better worry about doing a departure from these "Brief Rundown by Step" rules. That's what you worry about. Worry about departing from that.

And when you do something and it doesn't come out with this result, then you've goofed. How do you know you have departed from the "Brief Rundown by Steps, Routine 3M" – or any other concise 3M bulletin as they come out along the line? There'll be more of them issued; they will be lengthier, more concise. They'll be this, they'll be that, they'll be the other thing. How would we know, now, that we have departed?

Well, it didn't come out right, so we'd better go back and find out what isn't being done. And where wasn't it done first, and get it done there first, and then we find out that what we've just done wrong will come out right. A pc can take quite a beating.

Now, there's one other piece of phenomena that I can give you that will save you a lot of worry. When you first find the pc's goal and you do a source list, all this business about the pc turning black or something like that, or getting off-colored if something is wrong, is violating by that original step. When you get a pc's goal, when you get a pc's goal and that pc is listed out on a source list all the way through, don't be very amazed if the pc gets black. Because most of them will. The GPM is moving out of them and their skin tone goes awfully sooty. I've seen it now, case after case. What you start worrying about: as you find RI after RI, they aren't getting any lighter. There must be something wrong there, so you go back and find your "Brief Rundown by Steps," look it over and find out where you – where you de-
parted from this line. And you generally will find that you didn't pick the right RI off their four rocket reading items on the source list, all rocket reading. Source list incomplete.

There are various conditions. There's the condition of overlisting. Oh, you can be a complete idiot on overlisting. You can list ninety pages when you should have listed ten. You just list the list. A list is as long as it should be. And how long should a list be? Well, actually you ought to get no TA motion – and that's a relative statement – but no TA motion and fifty items beyond that, and fifty items beyond the last R/S on the list or RR on the list, whichever is last. You'll find out that that is how long a list is, and your item will be on it.

There are two types of lists. One of the things you haven't looked at yet – there are two types of lists in 3M and in 2-12. There are two types of list. One is the goal oppose list, or the source list, and that has entirely different rules of operation and mechanics. And then there's the RI oppose list, which is the reliable item list. And that has different mechanics. And you'll find out in the "Brief Rundown by Steps" that steps 1 to 7 of this 3M step rundown are devoted to a source list and handling of source list and getting the thing started, and steps 8 to 13 are totally dedicated to an RI list. They're two different types of list; they behave differently. All you have to know is the behavior for each one.

There aren't a lot of randomities going to jump up and put them in the face. I've been auditing and getting audited and doing research auditing and watching folders here and working and working with this for a very, very long time and I had a terrible time whipping up enough constants. There had to be enough constants so there wouldn't be a lot of variables. And fortunately, I found these constants and put them down here. And be guided by the constants, not how variable they get out around the perimeter and you will do fine.

Now, you've only got one clearing procedure. And I wish you had eight or nine or ten, but in actual fact there's only one and that is 3M. And it doesn't have very many steps. This thing has only got fifteen steps.

Probably the absolute rules of one kind or another boil down to being less than twenty, something like that. They're very few. Bank behavior is very constant. It's not actually very much to learn.

The thing that you want is familiarity. The thing that you want is confidence. The thing that you want is to know that is the way it is and see it in front of you operating that way and know that you can pull it off. That's the main thing you need. And I'm afraid an auditor has to go through all of these steps of the horrors of it all and worry and chew his fingernails to the elbow, and give it all up and try to blow the brains out, and just this – oh, you know, because it's just all too difficult.

And I had an auditor, left here – you remember Irene; she wrote me from Perth. I got the letter today. And she's had a cognition. For all of her training, three years of very hard, intensive auditing, she's had a cognition that it's a very simple activity and the more simply you do it the more results you get and the less complication you add into it, why, the better it is. And it's taken her three years and she's now cognited more or less – I think that was the paraphrase of it anyway – that auditing is a simple activity.
Now, now she's already done the cognition. It isn't necessary for you to cognite. Just know it, realize it's simple and you've got it made and you'll make Clears.

Now, what you want out of this is Clear. What you want out of this is to be Clear. What I want out of this is for you to be Clear and for you to make Clears. We can do that. It just all depends on your constancy, carrying forward the ethical approach – if something reads it reads, and if it doesn't read it doesn't read – and you'll produce them.

The technology is there, you're there. Let's get the show on the road. And realize that when you get a pc involved – I already know the MEST rule of games, which is easy entrance and deep involvement. Remember, I already know that, so I'll be looking at you.

But basically, what I want to look at is the number of Clears you make, and I want you so Clear that when they tap you on the shoulder, you just ring for hours.

Okay? That's it. Thank you very much.

Good night.
TV DEMO: CASE REPAIR

An auditing demonstration given on 27 February 1963

Here we are with a demonstration. And we're going to give an auditing demonstration here tonight that I hope you will appreciate. But, of course, we're auditing the television station general manager, electronics expert and janitor. And so therefore, whatever happens here on TV that seems a little bit peculiar to you, why, you will know why.

**LRH:** All right. Have a seat, Reg. And let's see this meter. All right. Now, Reg, the subject of this activity here is totally involved with doing a case straighten-up.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** The only thing I'm going to do is just go over everything that's happened on your case here.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**LRH:** ... and so forth. Okay? You needn't pick up the cans yet unless you'd feel more comfortable with them.

**PC:** I'm happy.

**LRH:** You're happy with them. All right. Now, if you'll notice here, we've got another area. This is another camera down here and it's flipped over so that we've got a... show your papers. See? Pretty good, huh? Reg is pretty good at this sort of thing. Of course, he's not listening to this broadcast so it's all right for me to praise him; I wouldn't dare do that to his face.

Okay. Now, Mr. Williams, you've been auditing Reg here. And the situation deteriorated into the finding of an item which didn't get found and didn't check out. That is the case of a non-checked-out item.

**Aud:** Right.

**LRH:** There is a lot of things I'm going to go into with relationship to this, because there's a lot of auditing been done here on the case since I last audited you. And we'll see where we are, just to give people an idea of how to check this back. But also because I'm interested in where you've gotten to.

**PC:** Thank you.

**LRH:** All right. Now, our main work here starts in and what I want to do... You very often, by the way, you know, you'll have to be – you'll have to be doing cases to which you have no auditor. So this is very easy tonight because I have Mr. Williams here to interpret his own writing and a few other things of that character. Now, I left this case way back here on an item "a murderer." Right?

**Aud:** Right.

**LRH:** And that fired very nicely. And nice big rocket read on it. And then – oh, oh, oh, I see some errors here. Now, "Who or what would oppose a murderer?" for completion; then assess the questions "Would a murderer oppose... a (blank) oppose a murderer?" All right. That's beside the point. But we had this, anyway, and we
were giving a brief tiger – first a prepcheck on "a murderer" and then on the goal "to know." We had here a auditing session – an auditing session of 3 October of last year and we see here that we had Prepcheck on murderer and so forth, and then tiger drill buttons on 1 October HCOB, on the goal "to know," which was, according to this, firing well. Now, did you see that TV demonstration?

**Aud:** Yes.

**LRH:** Yeah. Did you see the goal "to know" firing?

**Aud:** Yes, a – a – a few times I saw it fire.

**LRH:** Yeah. All right. That's where we went to. Now, what happened here? Now, we got into a situation – this is in no way a court-martial.

**Aud:** Thank you. [laughs]

**LRH:** We're not interested in court-martiaing you, no matter how richly deserved!

**Aud:** Thank you.

**LRH:** All right. So you're not up for anything here. But I'll show you how one of these things goes. Now, let's just look forward here and see what happened. And as we go over these lists and articles – you picked up the case apparently on about the 22nd of October. Right?

**Aud:** Right.

**LRH:** And we've got here this and that and the other thing. And you did some tests for completeness. Now, here's a represent on "a murderer." Ha-ha-ha-ha, that's the first thing I saw, ho-ho-ho-ho! Of course, that's a representation of a rock slamming item.

**Aud:** Mmm.

**LRH:** So that's what happened to its read.

**Aud:** Yeah.

**LRH:** Right? What does a murderer represent to you? And of course, that went no place. And any item you would have gotten off of that one – wow, man.

**Aud:** That's right. No item on that.

**LRH:** Well, there wouldn't have been. So that's what happened to "a murder," as an item. And then we went into a Prehav level "Dislocate"; and I don't know if there was an item here or not.

**Aud:** I got a – a ticking item, I remember.

**LRH:** Yeah.

**Aud:** I used it as a – as a – a List One.

**LRH:** Yeah. Then you eventually did something with this list up here someplace. Where are we at here? Tiger Drill. And we went up here to "Dislocate," probably wrong. Now, we went to – we found something: "a bad manager." How well did that R/S, do you remember?

**Aud:** No that – I think "a bad manager" came off the "Dislocate" list.

**LRH:** Oh, it did, huh?

**Aud:** And we – we really treat that as a represent. This was that experimental rundown.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. We'll neglect it. We'll neglect that. Let's look forward here now. Don't worry about it, huh? I see...

**Aud:** Now here's some more work on "a murderer."

**LRH:** And here's some more work on "a murder." This was "murder." Now, the original list was then extended.
Aud: Yes.

LRH: The original "What isn't part of existence?" was extended. That was where "a murderer" came from. And of course, its read was gone and we got out the end of the list. Now, I don't see where that list is. Must be before that.

Aud: That it there? There?

LRH: You've got a missing list here someplace.

Aud: No. Not there.

LRH: Yeow. There you are.

Aud: There. "Who or what wasn't part of existence?"

LRH: Yeah. And you got "a murderer." Is that right?

Aud: There. Assessed item "murderer."

LRH: All right.

Aud: And that's the continued list.

LRH: And then you opposed a murder ...

Aud: Murderer.

LRH: ... and uh ...

Aud: Murder.

LRH: Yeah, that's it. And you - "What would a murderer oppose?"

Aud: ...murderer oppose?

LRH: And "What would oppose a murderer?"

Aud: No, that was a test listing. I test – that was two headings, a test list ...

LRH: All right.

Aud: ... and "Who or what would oppose murder?" was the ...

LRH: Yeah, that was your oppterm. And you got down to that and you got something off of that.

Aud: Now, that's got out of order.

LRH: That doesn't matter. We're not much interested in it, to tell you the truth.

Aud: Oh, I know what happened, Ron. I got the – I made a – had a two-item package there. And then ...

LRH: Oh ...

Aud: ... then I checked "an impos- tor." No, then I went back later, soon as the four-item came out, and I made a four package out of it.

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. And "an impostor" came up here. Your old friend.

Aud: That was a test listing to see if we could get anything on "an impostor." Nothing.

LRH: And there was nothing.

Aud: No.

LRH: All right. And we move on forward. Lot of stuff here of one kind or another. I'm sorry to be knocking your items around.

PC: That's all right, Ron.

LRH: I saw right away that that wasn't quite all right. And we found "a gentle- man" in this package.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Right.

Aud: Right.

LRH: Right. And we got "a gentle- man" opposed and we got something on that. And this moves on down and then we got "uneducated people."
Aud: "Society".
LRH: And then you did a "life ...
Aud: "Society."
LRH: … "society." All right. That gave you a package. So you finally had a line plot of, says here, "murder" with a terminal "gentleman" – "a gentleman," and "society" versus "uneducated people." That's fine. And then "life consists of" and you found an item, "finding out." All right. That's fine. And you did something with it? What?
Aud: "Who or what would finding out oppose?"
LRH: Ah, I don't see this list.
Aud: It came up with – it came up with "sleeping."
LRH: Hm?
Aud: And the item that opposed that was "sleeping."
LRH: Oh, all right. All right. Gee, that's a long enough list there. Yes, and you got that "sleeping." Okay. Good enough. Now. These lists are a little bit in reverse here, that's why we're having a hard time.
Aud: Oppose "sleeping."
LRH: And then oppose "sleeping," and you got what?
Aud: Uh, "a selfish person."
LRH: Yeah, well, you should have a line plot that gives those. I point that out as somewhat negligent. Unless it's in here someplace. But that would be an earlier line plot.
Aud: And I didn't take it any further than that in view of this note here. I decided to go on to the goal.
LRH: Yes. Yes. Yes.
Aud: It didn't seem to be getting anywhere... Well, in other words, I assumed that the goal – getting the goal was more priority...
LRH: Yeah.
Aud: ...than fiddling around with that little package.
LRH: Absolutely, absolutely.
Aud: So the next session I tried to complete that package. And I took the goal "to know."
LRH: All right. And it reacted every time, once with an inch...
Aud: Half an inch.
LRH: ...half an inch latent RR. And you got sporadic RRs. And then you listed "Who or what would the goal 'to know' oppose?" Well now, of course, a goal that has been that left alone could be expected to be sporadic. So that would be of no criteria. You go ahead and list it and test list it and see if you could get something out of it. Now, you evidently got something out of it here. "What would the goal 'to know' oppose?" And now we're getting down to what is very, very interesting to me. And I will simply bundle up these other papers and lay those aside. That's all right.

And we will take a look here at this situation. Now. This is 22 February 63, is what we have brought this up to. But we have a goal here, list: "What would – who or what would the goal 'to know' oppose?" And this came up with, I think, the item "secrecy."
Aud: Yes.
LRH: And – acquainting ourselves with this situation – and we've got "secrecy." And where is the check out slip? Item checked out by Brian: "secrecy." RR,
sometimes one inch, sometimes a half an inch, sometimes a quarter of an inch. But, nevertheless, apparently it was an RI and it was firing. Now, where did that occur on this list? That's what's very important. Where did that occur on this list? Let's find out what this looked like.

**Aud:** I think it was about page 6. Yes, page 6.

**LRH:** All right.

**Aud:** That's the goal oppose list.

**LRH:** That's correct. And you had RRs on TD and you had RRs on nulling, huh?

**Aud:** Yes.

**LRH:** All right. Now, did you make a test of this for term or oppterm?

**Aud:** Yes.

**LRH:** And it was determined it was a what? Here is oppose "secrecy."

**Aud:** Well, frankly, I couldn't get a good test out of it. I couldn't be absolutely...

**LRH:** Oh, there you're -- there you're right there in good company. Because none of these early goals give a good test. None of these items. And you have to be very slippery about it. And you have to test them very gently. And this is too hard a list for a test list. You actually mustn't test list 3M. Completely different than 2-12. Mustn't test list it. Make up your mind. Now, there are several things that can help you make up your mind -- that's all right -- can help you make up your mind, several things. But this, you see, as a four-page test list, would be absolutely guaranteed to knock your frequency of the bank appetite over tin cup.

**Aud:** Hm.

**LRH:** So that you'd find yourself now having to extend the next list.

**Aud:** Ah.

**LRH:** You get the idea?

**Aud:** Yeah. Yeah.

**LRH:** So this is the kind of thing you want to look for. So there -- this would upset -- this would upset this list right here because it... we've got "Who or what would oppose secrecy?" and we've got this and this and we've got this all on a wrong way list. If it is a wrong-way list. But now, let's take a look at this list and see if we have an increasing incidence of R/S. Pc doping off, pulling missed withholds, pc remarked cognitions on this and that, like concerning his state. Now, what kind of a -- what kind of a... Here's one of the ways to check this thing. What kind of a list do you make when you are doing an oppose list? Let's see, this is, "Who or what would oppose secrecy?" So we want what kind of a list he does as a terminal list, don't we? And the goal "to know" gives us a terminal list. And what the dickens sort of a thing does he list off a terminals list? That is important. This is an oppterm list -- the goal "to know" oppose -- this is an oppterm list.

But here's our -- here's our determination here. And I already know this to be, studying the case, "a judge"? Read those.

**Aud:** "A judge, an honest man, a truth seeker, an investigator, a researcher, a straightforward man, a brave man, an open man, an open-minded man, a man with an open mind, a cheat, a briber" -- I'm sorry -- "a library, Scientology, a seeker after, truth, policeman, the law courts, courts of law," and...

**LRH:** I know this pc. I know this pc and that's a nice terminals list. Where's
the RRs?

Aud: There aren't any.

LRH: What's this – RR?

Aud: It's one RR.

LRH: It says R/S, R/S. Well, it's an interesting list, but it didn't give any RRs. Is that what we assume?

Aud: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now. We got that list which actually shouldn't have been done, which occasionally you find yourself doing.

Aud: May I have a look at my - my reports?

LRH: There's your reports.

Aud: Yes, that's the first list I did.

LRH: "Secrecy."

Aud: Yes. I – first of all, I tested it treating "secrecy" as an oppterm. Then when that didn't go so well, I ran the other way.

LRH: Hm-mm. And how didn't it go so well? What happened?

Aud: Well, it's just the – the – the nonappearance of a lot of RRs. In other words, here, that – that's a question mark RR. There's two reads there I just didn't see because of the body motion on that one. Some surges here.

LRH: Mm.

Aud: Now, actually, there's just the one question mark RR there. Oh, and there's a question mark RR on page 1 and a question mark RR on page 3.

LRH: "An honest man," huh?

Aud: Mm.

LRH: All right. Got the pc right here. Pick up the cans, would you, Reg. Is it all right with you if I make a check on you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Especially if I put the plug in. [PC laughs] All right. Now, let's take a look at this item here that was apparently the last something or other on this list and let's see what we've got. Okay? This is not very important what we're doing here. But there was an item there, so let's see if there wasn't anything about it.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Okay. Is it all right with you if I start a short check?

PC: Sure.

LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of check. All right. Now, we have an item, "an honest man." All right. Now, uh – what's this incipient RR?

PC: Oh, I – I – sorry, I was ahead of you, Ron. I was starting to see – to see if there was any form of suppressions or something on here and – uh ...

LRH: Yes? Yes?

PC: I – I was just sort of...

LRH: Oh, all right. All right.

PC: I was looking at the item, incidentally.

LRH: Good. Good. I probably added another suppression to it by doing that.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Here we go. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suppressed?

PC: Well, what I suppressed just then, I just caught myself, was that – uh – am I fighting honest men? In other words,
is it – is "honest men" an oppterm? That was the thought that I had when you asked me what was going on.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Thank you. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Okay, there's something here. Um – I've always strived so hard to be honest and it's been so – not so much out of – I don't want to put a halo up here, but it's more out of – uh – that's the only thing you dare to do is to be honest, you see.

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** I don't get anything else right away, Ron.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Let me check it on the meter. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suppressed? That's pretty hard to tell. I'm going to ask that again, it's equivocal read. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suppressed? I'd say yes.

**PC:** All I'm getting here is that I'm not 100 percent honest, as I told you before, when it comes to income tax.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Okay.

**PC:** That suppresses an honest man if anything does.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Okay. Now, on the item "an honest man," has anything been suppressed? Oh, I can't make anything out of that particularly. Do you think that's flat?

**PC:** I haven't got any answer, Ron.

**LRH:** Very good. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've been careful of?

**PC:** Oh, I've always been very, very careful to be honest. Um – if I'm being dishonest, uh – I have been very, very careful to make sure I wouldn't get found out. Um – very careful to be – to give the impression of an honest man. And uh – I'm being very careful now not to give the impression that I'm a dishonest man, because I'm not, really.

**LRH:** All right. Okay.

**PC:** That about covers it.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've been careful of?

**PC:** I'm always careful to prove that I'm an honest man – to um – um – put my cards on the table all the time.

**LRH:** Okay. Good. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've been careful of?

**PC:** I don't get anything else.

**LRH:** Very good. I'll check that on the meter. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've been careful of? All right, I don't think there was a read on that. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Failed to reveal that I threw a bit of paper away today that perhaps if I was 100 percent honest I wouldn't have done.

**LRH:** All right. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** No, I don't – um – don't get anything else.
LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check that on the meter. On the item "an honest man," is there anything you've failed to reveal? Well, that's not anything I can read offhand. Do you think that's flat?

PC: I was just sitting here, but I – yes, I think it's flat – I was just sitting here and this seems to be making me feel a very dishonest man for some reason.

LRH: All right. All right. I'm sorry.

PC: It's all right.

LRH: Okay. Very good. All right. On the item "an honest man," has anything been invalidated? Get anything?

PC: No, I didn't get anything right away.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suggested? Yes, there is a suggest on that.

PC: I've always suggested that I'm an honest man. And – um – I know I – when I was very young, I had the idea that it would be very nice to be – to go down as an honest man. And – um – I suggested it would be a good idea to be very honest in business and so on, which I have been. Like the only way to be.

LRH: Hm.

PC: I overstepped the mark in that direction. But sheer for profit, I mean.

LRH: All right. Okay. On the item "an honest man," has anything been suggested? I don't think there was a read on that. Okay. On the item "an honest man," has a mistake been made? Yes, there's apparently a mistake there.

PC: Um – that – the only mistake I can get is something it might be that I sometimes get this tied up with "a man of integrity." It's very much the same thing, but – um – well, that would have described it better.

LRH: Hm. All right. On the item "an honest man," has a mistake been made? All right. That would appear to be more or less it. On the item "an honest man," has anything been protested? I didn't see anything clearly read on protest. On the item "an honest man," has anything been decided? There's probably a decide there. This is all guess work on this meter, by the way.

PC: Um – well, I probably deci...

LRH: All right. Good enough. Good enough. You got that?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. On the item "an honest man," has anything been decided? You think of another answer to that? Lot of… lot of enturbulence to this meter.

PC: Um – well, it is the sort of thing that is said that you decide to be honest: I've decided to be honest in future. But uh – I can't – um – ever recall that dishonesty… Well, once as a child I was dishonest and got caught out very badly. That's right, I stole some change that's – from some shopping I've done – taking it or something like that.

LRH: Mm.

PC: And uh – got caught and was very badly punished. But, so I just sort of decided then that in future I should be honest.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. I'm going to read this item now: an honest man. An honest man. An honest man. Well, I would say offhand there's probably an R/S under this someplace, but
that is definitely not the item. Okay? You can put down the cans for a moment.

**PC:** Yup.

**LRH:** All right. Now, let's cross that out as TD, no dice. And now let's take up the item itself, "secrecy," and see what we get here. Although from the amount of jumping around here, probably the wisest thing to do is take this goal "to know," and see if I can get a fire out of that and then take up the item "secrecy." And then we will take up some of this material here toward the end of your list and we will check this secrecy oppose end of list. Okay? And we'll see what we can find on there, because there is something on that.

**Aud:** Hm.

**LRH:** Because I noticed you went page after page, you see...

**Aud:** Interesting.

**LRH:** It's so clean. See, these additional pages are clean. I maligned you you had completed the list. So you can put it down in your diary, "Ron maligned me and admitted it in public." [auditor laughs]

**Aud:** I'll never be able to use that motivator again.

**LRH:** Yeah! Yeah!

**PC:** It's recorded.

**Aud:** Is it? Oh, good.

**LRH:** Yeah. All right. The list is complete. But somewhere before this list was ended, you see, an item has appeared. It's for sure the item is there somewhere. And you will find – because it's an RI oppose list – that the item undoubtedly will fall on the matter – this is the wrong list – undoubtedly will fall on the last... that's oppose secrecy, your test.

**Aud:** That's secrecy oppose.

**LRH:** Yes. And somewhere here – there's page 9, now, there's apparently no action clear on out to the end here, you see, to page 12.

**Aud:** But this is treating secrecy as the term here, Ron.

**LRH:** Yes.

**Aud:** It's all right, is it?

**LRH:** Well, quite, what's the matter?

**Aud:** We've just treated it... That's – yeah, I see.

**LRH:** That list is now scrubbed.

**Aud:** Right. That says I was treating it as an oppterm.

**LRH:** That's treating this list here – we're treating this list here as oppose secrecy. And we've just found out it can't be an oppterm, because we took your last reading item... Now, if I wanted to be very, very clever here and if I wanted to do exactly what I was teaching everybody to do, I would take these. What's that?

**Aud:** "A microscope." And that did R/S. So did that one R/S.

**LRH:** So, we got "a microscope." What's this next one? "A mirror"?

**Aud:** "A mirror."

**LRH:** And what's the item above this?

**Aud:** That's cognitions. Yeah, "a drawing."

**LRH:** "A drawing."

**Aud:** See, that was after pc doping off, pulling missed withholds.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. So I to some
degree took that into effect. So this couldn't be a pull-over.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: See? So we'd have to go – you're supposed to go above and below. See? All right. Pick up the cans, would you Reg, and just let me read these. Just see where we stand here, see if we can get anything at all. I'm just being supercareful now; this is almost idiot carefulness – in view of the fact you had cognitions just before this and this was your very next item.

PC: Mm.


Aud: Hm.

LRH: And did you see that thing R/S?

Aud: Hm.

LRH: Small R/S.

Aud: See, it's marked R/S there on the list.

LRH: See.

Aud: Yeah.

LRH: Well, I know. But just because it's marked on the list, it shouldn't R/S when it's read back.

Aud: No, not if you've got a complete list.

LRH: No.

Aud: Not that I...

LRH: So there's something awful wrong with this list.

Aud: So it's definitely incomplete.

LRH: Well, it would be either incomplete or...

Aud: Wrong way to.

LRH: ...or wrong way to. And because it didn't RR anywhere and when you did it the other way to, you did get RRs...

Aud: Yes.

LRH: ...then we immediately assume that it was...

Aud: The other way.

LRH: ...other way. Even though we shouldn't have done this list in the first place. See?

Aud: Yeah.

LRH: We shouldn't have done this oppose secrecy list. If we hadn't done it, by the way, you'd only do this just a few items at the top. See?

Aud: Mm.

LRH: Your trick is, look at the pc, see. Is the pc getting any darker?

Aud: Mm.

LRH: You know, that kind of thing.

Aud: Mm.

LRH: As a list. And I don't care if he's going off and talking and that sort of thing. Still, look at the pc. You can tell just after a few items: it's that fast. See, you can tell all of this. All right. Now, we're going to go into the goal here, the goal "to know," and see if we can do anything about that, Reg.

PC: All righty.

LRH: Is that all right with you?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: And we're just going to drill that up and see what we've got here. All
right. On the goal "to know," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** All the mistakes I make are suppressed. Hopes about the goal are suppressed. Um – anything I don't know is obviously suppressed.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**LRH:** On the goal "to know," has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** I've suppressed thoughts that maybe didn't read all that well.

**LRH:** Mm. All right.

**PC:** Can't think of anything else on this.

**LRH:** Okay. On the goal "to know" – I'll check it on the meter now. On the goal "to know," has anything been suppressed? Oh, I think there's another suppression there of some kind or other. This meter's a little bit hard to read here tonight.

**PC:** Mm. I apologize.

**LRH:** No, no, no, no. No, no – it isn't you. It isn't you so much.

**PC:** Well, whenever I don't let other people know things I'm suppressing the goal "to know." Um – and I had to suppress such things as I – um – it's an overt not to know. If – um – well, for example if you want something, and I should be one step ahead of you, I should know. It's almost theetie-weetie in reverse, do you see?

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** I should know. And it's – I always feel guilty if somebody finds something before I do, or anything like this. It really is... people might find this hard to believe – but I feel that way – that I ought to know first. And – um – I ought to know.

**LRH:** All right. I'll check that on the meter. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been careful of?

**PC:** I'm always very careful to try and to know. And this does work in reverse that I'm also careful not to let people know, uh – on some things um – in particular, the wife and so on, that I'll be very, very secretive about this. This seems to be a flip on it. But it's um – this seems to work that I have to know myself but other people don't have to know. I suppose it's probably a win if I know and somebody else doesn't. And uh – so I'm – I'm careful when I'm keeping other people in the dark on anything.

**LRH:** Hmm. All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been careful of?

**PC:** I can't think of anything.
the meter. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been careful of? Yes, there is another one here.

**PC:** Well, I was careful to um – come into Scientology. That's what came up right away. Because – uh – this was right up my... I didn't realize at the time but I've since realized it that – uh – Scientology is the science of knowing how to know and so, of course, when I saw this, this seemed terrific to me. And I didn't – and I – whenever I was running PE course this would be the sermon: If you want to know anything, boys, you join Scientology. Do you see? And this was a terrific entry point for me. And I was very careful to take it up.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. On the goal "to know," is there anything you have failed to reveal? Unless you've thought of something. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been careful of? Oh, I wouldn't say – there is no read there. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've failed to reveal?

**PC:** Um – to other – as far as other people are concerned I've failed to reveal, as I was telling you earlier on. Um – this hasn't come up lately, but I have gone to great lengths to substitute "to know" – uh – with um ... I've always said, "Well, I don't know, but I always know where to find out." So that's – uh – I like notebooks and – or notebooks and books of reference, which I rarely go to but which I like to have there. And I can always find out. I always prize myself that I've got that far on knowing, that I know where to find out.

**LRH:** All right. Good. On the goal "to know," is there anything that you failed to reveal?

**PC:** Well, this – um – this works out as far as – um – somebody else's goal is in direct opposition to mine or apparently is in direct opposition. And I've never revealed it either to myself or to anybody else quite how this works out because it's extraordinary. Somebody has the goal "not to be found out," you see, and my goal is "to know."

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** And this opposite seems to apply quite a lot in cases and uh – I've always sort of felt shy of even examining this in too much detail, you know, because it might reveal something. So as far as revealing it to myself that... Are you – are you with me on this?

**LRH:** Yes, yes, I got it.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** All right. Check that on the meter again. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've failed to reveal? I don't think that read. Did you think of another?

**PC:** The only thing I thought
generally was that – uh – anything I don't reveal, of course, is an overt act. So I should confess. And I mean, uh – uh – as you know from experience, I mean, take that customs business, I daren't...  

**LRH:** Oh, yes.

**PC:** ...come through with anything because I would give... We were thinking it was on "impostor," at the time, but it actually is on this goal "to know." Do you see?

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** Because I'd give the game away. I can't really feel it's an overt not to reveal that I know it. You see?

**LRH:** Oh, yes. All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've failed to reveal? Boy, there is – there is something there, now, now.

**PC:** Well, what I just thought of then was, now there is a dirty trick; I just – I just committed an overt on you, you see, I'm getting you involved in the customs. They'd think you and I are running a terrific customs racket, do you see? [pc and LRH laugh]

**LRH:** Okay. All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you have failed to reveal? I didn't get a read on that one.

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** That's clean now. All right. On the goal "to know," has anything been invalidated? Looks clean to me. On the goal "to know," has anything been suggested? I'd say so.

**PC:** Oh, um – what I'm getting now is, there's not-know and know. And uh – if is – not-know is higher on the scale than know, or to know, and then know. And um – that – that's actually a suggestion to me. I haven't got a firm reality on it myself, but I can see the sense of it. But I – I started to look at it again. That's something that has been suggested to me and I sort of accept it.

**LRH:** Mm. Mm.

**PC:** Before I can have a goal "to know," I must obviously have had a goal to not-know or something to that extent.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," has anything been suggested? There is another suggest.

**PC:** Well, I suggested the goal was mine when we were on TV. Um – when you, upstairs, when we found this goal.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** I suggested it.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," has anything been suggested? All right, I don't think that was one. Okay?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** On the goal "to know," has a mistake been made? I didn't get one there. On the goal "to know," is there anything you have been anxious about? Yeah, I think so.

**PC:** Well, I'm a bit anxious about whether this goal is in or out and whether it is my goal. I mean the usual anxiousness that goes on with goals, I suppose.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been anxious about? I'd say, yes, there's another one.

**PC:** Well, I'm forever anxious. I mean, this is a – a terrible anxiety all my life on not... if I don't know anything. But uh... and I can see that many a time I got ARC broken just because I don't know. People come and ask me a question, if I
don't know the answer, I often find that I'm getting ARC broken with them. Because they – and then I accuse them of running a not-know on me, you see. Uh – and this happens. So anx... I mean, that's one long anxiety with this goal, Ron.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you have been anxious about? I think there is another one. Doesn't have to be, but uh...

**PC:** Well, I – I'd have to dig for it. I haven't got anything

**LRH:** You don't think. All right. Let me test it again. I might have slipped on that. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been anxious about? Yeah, there is one there.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** You'd better dig.

**PC:** Right. Um.

**LRH:** There.

**PC:** I – I know. I was a bit anxious when Peter was checking it um – out for the first time on this.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** Bless his heart, there's probably, and I put it there, a little doubt as to whether it was reading, do you see?

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** It was equivocal or something like this. And so I've probably been a bit anxious whether it has been in fact a goal that should be run. Yes, I think so.

**LRH:** Very good. All right. On the goal "to know," is there anything you've been anxious about? Well, I didn't get a thing there. Okay?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** All right. This needle's getting cleaner, by the way.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** On the goal "to know," has anything been protested? I have a protest here.

**PC:** I protested, um – that it should be run, I think, when we were messing around with something else on the begin – beginning of the intensive with – uh – with Peter.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** Uh, and I've been protesting "to know" is a very difficult goal to carry around on your shoulder. I can't get anything else.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," has anything been protested? That's equivocal. Can you think of another one?

All right. I'm going to ask that again. On the goal "to know," has anything been protested? I'd say there's another protest in there someplace.

**PC:** Um – well, I think it – it's – this comes down to protesting about – um – people who've got a goal "not to be found out" letting everybody know everything, and I've got a goal "to know" and being very quiet about it.

**LRH:** [laughs] All right. Good enough, Reg. On the goal "to know," has anything been protested? That's nice and clean. Okay?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** On the goal "to know," has anything been decided? Ah, yes!

**PC:** Well, I decided it was my goal "to know" all along. Soon as we got a tick on TD, I decided, that's mine, that's the
lot. I'm quite certain on that.

**LRH:** All right. All right. On the
goal "to know," has anything been decided?
There's another decide, I think.

**PC:** Yes. This – quite likely. This
is on what I – I – you once said to me that I
was a great decider and – or something
along those lines. And I often wondered – I
have since wondered whether cognitions –
(quote) "cognitions" I've had, have in fact
been decisions.

**LRH:** Oh, yes.

**PC:** Such as, uh – decide that this
is a heavy goal and it must be very difficult
to carry this goal around. And then uh, this
is the way it hits you. Whether, in fact, I
sort of have a look and decide these things.
So it's quite likely there's a lot of decisions
on the – on the line here.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to
know," has anything been decided? I don't
think that did a thing. Okay?

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** How do you feel about this
now?

**PC:** Fine.

**LRH:** All right. Let's get in the
counter button just for fun here, which is
"not-known." On the goal "to know," has
anything been not known?

**PC:** Hm. I thought I'd be saying
no.

**LRH:** Uh, what comes up here is
that I don't um – get a bit foxed on knowing
what not-know is. And that is not-know; it's
all to do with... Of course, that comes be-
fore the goal "to know."
**LRH:** Oh, this is bothering you a little bit?

**PC:** Yes, this does bother me a bit.

**LRH:** Ah, I see.

**PC:** I get this conception; I mean, I can see that high – higher up. But this state in between knowing this, presumably, and then not-know and then to know, just bewilders me a bit. And that is certainly not known.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** ...and until your needle's floating it would be.

**LRH:** All right. Is there a protest on the question?

**PC:** No. No. No.

**LRH:** No. Just – just – just is that concept?

**PC:** Oh, it's just that concept.

**LRH:** All right. All right. Sorry I misunderstood you.

**PC:** No, that's fine.

**LRH:** But I have understood you.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** All right. On the goal "to know," has anything been not known? You know, there's – there's – there's something sneaking around the edges. And it's probably that I am announcing an item. Somewhere on that bank there probably is an item, wouldn't you say? Because I'm starting to get a dirty needle on it – I mean, a dirty read on it. I'm going to leave that one alone if that's all right with you.

**PC:** All right. Yes.

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Now. Now, let's take this up. You can take a – take a break there, a moment, Reg. Now, let's take this up here. We've cleaned up the goal. We're not going to bother getting the goal to fire right this minute: we'll take that up in a moment. We've got here: secrecy. Hm. And I want you to indicate what's your last R/S on the list. Now, what is that word?

**Aud:** That's a question mark, that was nei... that's not an R/S or an RR. I checked that. It's "Invigilators." And I missed the read – it went off the meter or something – I came back and checked it. It never, to my knowledge...

**LRH:** All right.

**Aud:** ...has done anything; apart from that, I didn't see it.

**LRH:** All right. Now. From page 12 forward... Now, we've got this item, "dissemination," where does that come on this list? There it is. Well, now, look here, that's on page 7, is that your – actually your last RR on the list?

**Aud:** Mm.

**LRH:** All right. Now, I – I just had a cognition now.

**Aud:** I wondered what you meant when you said there was an RR after it. Now I see.

**LRH:** Ah! Ah.

**Aud:** Ah! Ah.

**LRH:** Ah! That's on page 7. And that's the last RR on the list.

**Aud:** All right. Now, I – I just had a cognition now.

**LRH:** Now what's that.?

**Aud:** I wondered what you meant when you said there was an RR after it. Now I see.

**LRH:** You had it folded backwards. I didn't look to see what your page numbers
were. Some auditors don't even number pages, you know. Now, that read, didn't it? And then did you add to the list?

**Aud:** Dissemination? No.

**LRH:** Have you added to the list since you tested "dissemination"?

**Aud:** No.

**LRH:** You haven't?

**Aud:** No.

**LRH:** And it read?

**Aud:** It gave a – it went like this. It gave a ragged sort of a – a rocket over. And that's the best I've had.

**LRH:** You mean this width?

**Aud:** No. No. No. You're the – you're the auditor.

**LRH:** All right. And that's the best what?

**Aud:** That's – that's – when I called it in – initially, that's what it did. It went – it sort of, it – it took off like a rocket but went and then did these little sort of jerks.

**LRH:** Well, what's the RR afterwards?

**Aud:** Ragged. That's got a question mark after it because I wasn't sure. And I...

**LRH:** And then over here somewhere it says "Adding to list."

**Aud:** No. Restarted list. That's the next session. In other words, that's the listing I did in that session. And then, look, I'm still getting – I got a little bit of TA there. So the next session restarted...

**LRH:** But this thing read. This thing read. This read.

**Aud:** It gave a ragged – look, I wrote on it, ragged rocket read. I got a rocket read on the Careful button when I ran a... the three-left-hand-button Prep-check on it. And next session I... before the next session I had Reg checked by Brian and he was checked on TV and there was no rocket read on there. So the best we've had on it, just calling it, is a – is this ragged motion. And I saw an RR on buttons. And then I – I- in that session I then big tiger drilled it and it went out completely. I couldn't get anything on it.

**LRH:** All right. In a case like that there are two things wrong. You have picked the wrong item off of your source list. That's the only two things that can be wrong now, see: you picked the wrong item off of your source list or that is the item. And it's been abandoned.

**Aud:** Hmm.

**LRH:** See, that's – because it read and because it RRRed on TD, can't be anymore. Your list is adequately completed here. How many pages beyond this have you gone? Seven. Eight.

**Aud:** One, two, three. Three pages.

**LRH:** See? And you haven't got another single read. Now, you just sit there and count the number of items from "dissemination" to the end of the list. Count for me.

**Aud:** ...It's fifty to there... A hundred. Do you want it exactly?

**LRH:** Gaa. A hundred! No other RR.

**Aud:** Right.

**LRH:** And you go a hundred and it read. You understand how you work this out?
Aud: Yes.

LRH: There's no sense in prowling around the rest of this list. Why isn't there any sense to it? This is 3M we're talking about now, not 2-12. See, here's the item, here's the item, "dissemination." Saw it fired. Fired on the drill. The list has been completed, completed, completed, completed. All right. We go back and sort out the number of things; we can say, "All right, secrecy is opposed wrong way to and we've got the wrong list or something of the sort." But, no, "secrecy" gave no RRs of any kind whatsoever.

Aud: Right.

LRH: So, it's a dead-end list.

Aud: That's right, so...

LRH: We tested the only read on it that was anything: it was nothing. You saw me drill it.

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: So that's a scrub. So this says there's nothing can be done about this except that's the item. Or one more possibility because of just this, these are just the only things: you grabbed the wrong one off the source list. Or it could be one more thing: wrong goal.

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: See? But that's highly unlikely because you are in the goals channel.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: Because you are getting RRs. So if you're getting RRs, that must be the item. You understand? I mean this couldn't be anything but the item. It's RRed on TD, you've completed the list, you did get "secrecy" checked out, it did fire, it's been opposed, obviously, right way to.

Aud: Yeah, well, why doesn't that check out?

LRH: I don't know. We will very shortly find out. All right. Do you understand the logic of this?

Aud: Yes, I see that.

LRH: Yeah. There's always that kind of logic, see. It can't be something else if that fired.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: See, because if something else fired, it would mean your list was incomplete. You understand?

Aud: Yes.

LRH: Only your list can't be incomplete because you've gone a hundred beyond it with no further read.

Aud: Hm. I'm – I'm pretty – I'm very positive I didn't miss one. Well, I mean, I could have missed one. But I – that would be – I was watching like a hawk, I was watching that meter. Particularly right from that moment on.

LRH: Oh, we're not worried much about that. Don't you see that you couldn't have missed one?

Aud: Yeah. Right.

LRH: You see how it proves itself without your sweating yourself to death?

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: You understand this logic? You'll see – sooner or later you'll see some auditor: well, that only read for a little while, so, therefore, we'll take over this list and we will check all of the things over and we will null everything on this list. And the guy's already extended the list a hundred items so he can't extend it any further. You know you can't extend these things more
than about twenty-five and then maybe you'll get another RR when you extend it. And you extend it another twenty five after that RR. You've just about had it.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: It won't stand any more strain than that.

Aud: Hm. Hm.

LRH: See, you can't go on listing the way you do with 2-12. The brakes go on right at that point, you understand?

Aud: Hm.

LRH: And you did have one that did read.

Aud: Right.

LRH: So we say, pc – pc very queasy. We say pc very queasy, pc suppress very easy. Pc have goal. We want to know. He doesn't know. He wants to know. We don't know.

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: Must be something like that going on. Furthermore, secrecy, and so forth. There's one – one more faint possibility: that somehow or another you got on the RR channel and you haven't got the right goal.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: See, that's another faint possibility.

Aud: Hm.

LRH: And we will see that possibility right now. But because that fired on the list and because the list has been extended...

Aud: Hm.

LRH: ...there's not another thing you can do about it. Now, if that hadn't fired at all you would then go above and below and above and below to make sure that the rocket read hadn't been sort of transferring. And you'd test all of those items.

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: And then you'd null it on out to the end of the list. And you'd find out you'd goofed one someplace and it'd now fire. You understand?

Aud: Right. Ron, I do have a confusion on this. I – I've got a withhold now.

LRH: What is your question?

Aud: Why could – this – why, because that read, couldn't there have been another one here reading?

LRH: There can't be.

Aud: I don't see that. I've got to admit that.

LRH: You went 100 beyond your last read.

Aud: Yeah, but suppose I'd missed one?

LRH: But you went 100.

Aud: Yeah. I'm being stupid, I know, but...

LRH: It's just too far.

Aud: Why?

LRH: Well, all right. Supposing you'd missed one. Supposing you'd missed one.

Aud: Yeah.

LRH: The list has not been added to.

Aud: That's correct.

LRH: So if two appeared on it the list would be incomplete.
Aud: Yes, that's correct.

LRH: This can't be incomplete. The list would be one, two... Now, look-a-here, here's the end of the list.

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: And we go one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three, twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty-six.

Aud: No, it was just body motion so I – I checked back and it was dead – deader than a mackerel.

LRH: You understand. But these are not added to.

Aud: No.

LRH: You didn't add these to the list.

Aud: No, I didn't. How do I know that list is complete? That's what I don't...

LRH: You've gone for pages here without a read.

Aud: And there couldn't be just one read that I missed?

LRH: All right, if there was a read you're sunk. You'd have to be stone-blind.

Aud: Yeah. Oh, in other words, it's chronically incomplete if there's one more.

LRH: Well, it isn't chronically incomplete or anything else.

Aud: If there was. Look, I...

LRH: We count on the fact that you were at least looking at your meter down the lines here.

Aud: Yeah well, I'm damn sure I was.

LRH: But you've gone on and on and on. Now, because one thing has read...

Aud: Yeah.

LRH: ...you understand, if another one now reads after that your list is incomplete. So that isn't it either. You understand?

Aud: I don't. I'm sorry.

LRH: Yeah. I had – I had a hard time getting this through Mary Sue's head and everybody else has had a hard time. If there's two items on the list, it's incomplete.

Aud: Agreed.

LRH: So if the second item occurs on the list, that isn't it.

Aud: The list is incomplete.

LRH: So why are you monkeying with it?

Aud: To complete it.

LRH: Well, look, this is either now the item...

Aud: Uh-huh.

LRH: ..."dissemination" is the item

Aud: Uh-huh. Yeah. Oh, I see, or the list's not about to complete, is that it?

LRH: No. No. No. That's nothing to do about it. It's simpler than that. Now, there's the item and it seemed – it's been seen to fire.

Aud: Yes.

LRH: You got it? It's been seen to fire. Correct?

Aud: Yes.

LRH: So that if any item occurs all the way down here and all the way down here and all the way down here and all the way down here to that point, since the list...
has not been added to since you tested that...

Aud: Yeah.
LRH: ...the item is not on this list if that isn't it.
Aud: Right. Yes. Now, I see that.
LRH: You see that?
Aud: Yes.
LRH: So the only possible test is, then, to make a continued listing of twenty-five items.
Aud: Yes, I get that.
LRH: Looking for an RR.
Aud: I get that.
LRH: This is the only possible way you can test the list.
Aud: Yes.
LRH: So either "dissemination" is it...
Aud: Yep.
LRH: ... or you add twenty-five to the list to see if you get an RR.
Aud: Right.
LRH: And if you don't get an RR in that, then "dissemination" was it and you go on and use it.
Aud: Right. I – I can see this now.
LRH: You understand?
Aud: Yes.
LRH: So the only actions to be undertaken here is "dissemination" to be checked to see if we can't pep up a read out of it.
Aud: Uh-huh. Yeah.
LRH: Or, if we can't, add twenty-five to the list, see if there's a read on the twenty-five. Because in that space on 3M you'll have gotten a read, see?
Aud: Yeah. Uh-huh.
LRH: And if that meter doesn't flicker during that additional twenty-five...
Aud: It's wrong source.
LRH: No. No. No. "Dissemination" is it.
Aud: Oh, "dissemination" is it. Or if it isn't, wrong source. Yes. It would be – if it didn't – if – oh, yeah, yes, yeah, I see. At twenty-five it must be there.
LRH: Correct. It's the only thing that's been seen to read on the list.
Aud: Right. Yes. Yes. Yes.
LRH: You follow me?
Aud: I do follow this now. I've got it.
LRH: You've got this?
Aud: Yes.
LRH: So all this 3M – well, we saw that read and it only read for a moment, so now we're going to null the rest of the RI list. This would be true of a source list, you'd go all over the darn thing, you see. You see, you'd say, "I – well, we'd better null from that down on to the end, don't you see, and we'd better do this and we'd better do that." You see how all that proves nothing?
LRH: If you did find one from "dissemination" to the end of the list... See, the list has not been added to.
Aud: Yes, that's correct.
LRH: So if there is one there, just
so you understand there, it can't be it.

Aud: Yes. That's right. I understand.

LRH: So the action you're about to see me undertake is what you would undertake on that. I'm sorry, Reg.

PC: That's all right.

LRH: Pick up the cans, would you? That's okay. I beg your pardon. I'm just looking this over to see exactly where we stand here. I'm not trying to teach him anything. I'm trying to whet this thing out. You feel all right?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Is this upsetting to you in any way?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Are you – I'm going to say your goal. To know. All right. To know. To know. All there was, was one tick and a speeded fall. Okay?

PC: All right.

LRH: Now. Let's take this item "secrecy" and make sure there's no tick on "secrecy." We're not looking for a rocket read, all we want's a tick if it's there. Secrecy. Secrecy. Pretty hard to tell. Secrecy. Secrecy. I don't know whether that's reading or not. Secrecy. Secrecy – looks like it's reading.

Aud: Something is reading.

LRH: All right. On this item, has anything been suppressed? It shouldn't read. Rudiments in or not, it just shouldn't read. This is one of your test steps of 3M the way it's been released.

Aud: I checked this on Friday. It was null.

LRH: And what happened?
LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? ...Something's suppressed there?

PC: Well, I suppressed arguing with you. You had suggested that "dissemination" wasn't on the goal line. And I suppressed arguing with you that it was. I could well see that "dissemination" was on the goal line. To me.

LRH: All right.

PC: And I was quite happy about that and I thought, well, it's silly to argue about it because it's my cognition and not Ron's. I mean, we have varying cognitions on it. And so that was suppressed.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? I'd say there's another one.

PC: Well, I think I suppressed admitting that I am a – a – an excellent suppressor. I mean, I've got a wonderful excuse now that I've got this item. Yes, this is what it is, this item gives me a terrific excuse, you see; I can say, well, it's all right, I suppress, it's my item. And this is rather a dirty get-out, you see.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: I think that's gone on. I've suppressed that.

LRH: All right. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? There is one there.

PC: Uh – this has a lot to do with the term suppression, which I have heard you say is a "forget." Um – I look upon suppress as more overt than a – than a forget; forget seems to me to be something that you haven't got a lot of control over at this stage of the game. That one uh – forget... Well, there's a lot I've forgotten which on that score has been suppressed. But I can't think of anything that I have deliberately suppressed or forgotten.

LRH: All right. Okay. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? Well, now, it's banging on a suppress and the item is reading.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Give me another suppress.

PC: Um – I wondered whether I suppressed the um – its opposition when I came on TV in here the other night. Probably, I must admit that I did, but how, I don't know, when I was trying to – uh – get "dissemination" reading. That is on the item suppress – that is on the item "secrecy," you see, "dissemination" is.

LRH: Was I going to – I don't quite get quite how you suppressed this or where.

PC: Well, here because it didn't read when it came to be checked out because it read for Peter.

LRH: Oh, that's right. You've been on television elsewhere.

PC: I beg your pardon. Yes, I came in – yes, we came in here on Friday. Brian was checking out. We thought we were going to show them rocket reads, you see.

LRH: Bells ring.

PC: I'm sorry.

LRH: All right. Very good. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? All right, I still got a reaction. It's another one, however. There.

PC: Well, I think when I was listing it I suppressed – um – despair and even protest because the list seemed to be going on a long while.
LRH: Oh, really.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? Boy, there is a suppress on that! And you think that that is because the item itself means suppress. Is that right?

PC: Secrecy can mean suppress, yes.

LRH: Is that what I understood you to say a moment ago?

PC: Yes, that would – uh – secrecy would be a suppression.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: It would be the big suppression. You suppress everything into secrecy.

LRH: All right. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed.? All right. Secrecy. Secrecy. Secrecy. Secrecy. I don't know whether that's reading or not. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? Boy, there is a suppression, just a pure garden-variety of suppression on this item "secrecy" now. What is it?

PC: Well, I'm very secretive. I don't know if this is it. I'm very secretive out of – uh – fear, very often that – uh... and the fear is one of these – uh – unexplainable things that I just don't know. I might not come and tell you something that I don't want to keep to myself, and yet when I come to tell it to you it just won't come out.

LRH: Hmm.

PC: That's why I say – therefore I say well, I'm secretive. I – I can't. Well, the same thing, to take it outside here, to go and speak to my wife: I get there and I just wouldn't be able to talk to her. I can't – and you know, I pick up a pen and I – and I just can't pick up the pens to write. I mean, it's this bad. And it's fear or something, it's one of these things I just can't explain. But, therefore, I'm secretive. And I feel this is wrong, you see. But um – there you are.

LRH: All right.

PC: Hell of a suppression on – on the – well, a hell of suppression on my life over it, is one big suppression.

LRH: All right. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? All right. There is a different one, that's another one.

PC: Uh

LRH: Is this being protested?

PC: Uh – it – it seems a terrific.... I can well believe it's reading because there must be one... there should – an infinite number of suppressions on this item.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And, uh – uh, I just – it might be a little while cleaning this up because – uh – to hear you say secrecy, what to me means suppression, and that's making me suppress all along, all the time. You see?

LRH: Uh-huh. Hm. All right. On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? On the item "secrecy," has anything been suppressed? All right. Unless you can think of a ready answer, I'm going to drop that one.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. I'm just going to read it just straight here. Secrecy. Secrecy.
This is reading, Mr. Williams, which probably gives us the source of our trouble. That has not listed down. Your proper action is to continue that twenty-five items. See if you find something else. Continue it maybe a little bit further – see if you find something else.

**Aud:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** If you don't find anything on those, go back to the source list. Because there's something awful wrong on an item that won't list down.

**Aud:** Uh-huh. Yes, I thought of that.

**LRH:** Yeah. And it is reading. The button shouldn't be charged on this thing.

**Aud:** Hm. No, that's charge.

**LRH:** Your last action in desperation, if you lost everything in all directions and you could find nothing else by extending your source list, you know, couldn't find anything and so forth, why, would be to try to carry on with this item because you've seen it rocket read.

**Aud:** Yeah.

**LRH:** Usually you don't get into this much trouble. But early on – early on on a goal that's having a hard time firing, see. I'm amazed that this goal's got a tick on it or anything like that, you see, that might still be just greased out.

**Aud:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** As easy as that. But he, not knowing whether this is his item or not, not knowing really whether secrecy is out or not, or in, you know – disoriented on the thing – is giving an example here because this needle is going back and forth here into a perpetual God-elp-us, you notice. It's been very hard to read. It's not your dirty needle [pc laughs] you used to have, you know, that's not it. This is just a wild swing. And it's doing it constantly one way or the other. And it's smoother now than it was. And what have I done? I've drilled the goal "to know"; I drilled "secrecy" a tiny bit. But actually that "secrecy" shouldn't be reading, see? It just shouldn't be reading. We shouldn't have to tiger drill it to make it not read, see. You don't tiger drill these things, you list them.

**Aud:** Uh-huh. Incomplete list.

**LRH:** Apparently. Simple. Now, the chances of your having a wrong goal here are very remote. Because it has been seen to fire and you haven't got enough items yet to make this goal read well.

**Aud:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** It'll take you as many as twenty-six goals – pardon me, items to run it out. And it might just take five, six, seven accurately found, instantly found, you know, very smooth, easy-on-the-pc items and the goal will be firing like crazy. Got that?

**Aud:** Yeah.

**LRH:** So, that's all there is to that.

**Aud:** Hm.

**LRH:** All right. You can straighten these out in due course. Now. Let's put in a little bit of rudiments here, shall we? For the end of this demonstration.

**PC:** All right.
has anything been suppressed?

PC: Don't think so. You can have my all. Except what I've suppressed on secrecy.

LRH: All right. All right. In this demonstration, has anything been suppressed? All right. I changed the word there from that, to checkout to that. In this checkout, has anything been suppressed? There has been something suppressed here.

PC: Uh – yes, you asked me and I suppressed the nature of the paper I threw away.

LRH: All right. Very good. In this checkout, has anything been suppressed?

PC: I don't think so.

LRH: All right. I'll check it again. In this checkout, has anything been suppressed? All right. That's clean. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of?

PC: Careful to cooperate. That's about all.

LRH: All right. In this checkout – I'll check it on the meter. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of? I'm afraid there is one there.

PC: Well, I was very careful to try and follow the discussion between you and Peter on this complete list. Because I was up here, you see.

LRH: All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of?

PC: I was careful to look for answers. And... I don't get anything else.

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check that on the meter. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of? There is another one.

PC: Oh, careful to give a good impression, I think. Yes.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of? I've got another one.

PC: Uh – I was careful when I was speaking about Peter, not to accuse him of doing something wrong. Because I don't think he did at that time but I tried to wrap it up nicely when I came out with that one.

LRH: All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of? Another one.

PC: Well, I was careful, I think, at one stage not to mention somebody's name.

LRH: Yeah. All right.

PC: I hid that one for a bit there, but still.

LRH: Okay. In this checkout, is there anything you've been careful of? I don't think there was anything there. All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

PC: Well, I didn't reveal all the suppressions that – obviously that were on that – on the secrecy. But on the other hand, I couldn't say that I've revealed all that I was aware of. Put it that way.

LRH: All right. All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. I'll check that on the meter. In this checkout, is there anything you have failed to reveal? I've got a kick on that. What is it?
PC: Well, I was – I failed to reveal to Peter at times I didn't think he was speaking loudly enough to get into that microphone. Because he's over there and the microphone's there, you see.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: I was trying to give him signals at times. Perhaps I failed to reveal to him what I actually wanted was for him to speak up so that everybody could join in.

LRH: All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've failed to reveal? There's another one.

PC: Something to do with the fear of – uh... something to do with the fear of telling of – of saying things. Oh that – that it doesn't apply to everything. There's some – I've never been able to work out what the line is that I get scared about talking, see, to people about. But it's just something I – and there doesn't seem to be a common denominator. I mean, there's lots of things I'm quite open about and there's no difficulty in talking to people about it. Some things, and I haven't sorted this out, no doubt it will come out in the goal "to know," when I'll – I run that out, but it's – uh – it's certainly there and I think it's something to do with showing myself up in a bad light and so on. And I didn't reveal all that I've just told you, but that's as far as I know on that subject.

LRH: All right. Okay. In this checkout, is there anything you have failed to reveal? I don't think there was anything more on that.

PC: Good.

LRH: Okay. Now. In this checkout, has anything been invalidated? I didn't get anything except a latent something or other. In this checkout, has anything been suggested? There is a suggest.

PC: You suggested – you suggested one time – you didn't mean it – but I got the suggestion that I'd got a dirty, filthy needle there. I was a bit concerned about this.

LRH: Oh, all right. I'm sorry.

PC: I've done a bit of suggesting – I'm a bit uh – I did notice that the tone arm was rather low and I – and uh – suggested there must be something wrong with being checked out on TV that gives me this very low tone arm.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And I was a bit puzzled about that.

LRH: All right. In this checkout, has anything been suggested? All right. I don't think there was anything there. In this checkout, has a mistake being made? I'd say yes. Just to be careful.

PC: Oh, yes. It's to do with murder or murderer. And uh – you found "murderer." And as you know, I always disputed and protested this to some extent. And you said you got witnesses and so on. And I always had the thing where I couldn't pass it, and when he came up with "murder" such as it was, I said, well, that was the item, it was "murder" not "murderer." I didn't mind buy a "murder," but "murderer" didn't – never seemed ... I don't see any real reason for this, but "murder" seemed to fit so much better, do you see? And so this was again mentioned. And you said, after Peter said it was "murder," you again said "murderer," do you see, down the line... and uh - when actually the item found was "murder." I don't know – uh – possibly a bit of a missed withhold. I don't know whether you really appreciated the item that you
found was "murderer," but the item Peter ran was "murder." And uh – they're two different things.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Very good. Okay. In this checkout, has a mistake been made? All right. I don't think there was one there. In this checkout, is there anything you have been anxious about? Oh, I think so, at a guess.

**PC:** Anxious about tone arm. Anxious about Peter's speaking loudly enough. Uh – anxious for Peter sometimes that he wouldn't get on. Anxious that we got a – a decent read for them out on the other side. Uh – a bit about uh – anxious about Mary Sue because I took away her screens upstairs. Um, oh, I think that's the lot.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? Oh, dear. Let me see. Let me give that again. In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? I think there is. One more.

**PC:** Yeah, I've been anxious about this – uh – feeling of fear that comes up even in... on these sessions, on TV, and I can't make it out because I can't see... It seems – uh – I've no – I've no sympathy for the students when they come here. There's nothing and I - and I'm quite happy to come and sit down here and do it. And yet once I sit down here and you start asking rudiment questions and so on, and – yaaaaa, and I feel so filthy and secretive, and so on. And yet – I – I don't get this at all. I've been anxious about that.

**LRH:** All right. In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? Do you think there's another answer there? I couldn't make it.

**PC:** I have – I haven't got one.

**LRH:** All right. Let me check it once more. In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? Yes, there's another.

**PC:** I was anxious that that would read there because I thought we cleaned it, you see, and this always happens. Peter gets an equivocal and it always reads the next time.

**LRH:** Oh, I see. All right.

**PC:** And I get anxious about it.

**LRH:** In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? Oh, I don't know. Anxious about. There is another one.

**PC:** I was anxious about the time once.

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:** Uh-huh.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. In this checkout, is there anything you've been anxious about? Well, I don't think that had anything on it at all. All right. In this checkout, has anything been protested? Yes.

**PC:** I was probably protesting um – Prepcheck or the drilling of uh – taking suppress off "secrecy."

**LRH:** Hm.

**PC:** I don't know of any other protest at all.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. In this checkout, has anything been protested? That looked clean to me. And in this checkout, has anything been decided? There's one.

**PC:** Well, you decided to set a course of action in my case. Uh – and I think I've decided something on this – there
must be something more on this question of fear, I think a... decision.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. In this checkout, has anything been decided? I don't think there was anything there. All right. Now, how are you doing?

**PC:** All right. I feel quite – uh – quite perky as a matter of fact. As we went through these rudiments I did really come up quite a bit.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. It would be unusual to put all these in, in a checkout, but I thought you deserved them.

**PC:** Thank you.

**LRH:** All right. Is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this checkout?

**PC:** Uh, no, thank you.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Thank you very much for giving it to me. I appreciate it.

**LRH:** Good enough. Here it is: end of checkout.

**PC:** Thank you.

**LRH:** Okay. There we go.

Well, you've seen something of a straighten-up tonight on a case. And I've simply reviewed the case. But the truth of the matter is, is there is no large read on this goal. That doesn't at this stage of the game, however, mean a thing. If rocket reads are being actually observed and checked out on this case, that's no excuse not to go along and follow the thing through. But it might be a little more difficult than it first appears.

Now, the main difficulty which is being caused on this case and why this... I wanted to find out why Peter here was writing down lots of question marks and having trouble on what read and that sort of thing. Now, I see the reason for this. The reason for this is that somewhere in 2-12 they must have kicked in some sort of a needle pattern of some kind or another or the pc was upset about some incomplete package or upset about something there one way or the other.

And what I would do with this pc is to give a good interested – interesting approach, which is a nice smooth Prepcheck. And I would do that this way: I would take goals, listing, auditing, auditors, something like this, and I'd make this little list. I'd make this little list and write it down and then I would assess it over here on the meter. And I'd give it a nice assessment and find out which one of these things went pow! And then I would run an eighteen-button Prepcheck on it. Just like that. And I'd be sure to give this pc a very, very, very smooth auditing session, smooth auditing approach. I would give them everything in the world to build up ARC, confidence squared up, get anything he's worried about. Don't you see? Any one of these things, you see. I'd make him feel good. Particularly I'd pull any missed withholds from auditors and that sort of thing.

But I wouldn't pull it in any naggish fashion. You understand? I'd pull it very smoothly. It's not that this pc is in bad shape: this pc isn't in bad shape. But some of these 2-12 packages have apparently roughed this pc's needle up. Because I know this pc's needle and I have it smooth as glass. And that doesn't mean that Peter did anything wrong particularly or otherwise, but something somewhere along the line here has roughed this thing up. And I
would try to get rid of that needle pattern and after that audit him on a very smooth, clean needle.

That's the first thing I would do. That doesn't necessarily take a long time. That pays good, heavy dividends, don't you see? Because then you're operating with a pc who has some good confidence in the auditor, and so forth. I'd go along – it wouldn't take too long, take maybe at the absolute outside two three-hour sessions. I mean two two-hour sessions. Because that's done rather rapidly.

Then I'd come back here and I'd test list this item "dissemination." I would just simply go another twenty-five, something like that, watching this new, clean needle we have here and make sure that we didn't have a rocket read as we went that twenty-five. And if we didn't have, then I would take "dissemination," which has already done a rocket read on checkout – Tiger Drill, but it wasn't checked out – and I would take "dissemination" and I would establish whether or not it was a terminal or an oppterm and I would list it down to a new item. And I think I'd find that we were approaching closer and closer into the bank that the goal would read better and better. Just go on down the Spiral Staircase as long as I could get rocket reads. And that would be the criteria.

That is everything that I would do. I wouldn't do anything new, novel, strange, anything else. I would just do – find out what it is that's worrying this pc, whether it's goals or listing or auditing or auditors or whatever it is that's worrying him. Give him a Prepcheck on that particular subject. Good, high ARC with the auditor. Go back in, list this thing the additional twenty-five items that proves it up. No read on the twenty-five items, obviously "dissemination" is it. Take "dissemination," terminal or oppterm, oppose it on down the line.

And of course, the only thing about it would be if I never got a new rocket read and the lists were all bare and something was dead wrong. I would then assume something was awfully wrong with the source list. And I would go back to the source list on the goal and I would sort that out. And I would complete it and only assessing the new items that I put on the list completing it, go over those and see what I could find.

That's everything I would do with the case.

But we're looking too far ahead. This case is perfectly all right and it probably will work out that "dissemination" simply has to be opposed. And you'll see that it won't take the auditor too long to do this.

But in actual fact, this case has had too much... too many question marks thrown in his way. He's worried a little bit about this, he's worried about that and, of course, he's stuck right here in this "secrecy." Well, this thing is still kicking. The fact that it's still kicking, that it had been listed down in the session we agree, possibly was clean. Well, that was good enough, but because it doesn't have an oppterm that thing is going to keep kicking. Don't you see? That's enough to make it tick. But it's also enough to make one question whether or not the list was complete in the first place. That's everything we know about it.

All right. Now, that's it. And thank you very much.

And good night.
Well, good evening.

We have a lecture here tonight on the GPM. And this is the 28th of February, AD 13.

Now, the difficulty with this lecture that I'm about to make to you is it's liable to bring your GPM loose from its moorings. And if so, I'm very sorry for that. I'm very sorry for it, but we will be able to pick it up as we go along, so don't feel too upset.

GPM – what is this? What is this? The Goals Problem Mass is what it stands for. Why is it the Goals Problem Mass? It is that mass which accumulates after the postulation of a goal resulting in problems. Only these problems are not the problems of postulate-counter-postulate, but they're identity-counter-identity.

In handling the GPM, we are actually handling identities.

Now, let me put you in focus with regard to where we have gone in processing. The first processing resulting in Clears was simply a Key-Out Clear – getting somebody to confront his bank and his actions on a gradient scale. And that is as old as 1947.

Now, as we move forward we find that Clears – as we move forward in this technology – we find that Clears were not continuous, permanent and stable as the years went along and that anything from three days to many years after being cleared, something would bite. Something would cave back in. Something would happen and they would cease to be Clear.

All right. What is this something? Well, this something is actually what made them a non-Clear in the first place – the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, an individual goes through this type of cycle and action: He makes a postulate. He becomes an identity to make the postulate stick, and in the process of doing that, he is opposed by various elements out of his own fancy or the determination of others which causes an opposition identity to materialize. And the presence of the opposition makes the individual believe that to accomplish his goal he must now become another, different identity in order to handle the new opposition which has appeared.

And because he is this new, different identity – all in the same goal – new opposition, a new opposition identity occurs in his vicinity. And because this second opposition has now occurred, he believes that it is incumbent upon him – either because he is losing or winning – to assume a third identity in sequence. He assumes this identity and as soon as he assumes that this new identity, he now has a new opposition form ...

Well, I'll give you an idea. We mean opposition like this: A man decides to be a smoker. Let's not put it on the GPM basis, let's put it very finite. A man decides to smoke. He therefore becomes an identity known as a smoker.
You've seen them in the ads. They look very placid. If they smoke cigarettes, they chase pretty girls. And if they smoke pipes they chase fireplaces. You know? And we've seen this. Whatever this identity was, he's assumed this identity and then he gets married and his wife objects to his being "a smoker"; so now he has an opposition known as "a wife." So he assumes a new identity which is "a dominating husband" in order to handle the identity "wife."

But now we have a new identity show up. We have something called "the Ladies' Aide Society" – And his wife has joined that. And their combined forces are going to cause him to stop smoking. So now he has to become "a wealthy self-determined individual." You see that? And the Ladies' Aide Societies then get a bunch of quacks – members of the AMA – together and they say that if you smoke it produces cancer. They don't know what produces cancer but they say that smoking does. They... you see that's the ghost-shirt messianic thing. They have no solution to it, they can't cure it so they pick on something and they say, "Well, everybody spits in the water so that's what causes typhoid fever." They don't know. You see?

So, now he has a counter-identity called "the American Medical Association." You see? And that's an identity. So, this fellow now in desperation to handle this situation, becomes "a political genius," you see. Because you have to be a political genius these days to handle the AMA. That's the only place where they operate effectively. Don't operate effectively in the operating room anymore, only in Congress.

So here he is now "a genius," you see, "a political genius." Now, the political genius runs into an opposition party. So, you have an opposition party – "the Democrats." You see, that's the next oppterm. And that's about the high tide of the whole thing.

Let us say not... no reference to the number of items you really have. You've got a deterioration of this situation. He now starts getting lesser identities and the opposition on the subject starts to get bigger.

So, he says – he becomes then "a ward politician." And the opposition, in this particular case as a ward politician, becomes "the nation." And then he becomes an idea called "political bribery." And his opposition is "the world." And then he becomes a fellow who wouldn't... can't stand the idea of smoke and the opposition is "the atom bomb."

You see? This is the – the term-oppterm list I'm giving you. But I'm giving it from the goal upwards. Not as you the auditor, contact it.

All right. Well, let's take it now at the point of the... "a fellow who can't stand smoke" versus "the atomic bomb," which is the most smoking thing which there is on the planet, you see. And those are the first two terminals you run into. That's, pardon me, the first two items you run into – RIs. And the first terminal you run into for the preclear is "a fellow who can't stand smoke." And the opposition you run into is "the atomic bomb." So, as you list this goal oppose list you run into the atomic bomb and he says, "That's the most smoking thing I can think of. The goal is 'to smoke' or 'to be a smoker,' so therefore I am the atomic bomb." Of course, you are immediately backwards, instantly backwards. Because the first items you run into, the goal has gone into a deterioration on the terminal side and an amplification on the oppterminal side.
So, the amplification of the oppterm means that it is the top dog type of item, and the individual as the term is the degraded type of item.

You never quite know what you are going to run into. It isn't fair for an auditor to totally make up his mind so that no listing or anything else can prove him wrong because it's the mechanical facts of listing. I'm just talking now about the GPM, not so much how you audit it. That is what it looks like. That is what it looks like from a standpoint of making the postulate "to be a smoker," going through these various phases as terminals and meeting these various oppositions.

Well, now we know that a problem – the reason it's called a Goals Problem Mass, is we know that a problem is a very balanced situation. A consistent problem is one – is consistent and continuous only because it is so well balanced between its two poles. In other words, the amount of violence contained in each one of the sides of the problem are more or less equal. So the problem continues.

Well, when we look at a GPM we find actually that it is composed of black masses. And that is said advisedly. You say "What is a mass?" Well, a mass is a mass. If you had a bunch of black cotton or something of the sort heaped up in the middle of the floor, that is what the GPM looks like.

Of course, that whole black mass is composed of these little parts – these terminals and opposition terminals – and each one of those is a black mass. Well now, we say problem – a problem consists of postulate-counter-postulate which means an intention versus an intention. And the husband wants to go to the movies, the wife doesn't want to go to the movies, so we have a problem. And if their – if their determination were equal, it would be an unresolvable problem. There are these determinations – were exactly equal and it would hang just like that. And it would go on interfering with their married life. And it'd become more and more solid and more and more reinforced and it would hang up.

Now, actually problems are almost impossible to balance in this fashion. One side is stronger than the other and they over-balance. Therefore, the residual of two hundred trillion years is composed of a few sections, a few goals and a relatively few of these items. Because they have to be so delicately and intricately balanced. The opposition is hung up against the terminal, and these things have to be very, very, very carefully delicately balanced in order to ride forward.

You'll notice the odd part of it is that if you want something to ride forward in time, you make two counter-opposed efforts. You have to have effort A versus effort B counter-opposed. And if you get those things counter-opposed, they will ride – it will ride forward in present time.

Now, the whole GPM is tending to ride forward in present time and its characteristic is instantaneousness, because it has no time in it. That is because every time one of these firm identities has been opposed by a firm opposition, and where the balance necessary to a hang-up has been achieved, we got a timeless situation.

This thing started drifting forward in time. With each click of the clock we weren't able any longer to overbalance one and the other. So there they are, fist against fist, incapable
of being disturbed. Nothing disturbs these things. And then we get two more on top of this and two more on top of this, so those are jammed and then two more on top of this and two more on top of this and those jam. And we eventually get this situation which is riding forward in time.

Actually, this goal has produced literally billions of identities but those aren't the identities which we process; billions of them, but they didn't hang up in time. Do you see that? Because they weren't accurately and exactly opposed. They didn't hang up in time. Only those which hung up in time are those which have to be addressed. What happened to these other identities? Well, they just dropped off and as-ised and skipped it and so forth.

And that's fortunate for you because two hundred trillion years, if you write it down on the wall and figure out that an identity was achieved – oh, every three or four – three or four times a century or even if an identity was achieved once every hundred years, you'll find out that you have an incalculable number of identities which have an incalculable number of oppositions. And you just would never be able to process them. There are just too many. Numerically, it is just too many.

But fortunately it's only those that were exactly balanced, the terminal is exactly intentioned against the opposition which is exactly intentioned, that match it with absolute precision that permits all this thing to drift forward for – well, the first one has been drifting forward for two hundred trillion years. That's how old it is. Pretty moldy.

That's... but it's what saves us in processing this thing is the almost incalculable rarity with which you got a total hang-up. We don't always have the problem, "I want to go to the movies" and "You can't go to the movies." We don't just have that hanging. In life ordinarily the husband says, "Well, honey, actually I think we ought to go to the movies because as we were passing the drugstore I was going to get you a box of candy." And she says, "Well, I think we better go to the movies, huh?" And, or conversely – conversely she breaks out a rolling pin, hits him over the head and of course he can't go to the movies or anyplace else. In other words, the problem resolves itself there, see? One side overweights the other side.

But you get a tenuous holding of one against the other – no matter what violence was interchanged, they tenuously hold against each other and exactly balanced – that problem has never been solved. So the GPM could be said to be that accumulation of identities and oppositions which have never been resolved from the beginning of time.

Now, of course some of those originate in relatively modern times. But the earliest of them has been with us since the beginning of time.

Now, what – what... why do we call this then the Goals Problem Mass? Well, we call it the Goals Problem Mass because it's generated by the effort on the part of the thetan to execute a goal he has postulated. That's goals. Problem because it is in terms of an identity versus another identity which has hung up as a problem. And we call it mass because this pair banging against each other has given us in the bank, mass – Goals Problem Mass. And that is why it is called that.

All right. By the way, it's a brand-new discovery in Scientology so there is no similar terminal to be... I mean, no similar designation. There aren't even words for these terminals,
for opposition terminals. I mean, this has to be new nomenclature because there is absolutely nothing to measure up to this. These things have never been observed before in the human makeup.

For instance we're new, as it's new, as this: We were the ones who identified a field. What is a field? You know a black field or different moving field or that sort of thing. What is this? We're the first one that ever found out people had it.

And actually although a few people have called attention to... I think beginning about at 1913 somebody mentioned the fact that some people could see pictures. I think that's about the earliest reference on it.

The lock, secondary and engram are all original with us. And then we take it one step deeper and we get the mass which is the result of having an identity, and we call that a circuit. And oddly enough it'll continue to talk, it'll continue to think, it'll continue to do a lot of things when energized and we find people with these circuits and so forth. Those circuits are fringe – that we normally see in operation – are fringe parts of the GPM and we're actually looking at the GPM when we look at circuits.

Well, we are the ones who have found these things and therefore our terminology for them is quite new. But it can be nothing else because, never having been discovered anyplace else, it of course had no terminology.

Now, look at the cycle of processing, getting back to that. First we started to make Clears by accustoming people to look at their banks and be able to see that bank. And just these little pictures. And to the degree that they could confront those pictures you would get a key-out. That is to say the individual would no longer let them bother him. And going in on a gradient scale, you could do this today – it's long and arduous – you could get the individual more and more accustomed to confronting his bank. And more and more accustomed to it. You could show it to him, get him so he could see it, so he could face it. And the next thing you know he'd see more and more things in it and more and more things in it, be less and less flinching. And next thing you know his needle on the E-Meter over here – his needle would go clean and you would have a Keyed-Out Clear. You could do that today.

Actually you can tackle the GPM this way. You can take 3M and you can call off items... Well, you don't have to. You can just say – after you've listed the list you can say to the preclear, "Which one of these is your item?" He tells you the wrong item. He never tells you the right one, by the way. Well, not unless he's about one goal down, you've already got his – his cognition level is picking up and he's beginning to see these things. Auditors shouldn't be dissuaded, however. They should go on and get the item that reads.

But anyway, you say, "Which one of these is your item?" and he will inevitably – particularly on the first goal and part of the second – call it wrong. And now if you took that item and you opposed it – you know, it didn't read – and you opposed it in some way – you're doing listing as auditing – and you got another list and you said, "Which one of these is your item?" And the individual said, "Well, it's that one." That's wrong, too, because this list, by the way, doesn't RR. And then you said, "All right. Which one of these is your item?" And the individual would say, "Oh, so-and-so." There's some chance that you would produce a Keyed-Out Clear. This is quite interesting but there's some chance that you would do so.
There's always an equal chance or maybe a superior chance that you would continue to drop him through into heavy areas and earlier GPMs which made him go clank! You know, I mean, just – just caved him right in, just dragged him into zones and areas where he had no business being.

So this is no sure cure method. But you're going to hear from time to time as the years go on, some wild Indian jumping up suddenly and learning how to make a Keyed-Out Clear and trying to pass for the real thing. We've been making Keyed-Out Clears now for sixteen years. There is no particular reason to make any more of them.

Now, they've been enough worry to us. Thank you.

The... what I'm getting at here is our first address, then, was really to locks. And I almost fell out of my auditor's chair back in 1947 or 48 when I found out that people could confront their birth. Now, those engrams weren't run. See? They could see prenats. They could see this, they could see the other things. And actually it was less confront. I was throwing them into it more and more heavily. See? And I was not building them up and when I started to train auditors, they didn't handle this smoothly and the next thing you know we were involved totally with mechanics. And we were not involved in any way, shape or form with the preclear. You see the difference? So therefore we got PCs going into engrams which were very hard to run indeed. And this got us into Dianetics in 1950.

Now, we can do some marvelous things running engrams. There is no doubt about that. And it's quite remarkable running engrams. But do you recognize that every individuality which this individual has had all the way along the track, every person he has been, had a complete bank?

Now, look at that. Do you know how much bank there is in this current lifetime in a PC? Well, there's a lot of bank, man. There's lots of pictures, lots of locks, lots of secondaries. And you sit down to run out just one lifetime, all the engrams in one lifetime, and you're really biting off a large chaw of tobacco. That's a big bite. I don't think you could do it. Takes too long.

You realize that every thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy years, he's accumulated – if he were in a body line – he's accumulated a complete bank. You know, a complete bank as we see it in a lifetime. And that for every, well, let's say three times a century or once a century or some intermediate figure, from here back two hundred trillion years at least – see, two hundred trillion years at least – for every one of these lifetimes, he has a complete set of what he has in this lifetime. You understand how many pictures that is? It gets into some astronomical figure. And if you had to erase each one of those pictures you'd be in a bad way as an auditor.

In other words, erasing the whole bank got mixed up with keying out the bank. And the defeat of Dianetics was simply – to the degree it was defeated – was simply undertaking to wash out, to erase the whole bank, not to key it out. You understand, a big difference there.

The early techniques were very feathery, they were very lightweight, the PC did just exactly what he could confront. I can remember vividly getting a PC to go out and walk in the office, three, four, five, six times and shut his eyes each time and see if he could see a picture of the office. Until he finally could see a lock of the office. And then I'd ask him if he could
confront it and what he could confront in that. In other words, I made him make his own pictures.

These were people with fields and so forth but I hadn't myself seen a field, so I didn't know how to get people out of them when I found they were in them. I could get people out of them as long as I didn't know they were in them. You see? But then, when it was finally pointed out to me by people that they were in fields and therefore couldn't see pictures, I bought this because I'd never had any difficulty before.

I remember one time – Mary Sue had a big win this way one time. We were just fooling around out in Phoenix and she said she'd never felt any effort. Ah! Old Effort Processing you know? So, I said, "Oh, you never felt any effort. Well, let's see..." So I had her go around – you know she's quite featherweight – and pick up the heavy end of the couch. And then walk back and see if she could feel the effort of picking it up without picking it up. Got that? And I made her do this and then feel the effort of doing it and then pick it up. And she was actually... You know, Phoenix is sort of warm. But she finally – she got away from it and she – and she could feel the effort. She could get the idea of the effort. And it's the first time she ever had any idea of effort. Actually, she hasn't had any trouble with any recognition of it since.

That was actually the type of processing which the earliest processing was. "Walk in the room and close your eyes and see if you can see a picture of the room. Oh, you couldn't. All right. Go on. Go on outside and walk in the room, take a look at the room and shut your eyes. Now, just tell me everything you did coming in the room and everything you did coming in the room and every... Can you see the picture? You can't do it yet. All right. Go outside and walk..." You got the idea? It was just the idea you can got pictures and you can confront them. That was the whole idea.

Here – effort – you can lift up the couch and then go over and get the idea of lifting up the couch and feel the effort of lifting up the couch after you've lifted up the couch. You see? Actually, that's getting the mental image picture of the effort is what – really what it is.

It – as a kid you probably have leaned against two sides of the door with the backs of your hands. You ever do that? You get your two backs of your hands against the two jambs of the door and say, "Hold yourself there very solidly," you tell some other kid. The second that you do this and step out of the door, the residual effort in the muscles will make your arms go up without volition. Well, that's quite interesting because that's actually not a muscular action that's taking place; that's a mental image picture action. You've postulated that the arms go out and they haven't gone out; so therefore, the image starts running out. You can do that with effort. You can do it with all these things.

Now, that was key-out. That was key-out as opposed to erasure. You have a big difference here because this is where we started making Key-Out Clears, 1947. And key-out clearing is successful but it isn't stable.

Now, the two things which had to be brought together occurred then with the first book, which is the erasure of a mental image picture. And usually this was done with – well, without much ARC with the pc. And when there was not much ARC with the pc you didn't get a chance to build up anything with the pc. His confidence did not increase. Yes, you could
get rid of the immediate somatics. You could get rid of the illnesses which were coming di-
rectly from that engram. Yes, they were being caused by a specific engram which could be
located. And, yes, the individual wasn't likely to have them again. Yeah, all these things are
true. But the pc's ability to confront the bank had not been especially raised. And in view of
the fact that it had not been raised, you did not get the Key-Out Clear phenomena. But look,
this started us on a long run.

Next thing you know, we're into past lives. Very unpopular subject, very unpopular
subject. People don't like to be reminded of their last death rattles. That's about all it amounts
to. It isn't that the church or state is against it. They obliterate their memories and they sell
everybody on the idea you only live but once. That sure makes nothing out of people doesn't
it? You're only seventy years long when actually you're two hundred trillion years long. That's
a method of making nothing out of things.

So, we got into past lives and that was very unpopular. I remember old Joe Winter. He
made a classic statement. "I would rather err with Galen than be right with Hubbard." And
they actually passed a ruling that we mustn't investigate past lives one time. And it was very,
very fascinating. Imagine a – uproar. The popularity of technology.

Any time you worry about popularity when you're doing research, why – and pervert
the truth just so that you can be patted on the back as a very smart fellow or something of the
sort or a very agreeable fellow or a well-liked fellow, you're heading for being a very badly
hated fellow.

So there we were – there we were into the soup. And with the idea of erasure, address-
ing this to past lives – myself and other auditors were engaged all through 1951 exploring the
length and breadth of the track. Exploring the length and breadth of the whole track. Wow!

The FDA is probably spinning itself in right now on the old book History of Man or
What to Audit. That was one of the books they seized over there. I hope they read it. I hope
they read it and get overts – get overts on it you know – and say, "It isn't true, this Grim
the next – I hope it doesn't key out. I don't wish them any hard luck, I just hope they get stuck
there forever. Anyhow, you could imagine it. They get overts on a book like that. See? God,
some people are adventurous.

Anyway, we concluded, "Nah." I concluded no. Yeah, we could find thi... I have found
things on the track, that Grim Weeper amongst them, that you can get sixteen dials of drop –
sixteen dials – one, two, three, four, five – all consecutive, consecutive falls. Just down,
down. In other words, a whole tone arm drop like this down, down, down, down, down,
down, down, down. This thing going on, falling, falling, falling, falling, falling. That's just
one fall on one of those old engrams. You like that? That's steep, man. That's what some of
those beach engrams will fall.

Do wonderful things with them. I audited a guy nine hours one time. I did a lock scan.
I did an engram scan in order to lock him up in the engram he was stuck in. An old trick.
Found the engram he was stuck in. He was stuck as a clam at high tide with the sunlight shin-
ing in his face. And my golly, what it didn't do for that bird. It took about nine hours to erase
this engram. Marvelous change in the individual. Heard from him the other day, by the way,
he's getting back on the bandwagon again. He feels he's been out of it too long, and so on. Well, there are remarkable effects to be gained from that.

And that was the main trouble. You could get terrific effects, but we weren't making Clears. What happened to the Clears, you know? Well, what happened to them is that we were on a different approach – different approach. We were trying to erase the whole ruddy lot. And actually I backed off and began to investigate something else. And this became Scientology. I finally found out what we were investigating. We were investigating a spirit. I don't care whether you call it a thetan or not. It's just the spirit, in final analysis. And we found that the spirit was the man. Now, by George, you know that's quite a discovery, because it's long since been forgotten.

These people going around talking about "my spirit." "I know that I'm out of my head," we heard the early theetie-weetie say, "because I am over there in that corner." Oh, yeah, you're over there all right, ho-ho-ho. No, the man is the spirit. All there is alive in man is the spirit. He is. And probably it's the first time in twenty-five hundred years – studied the subject of exteriorization. There was undoubtedly no successful study of it before.

Psychiatry, by the way, had heard of exteriorization. They considered it an insane manifestation which was some sort of a delusion, because people would tell them they were out of their heads at a distance. And they knew this was crazy, so they never investigated any further than that. But it had been remarked that some people were in this condition.

Now, this study had to... was this much of a hill climb. Man no longer believed, in this period of time – man no longer believed that there was such a thing as a soul. I mean, in – probably in early Christianity it would have been a ball. Probably some of those fellows still thought of themselves as spirits. They didn't say, "I will have to be good because my spirit won't go to heaven," or something you know. They probably thought of themselves as spirits. They said, "Well, if I'm not good I – I, me, getting out of my skull – won't go to heaven." That's the way they probably figured it. But all that had been lost.

And not only that had been lost, but man had totally lost a grip on this thing called the spirit. It was something esoteric. They believed in God because they had been taught to and so on. They had no reality on the situation at all.

Nineteen fifty-two saw an advent of exteriorization. And that was for the first time in twenty-five hundred years that we have any record of at all. Buddha was the last one who was dealing with this. Now, we didn't come into this because we were following Buddha. We came into this because we were studying the truth. That's always something to remember. We are not necessarily the inheritors of Buddhism, although you're liable to lay yourself a wide-open trap there. We walked into the side and found that there were certain truths and that this condition had existed and had been known twenty-five hundred years ago and was called bodhi. Bodhi, hence Buddha. And called bodhi because when he first did it and blew out of his 'ead, he was sitting under a bodhi tree. And that's where we get Buddha.

Well, when I was fooling around with this, why, it was sitting under a yucca tree, so we should call it "yucca." See? We should all be yuccas. But I don't think that sounds very good, so we'll skip that.
I didn't have such an approach to it. The only approach I had to it at all was the fact that I was trying to locate what was it that was looking at these pictures, because I found the pictures were absolutely inexhaustible in number. That's a terrible fact. You'll find that they're infinite in number and nobody could erase them, no matter how good your technology of erasure was; you certainly better find out what you're erasing with. And what we were erasing with was a thetan, a spirit. We were – it was the thetan who was doing this. So, of course, I thought, "Isn't this interesting. All we have to do is exteriorize this fellow from the middle of all these pictures and he'd be Clear." And sure enough you can produce a – well, right now you could produce a one-minute Clear very easily. You could tell somebody to be three feet back of his head and then tell him to be three back of the black mass he was in and he would be. In very... lots of cases he would be.

The first auditing process on exteriorization which has great validity was the command – was figured out by Evans Farber. And he came up and he sat up all night outside my window until I finally would come out and listen to this command. And I did and he fed it to me and I went three feet back of me 'ead. And there was yucca trees thereabout and a few palm trees. I guess it's – the conflict is whether or not we should be called palms or yuccas, you see, that makes us abandon both, you see?

And he says, "You see, it works. It works. You were right, you know. You can exteriorize, and here's the command. It's 'try not to be three feet back of your head.'" Of course, he'd run into the negative flow and he'd figured it out very carefully. He'd taken some of the recent PABs and he'd figured it all out and he figured out the exact command that would produce this phenomena and bang! So I blew him out of his – he blew me out of my head and I blew him out of his head. That was two Thetan Exteriors we had to our credit and so on.

Anyway, all this was very interesting, but nobody would stay outside. Sometimes they'd stay outside for three days. And then they'd be driving down the road a hundred feet above their car and they'd hit a traffic light or something of the sort and then they'd forget they were driving the car and go off and look at something or other and the traffic jam would occur. And somebody would start manhandling the body into an ambulance. Something like that would occur, or just start to occur, and the individual would say, "Oh, no, no, no. Nobody's going to take my body away from me," and he'd go back in his head and you couldn't get him out again. You say, "Try not to be three feet back of your head," and he'd say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha."

Well, out of this I developed the theory of havingness. It was obvious that havingness was more important to a thetan than entrappedness. Isn't that interesting? But of course somebody who is trapped in the middle of spikes doesn't like to be trapped. But somebody who is only mildly uncomfortable doesn't mind it so much and when it comes to losing the body and going out of communication with everybody and losing the game and getting death restimulated and all that – well, they'd rather stay in their heads.

This still has an interesting series of workability. I had an insane woman one time, exteriorized her, had an intelligent conversation with her, got all the facts of the case and what it was all about, she went back into her head again. I did that on several occasions.
Here's the point. The point is that exteriorized out of his bank the thetan is sane, and in his bank he's nuts. That's it. He has tremendous abilities. And the funny part of it is, as you'll find in the Philadelphia Lectures, a thetan's abilities are all measured, taped, everything else. We know what a thetan can do. All that sort of thing. See? I've researched all that and all our work since has been sort of in reverse.

Now, recently – 1958, 1957 – we start producing Keyed-Out Clears using techniques which were a cross between being able to confront and a mechanical erasure. See? The two techniques at the same time still produced a Keyed-Out Clear, but using them both in combination a Keyed-Out Clear was produced. Do you see that? All right.

Now – I want you to get this now – with 3M we're producing an erasure Clear. See? This is – this is a different, see, this is a different thing. It's an ultimate, near ultimate. You see why? Well, having found the exact mechanics of this GPM, I can make all these masses, you see, as you audit the fellow, suddenly discharge and of course they can't hang up. And the next pair of masses – they suddenly discharge and they can't hang up. Do you know what you do every time you blow a couple of those items? Well, there probably isn't just one lifetime packed into one of those items. It may be dozens, it may be hundreds of lifetimes and every one of those lifetimes has a bank as long as this current lifetime's bank. Ha-ha, we're blowing – we're not blowing locks, we're not blowing engrams, we're not chipping off a few circuits; we're blowing packages of lifetimes.

And actually you can do it in thirty-five minutes, finding one item. Isn't that remarkable? Because I found out the only way it can hang up, there's no way for it to reassemble itself. And I myself now have got terrific subjective reality on how this is done. You blow it – nothing can hang up and they just go. They don't go back on the track, they just go, because there's nothing making them hang up and nothing generating the creativeness inherent in them, so there's nothing to keep them created. And that's all. That's actually what you're doing. It's astounding. It's an utterly astounding fact.

Every time you look at one of these things... All right. We've run into this item called a smoker versus a wife. See? And we find this RI "a smoker." And we find – this is the bottom two on the chain, we've come all the way down the chain and we find the opposition "a wife." Well, the charge when it goes off of this meter is the only charge that was holding both of those pair in suspension. And in view of the fact that the... when the meter charge went out you had nothing to keep them in suspension in time. And that wasn't much charge. It just went ffist-ffist-ffist and ... 

You get to the wife, the goal itself is probably your next thing up. And the next item you get is the goal "to be a smoker." And that goes pshew-pshew-pshew and fire. And you're not going to find anything of that GPM sticking around to amount to anything. There would be a few little locks and a few little this and that. In other words, we've gone right down the center channel of that GPM. That's what's caused the blow.

These GPM items are each one a package of lifetimes, each one, several identities usually crowded into each one. And they've summated one way or the other under some heading and therefore they register on the E-Meter. And the oppositions – there's just countless numbers of oppositions connected with that one opposition phrase. These two things are in
total balance with that rocket read, they blow one against the... each other and they're gone. There is no way to hold that. There is no goal there to hold it. There is no bottom two terminals to hold it. The rest of the GPM goes. But you've got to come all the way down or you don't find the bottom terminals so you blow this charge, this charge, this charge, this charge, blow the bottom two charge, blow the goal charge and that's the end of that GPM. You'll sit there and look at a free needle.

Now, you haven't got a Keyed-Out Clear. This guy isn't going to cave in in another three years. There's nothing... He's going to have to live two hundred trillion to get that many accidental hang-ups, see? It's not permanent. It's only probably worth another two hundred trillion. See? Now, I'll buy that. That's good enough for me at the moment.

Now, here's the composition of the GPM. When you first enter the case you find a person who is usually so agitated in this lifetime that you couldn't even find the basic goal of it. You've got to give him some auditing to smooth him out to get him up so that he can confront things enough so that you've got this lifetime. One of the best answers to that is Problems Intensive, something like this.

Now, when you start – you start making a goals list, the goal itself, being a postulate, can be read all through this GPM. So it's the commonest read to the GPM. So, that's why you can find a goal reading before you can find an item reading. It travels on the wings of thought. And it's a common denominator to a whole GPM. Very simple.

Your next action, then, is to find this fellow's goal and you'll get this goal firing. Now, what would this goal oppose and you'll run into either the first terminal or oppterm. Each item found has to be a terminal or oppterm on its own merits, not because of how it was opposed. And then from that you find the next item. And sometimes people wanting to make things complicated give me a headache.

Today I found out that people are packaging 3M with four items. You don't do 3M that way. You have a big line plot and this is terminals and that's oppterms and you just put down every terminal you find and every oppterm you find on the line plot in the chronology of "found." And that is what you do. And if that is too simple, I'm sorry, but that is the way it is.

You don't make four-way packages and then take each one that is left over and try to oppose it independently and get every... Oh, Christ! You know! Why do something like that? Look, all it is is a "Spiral Staircase." You enter this – you find the goal by reaching to the bottom of this thing with an E-Meter and find the common denominator to it all. And then you find out what the goal opposed and it runs you into the top of the "Spiral Staircase." And then that gets you to the next terminal and then that gets you to the oppterm and that gets you to the terminal and that gets you to the oppterm and that gets you to the next terminal and that gets you to the next oppterm, that gets you to the next terminal and that gets you to the next oppterm and that gets you to the goal and it all goes – it's going boom, boom, boom as you're getting these things and then it all goes pshewwww! And that's the end of that and you got a free needle. Now, why do you want to make it more complicated than it is? It's awful simple.

"Yeah," you say, "but every once in a while you wind up with something that won't package." Oh, do you? Well, if you find something here that won't package, you're going to find an extra item over here that would fit up there anyhow and the pc will recognize it. So
why worry? Just put them down chronologically. Put them all down chronologically on your terminals and oppters on the plot and it will all come out right eventually. The thing sometimes will get down to here and the terminal that was missing up here will suddenly come off of this. But if you put it here, it also belongs here, but the pc will say, "Hey, that belongs there." So you just write it in there, too. Don't get so complicated, man. I worked it out so it's so simple, now you're going to spend the rest of your life making this thing involved?

Look, the MEST universe doesn't need your help; it's got us involved enough already. It's actually a very simple mechanism.

What happens when you get to the bottom of this GPM? What's it look like from there? I'll tell you a secret. The next GPM alongside of it is what the first GPM would not oppose. And the next GPM below that may be an opposite to the second one found. But your GPMs run in pairs, just like items run in pairs and your GPM is hung up on the counter-interaction of the goals. Only it's hung up on a four-way packet so you've got a positive and you've got a negative and you've got a not-oppose-not-oppose. The first two GPMs you'll find are on the postulate "not-oppose each other." I don't care what the goals are, they just won't oppose each other. They're pals. And they're hung together by affinity and the couple below them are hung together by opposites. But this tells you something interesting. It tells you that when you first enter the pc's goal channel you actually might enter any one of the four goals. Any one of the first four goals.

Now, somebody – eager beaver around the organization, actually ought to build a GPM so they can see what it looks like and use colored spheres. And if they used colored spheres, these colored spheres would look like this: You'd have a rope of spheres. These are green – green spheres – all hung together. And with toothpicks or something they would connect another rope of green spheres with black stripes. That's just to show you it's the same GPM but the black striped ones are oppters. Cowboy in the black hat, you know?

So you'd get these two ropes and they're hung together. The goal is down at the bottom and then they go terminal, oppterm, terminal, oppterm, matching each other knickety-knock up to the top of this thing. All right. That's two ropes of spheres. That's one – one GPM section or cycle. See? That whole thing is hung up on one goal.

Now, let's take some – two more ropes just as though we strung these great big – oh, you know like croquet balls or something – and we strung these things all together. Let's have – let's have pink ones, pink croquet balls. And let's make two ropes of pink croquet balls and hang them together with toothpicks, the two – two opposite balls on the rope. You see – rope A, rope B. So the first ball on rope A is pinned against the first ball on rope B, don't you see? And that goes down, balls opposite balls till we get to the bottom of this thing and at that point we have another goal. An entirely different goal but oddly enough these two – two chains of two are interrelated.

So, we've got these – we've got these two GPMs. Well, we hang them smash together like that! They – actually, their items don't oppose the items across, but the goals at the bottom are connected, they're pals, they have affinity.

Now, lets take two more such sets. In other words, a set of two ropes of spheres with a goal at the bottom. And another set of two ropes of spheres with a goal at the bottom and we
hang them onto the bottom of these first two. Now, we've got four sets haven't we? We've got four goals. Do you see that? We've got four goals. One goal influences two ropes of similar color, which each item of which opposes the item on the other rope. You got that picture? All right.

In doing a Goals Assessment you will have many things fire. You're liable to see many rocket reads – two, three, four, five. Some of these things fire very slightly. Some of them fire quite well. Do you know that you actually could be – do you know that you actually could be on one of the other three, rather than the first one up.

Now, as we hang up this GPM, let us say that the pink one here that I described first, is number one up. And the other one hangs just out of phase with it, just a little bit lower. But do you know its goal will also read with an occasional rocket read. It may be tiny, but it occasionally will read. The one you want is the pink one and that'll rocket read every time.

And yet you're liable to enter this thing on the basis here of the second GPM. You see? And you're only going to get little reads and that's going to sweat you to death, running that one. It'll follow all the rules but you've... you're running the little tiny one and you should be running the big one, see, because it looks small to you because the reads aren't very big. Really you'd get – it'd be very easy running this first one, the pink one, whereas you're running, maybe, the red one that I described.

Now, oddly enough, theoretically you could also get down to the lower two. And boy, that would read a flick once in a blue moon. And if you tried to run one of those things it would practically kill the pc. You would never get it to rocket read to amount to anything. It would be more like a tick or something, but you'll have a trace of it.

Now, you get a family of goals, then, which have these GPMs connected with them. It's a family of goals. And these goals will all have something in common. "A smoker" is, let us say, is your top goal that was ready to be plucked. But right alongside of it and just a bit junior to it as far as your meter reads the first time, but actually far beefier when you really get to running it, is a second goal, "to be a fireball."

Now, actually a fireball won't oppose a smoker and a smoker won't oppose a fireball. It's a not-oppose situation.

And then we get down below "a smoker" and we find its associated goal – this third GPM pair of ropes that I was talking about; that third one and we're going to have something like "to be a pure man without bad habits." This is just talking off the cuff, you see. And that's going to oppose "a member of the YMCA," see? "To be a member of the YMCA." We don't care what the... what these goals are. There's four goals. These two down here won't oppose each other and the two close to the top up here, they – they won't oppose each other. But there's an opposite one down underneath it. Isn't that interesting?

So, they go – these goals go by association, but not-oppose is the keynote. But they all have something in common, even though they're opposites. You understand?

The first pair that you run into is, "to have real bad habits." The next pair you get will be, "to have real good habits." There'll be something about the next pair. Each one of them will have that in common. And that's how they get locked up, one upon the next.
I consider it quite interesting that there's a frequency amongst GPMs which is the message I'm giving you this evening which is rather amusing, because you're all engaged in trying to find the first goal, see? I'm already telling you, well, the GPM goes in frequencies. You're trying to find the first pair of the dumbbell that goes together. You got a goal oppose and, gee, will that ever fire and will you ever find the next one against and so on. I'm just telling you offhandedly that there's four sets of these things which are set in amongst themselves and that isn't the end of it, not by a long ways, because there are other of these GPMs. Your saving grace is, is the deeper you go, the higher toned the pc is. It's a mechanical proposition. It isn't so much a matter of confront. It's what he's confronted, although you have to hold his morale up to keep his meter reading.

And you got these next ones. And of course there's other sets of GPMs, but not an infinity.

Now, I consider it very interesting that the possibility exists of getting the first goal that you get on this pc of being actually the second goal ready to be run. That's the misbehavior, the difficulty of the goal, that sort of thing. There may be a very available goal which is right up to the top which you've just missed. Well, what I'm telling you about all this – if you have two GPMs which not-oppose each other, if your first item that you encounter – that's the top items – is senior in opposition and junior, you see, and degraded in terminal, see, the oppterm is more smacking of the goal than the terminal. That's the truth of the matter. You see, the pc is pulled less and less away from the goal and the opposition has become more and more like the goal as he has accumulated masses. Well, I consider this very interesting because it gives you a way to get goals. You can dream up things of that, because he considers his own goal is an opposition.

In other words, the opposition terminal is more germane to his goal than he is. So you get such questions as, "What goal would be impossible to achieve?"

All right. Let's say you find a goal that sporadically goes bang and that sort of thing and won't really prove out and won't rocket read, you realize you might have the not... because you said impossible to achieve, you might have this second mass over here. You might have the goal of it. It's not ready to be run yet. But you say, "What goal would not oppose the goal you just found?" And all of a sudden he will give you immediately the family goal, you know, that is ready to be found. Do you see the gates that this opens to goal finding? This is a theoretical lecture, a descriptive lecture, not a lecture of a whole series of techniques. I'm just showing you here.

Now, what about this top one? Well, you get such questions as "What action in present time makes you go frantic if you fail at it?" See? You'll find out that's always the common denominator of the goal ready to be run. It is very common in present time, he considers it part of his life. He possibly won't even put it down on the list because it is so much a part of his life and he does it all the time anyway. And that is his personality. But you just ask him what does he get frantic about if he can't do it and he will present you with his goal.

You take a series of actions like that, you could assess these things and then write goals for the point that you got. You... I'm not trying to give you a technique. I'm just showing you here that there – if you know these mechanics which I have just given you on the subject
of goals – if you know these mechanics – then there's a possibility that you could work the pc's goal out.

In other words, he considers – he may only consider that his goal would be difficult to achieve, or he may consider it's something he doesn't want to have to achieve, or something he would find it very tiring if he found to do, or something that would make him very frantic if he did. Why? Because its most representative terminal which is closest to present time is very, very weak. And the most representative terminal to the goal – the goal itself is the oppterm, so therefore he must be fighting at this stage of the game, the enemy. And so you will find it work out, he's fighting – he's busy every day of his life fighting the enemy. It's his own goal.

Imagine the poor fellow that had to go up against Kaiser Bill or Hitler who had the goal to conquer Earth. Yet, of course, he knew of course that was very evil, even though it was his own goal. So you get his goal, you say, "All right" – you knew that this made him very unhappy – you say, well – you get Hitler, see, as an oppterm that fires-and you say, "All right. What goal did Hitler have that would be... that you would find very antipathetic?" And he gives you "to conquer Earth," and that rocket reads because that is the pc's goal. You get the idea? You get the mechanics, the way it is?

Now, supposing it just went tick and it rocket read once and then you couldn't get it to rocket read again. Then the chances are that you're in the family of goals that's ready to be found but you've got the goal of one of the other GPMs. Well, you possibly could do something like this: You could find out what wouldn't oppose it or what would be the opposite of this goal that rocket read once and the pc gives you the right goal to be run.

In other words, I'm showing you that there are elements here and there are mechanics here and – in the anatomy of the GPM – which bid fair to make goal finding easier and to make the GPM run out very, very well. Because you try to run out the wrong GPM first and you're going to be in bad trouble, because your reads are going to be bad and everything's going to be bad and you're going to have trouble all the time and the frequencies are going to be the same but you won't be able to read the meter-a lot of things like that are wrong.

But as far as the GPM is concerned, it is a mechanical proposition and all you have to do is just get the charge off each pair of items and then after you've got this GPM run – you don't run one GPM against the other GPM but after you've got GPM one run you go to GPM two – that's from the top down counting and you get its discharge, GPM three will be ready to come up, GPM four will be ready to come up. You dish around for another goal. You'll find another set that is just waiting there to be run, and you get those things apart. And it's just blowing charge, because you blow that charge, you've blown up these accidental hang-ups which are almost impossibly, mathematically, for them to have existed.

That this problem – think of it ... And this is what led us into the discovery of the GPM, is I realized that a problem which has endured for two hundred trillion years – oh, man, that must be the most delicate balance ever known to man. That must be a pin versus a pin, both of them meeting with their points. To travel ahead this long, the balance must be so perfect that none of his livingness – not getting shot or killed or ruled by Kennedy, nothing, see –
would absolutely unsettle this for two hundred trillion years. Well, this is kind of a weird con-

traction.

So I sat down and figured out what kind of a contraption that would be that would en-
dure that way and came up with the GPM and it worked. Therefore, we have a mechanical

address.

Your job is just to get these consecutive points missing. In other words, blow the

charge between these two items and they go! You don't have to do anything more with them.
It's like Humpty Dumpty. All the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't put Humpty

Dumpty together again. But there's nothing easier than to drop an egg. All you – all I'm asking

you to do is drop a few eggs. Simple.

All right. By knowing this anatomy and giving you now what I've – know of the GPM

objectively, theoretically. I extrapolated all this from the top of the thing and then imagine my

surprise to walk in and find it this way and even neater. It gives you a way to find goals. It
tells you what you can do with goals that you have found occasionally. It tells you what kind
of a terminal to expect coming up. It tells you, really, what you have to do in running the
thing. It tells you what you're looking for. In other words, it gives you a lot of data and should
give you a lot of success.

The material contained in clearing will actually only be complicated to you to the de-
gree that you try to make it complicated. Now, in just the last hour and five minutes or some-
thing like that, I have been able to describe to you, bangety-bangety-bang, I think, so that you
could duplicate it. Certainly if you heard the lecture again, you could, dead easy. I think
you've got a good grip on what this is. I think you see what you're going up against and so
forth. This is – this, man, is the riddle of the ages. What makes man the way he is? I mean,
what is the bank? What is the reactive mind? What is all these things? What are they com-
posed of and so forth. Well, it's actually in actual fact contained in this very, very short lec-
ture.

The thing is not a very esoteric subject. You try to get more involved in it than you're
involved. You try to involve it more than it needs to be involved. You try to put it together in
packages which are the square root of forty-two because that was after all the Talmud's figure
– I don't know where you got all that – and you're going to have lots of trouble. I don't want
you to have trouble with the thing. The thing is very simple.

All you do is go down the "Spiral Staircase" and blow all the item packages that you
run into. You don't go packaging things; you just blow them. You ask the pc every once in a
while if it confronts this and if that oppterms that and if the goal refers to that. That's just to
keep him happy, not to get anything done. And you get on down to the bottom of the thing,
the goal blows and you're into the next GPM and you do the same thing and you run that out.
And you've got a permanent erased Clear.

This is a new thing. It isn't a Keyed-Out Clear and so actually we're on the border of
OT, because frankly you never would have made an OT with a Keyed-Out Clear. Because the
whole bank that I have just described to you stood as a barrier between him and the accom-
plishment of those activities. And at any time he committed an overt that referred to that bank
it would have keyed in with him again. So, the route is open to OT which would be the route to total freedom. And that has just opened up here in the last few months.

Thank you very much. Thank you. Good night.
Okay. Here we are on the 5th of March, AD 13. And how are all you today? We have a lecture here, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have a bit of news. A bit of news. I was talking to the Z Unit today, I mean, part of the Z Unit has been relegated to the W Unit to learn how to do a Z Unit, you know? And I was talking to the Z Unit today and they – they didn't really think that, you know, you get Clear – the part that was relegated to the W. Feeling good because they hadn't had any auditing, you know, that kind of an approach. That sort of nonsense. Anyway – anyway the people in V Unit, of course, are the ones that are getting Clear. And I suppose that's as it should be. The ones that are supposed to get Clear, you see, are in Zed Unit, so the ones in V Unit get Clear. It's this type of dispersal that makes this universe interesting.

And out of the full Z Unit, seven have had goals found, six with no goals found. Five of these last are on W Unit at presence [present] and three goals have come out of the V Unit. That's very, very recent figures, and that of course refers to just the last few weeks I'm sure.

Now, some, of course have come in here with their goals found but doubtful and not checked out, so we're doing all right. We're doing all right. And I had an interesting remark from Sydney, which is trying to slide these days into Sydney harbor, and I had an interesting remark from there that the two auditors that were keeping their head above water and keeping things going and doing very well were of course two auditors who had had their goals found. So it makes a considerable difference to a person to have had his goal found. And that of course tells you why the five auditors are – from Z Unit who ought to be in Z Unit getting Clear, who haven't had their goals found – are in W Unit at present.

The gist of this is it's awfully easy to get Clear these days. All you got to do is know how to audit. And that's the only thing you have to know how to do. And the better you can audit, the more probable it is you'll have your goal found. And that's for sure.

Now, I have been taking a very, very good look at the GPM, and I've been taking a very, very good look at items. I've been taking a very good look at these various things. And I have a considerable reality on what the GPM looks like and what the GPM is all about and there are a lot of things to know about the GPM. But one of the things to know about it is that you can handle it. And the other thing to know about it is that it's built with tremendous mathematical precision, the darnedest mathematical precision you ever wanted to have anything to do with.

But because it is built exactly as a thetan would not as-is – you understand this – because it is built as a thetan would not as-is, therefore it's impossible to confront. That is to say, the thetan never has confronted it and therefore you're busy flinching. But I don't think you are flinching. And as I told another unit today, it's the thetan has trouble confronting it and it's
an awfully good thing that I'm not a thetan. I think that's very fortunate, fortunate... That's a joke. That's a joke. There's a person there in the front row that didn't think that was a joke. They wondered, well what is he then? Well, I'm me.

Now, you understand that if a... there's a certain frequency of things that a thetan wouldn't naturally see, then he'd pack one of these things along, and he'd just add to and add to and add to. He runs along on a different set of values. I'll give you an idea of the way one of the things happen. This is how one of the things happen – one of the things that happen. He gets an idea that total meditation and attacking nothing will get him through. Well, that's an interesting idea. So, you realize that he is opposing opposing things. See, he can't win. He develops this terrific philosophy, you see, he just knocks his brains out, you know. Walks all over the Himalayas, climbs Mount Everest with one fingernail and does all this kind of thing. Sits there and regards his navel and makes himself a petty officer. And the whole thing then boils down to the fact that his supermeditation, his superpeacefulness, his super-superness has all added up to the fact that he is opposing opposing things. That's quite interesting, isn't it?

Well, that takes that type of philosophy in order to back up one of these banks and so forth. So somebody – somebody has agreed that he will get through the universe if he opposes nothing, and therefore he is opposing things. Well, I think that's marvelous. Because of course what is he doing? He's stacking himself up a beautiful GPM. If he won't oppose anything he's drawing back from them, isn't he? Well he's still going to have an outflow. He's still going to oppose things, he's still going to get opposed. He's still going to get into groupers. He's still going to get things messed up most gorgeously.

So everything he's tried to think of as a solution to the Goals Problems Mass has added to more GPM. And it all comes down to the original postulate that any cure eventually has to be cured. And the GPM's solutions were of course the compounded cures of how you get along for life, see. The cures of the problems of life became the problems of the GPM.

It's very funny, you find some fellow who can't drink. He can't drink. One of the reasons he can't drink is because it develops a terrific backache. Every time he takes a drink he has a backache. All right, what's this? Well, this is a GPM action, of course, but we're speaking about drink. All right, he can't drink because drink gives him a backache. Obviously at one time or another then, drink was the cure for backache. But now taking a drink gives one a backache. That's interesting, isn't it?

So all solutions result in new problems. And the composite of this little axiom all by itself becomes the GPM. And the only odd part of it is, is the frequency is so constant and the difficulties are so constant. But then all thetans here at this time in this place must have something in common or they wouldn't be in this time stream. And the thing they have in common is the composition of the bank and the first ten Axioms. They have these desperately in common, actually have all fifty-five in common – fifty-six. But that set of Axioms going full out, based on particularly Axiom One and Two and Three, given those, and recognizing that all a solution ever does is develop new problems, you get of course the GPM. And because people of this same size and stature, and length of time on the track are here, why you get the same order of frequency.
So they've never confronted these problems, they've never confronted these oppositions, and they've developed a certain series of agreements about these oppositions at various times and places which winds up in the Goals Problem Mass. And it winds up with remarkable similarity. I think – consider it's quite wonderful. Take the twenty-five rule: Go twenty-five beyond your last RR or R/S. Yeah, well, the other day we tried to break that rule. We said, "Well look, we're getting into the second GPM, beginning of the third GPM – I mean, well heavens, the pc is putting the RR on the list as item three. Well, why not just pick these things up, see? It's the third item he puts on the list. Well, why not pick these things up, and we'll compromise by going only twelve beyond." Ha-ha! And we goofed, and goofed, and got some wrong items, and things went backwards, and went back and checked it over. And do you know, that if the twenty-five rule had been insisted on and continued, every one of those goofs would have been spared. Isn't that interesting?

In other words, the incomplete list would have been a complete list if the twenty-five rule had been obeyed. There was never twenty-five items between RRs on a continued list. When we continued a list we never had twenty-five items to the next RR – you understand that? Although you can continue almost any list and get a new item. That's a peculiarity of Routine 3. You can... if you got a slight tick left on your source list or something, as you go back and inspect it, you already have found an item off the source list and used it. Well, you continue the list which you already did and you'll get a couple of new RRs or something like that and then you'll get twenty-five to a blank. See, you've had twenty-five but then you're asking for a new item. You can always pick up a new item off of any old item that ticks.

Well, now, you daren't do this in Routine 2. Now, Routine 2 is the perimeter of the bank. This is the technology of the GPM's perimeter. Routine 2 handles the oddities and frequency of lock items, which are simply locked up on the actual central items of the GPM. You can relieve these and get away with it. Which is quite interesting.

In actual fact, Routine 3M is easier to do than Routine 2-12 because there is one thing you can do with 3M that you cannot do with 2-12. There's a little difference in this. The frequency is different; you've always got to go fifty items beyond the last RR and R/S. And you remember last week, I was telling you about this staff member down here, this staff member that said, "Well, we... they should be relegated to prepchecking in their staff auditing because – because after all they – it – were in an administrative position, couldn't be expected to be professional auditors."

Well, you remember I told you something about that. This is in confidence, of course, I wouldn't want them to hear about this. But said this, see, and I asked them just a couple of days ago, I said, "Now, on that pc you're auditing you found this RI and are completing the package and so forth in this Routine 2. Did you go fifty items beyond?"

And he says, "Well, well not really, I guess so, I'd-I-did-I-I-so on." I said, "Did you count them?"

"Well, no, I just went a few beyond and so forth..."

Well, what do you know! They accidentally found the item. He hadn't counted them. He didn't think it was necessary to count the items. So you'd say that the difference between a professional auditor and somebody who was merely an administrative Scientologist, the dif-
ference, the basic difference is that the professional would count the number of items. And he
wouldn't make any mistakes. And the fellow who wasn't, you see, he wouldn't count the
items, you see. Actually I don't know how...

Look. There's just certain targets to be attacked. You see, here you've got a bank pe-
rimeter, you've got this big bank perimeter, one kind or another, and then you've got the core
of the bank. And here's the core of the bank and it obeys very precise laws and in auditing
them you'll never find any variation in these laws if you do it right. See? And if you do it
right, simply means it's just following the rules.

All right, here's this core and then it's got a lot of lock items around on the outside of
this thing and in Routine 2 you hit the lock items of the first GPM, inevitably. That's what
they are. They're lock items and that gives you an R/S. When you hit the core it gives you a
rocket read. Sometimes you can get a broken-backed rocket read where it goes "Pssww-
ssww." Well, it's a rocket read which at the drop of an eyelash would turn into an R/S. And
you actually can drill some R/Ses and cause them to turn into RR's. Well that's an item that's
out here, that is a core item, but is out on the edge of the fringe. That's perfectly all right, do
that, it's still a rocket reading item. But it shows up as an R/S and then you put in the big mid
ruds in on it and what have you got? You've got a rocket reading item.

Well, about halfway between these two things you'll get a broken-backed rocket read.
And it goes, "Pssww-ssww." And it goes halfway – it doesn't know whether to slam or rocket
read, actually. You'll sometimes get a half slam. Somebody out in Los Angeles thought that if
a first slash of a rock slam up, went, pssw up like that, then that was an oppterm. And first -
and if a rocket read went down, pssww like that, then, well, that was a terminal. Unfortunately
it's more difficult than that and also unfortunately there are no up-flashing rocket reads. All
rocket reads are in the direction of fall. They always go to the right. And if anything starts up,
pssww! suddenly like that, it's just the first slash of an R/S and you drill it a little bit and it'll
either disappear or become a real R/S. I wish there was something that did that, but unfortu-
nately a terminal and oppterm look quite alike.

Anyway, to go back on this other thing. You always have fifty items beyond. Well,
why is that? Well, you're not in as fundamental an action. But, let me tell you something. Let
me – let me tell you something that's quite important to you. Routine 2 has something about it
that is very, very dynamity. If you take a source list or actually an RI list and you pull an item
– it's less an RI list but it's certainly a source list – and you pull an item out of that and you
use it and then you decide that you didn't get anything off of that or it was wrong, maybe it
was wrong, maybe it wasn't the last item, maybe the list wasn't complete. But you've pulled
that R/S item off there and you've monkeyed with it a little bit and you decide that isn't it and
then you continue that same list, you'll shut off the R/S and RR of the pc and if it's not untan-
gled you've left him for the next two hundred trillion. You got it? Now, that's pretty, pretty
horrible, isn't it?

We learned that the hard way. We did it. I did it. And I traced it back to find out what
this is. Oddly enough, there's something that goes along with this that we'll call the sad effect.
The pc has been sad since. That is the sad effect. The sad effect actually comes from an over-
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whelm or ARC break. But this is – something is goofed. And the pc's had an R2, R3 ARC break and then this has been overwhelmed. And the pc goes into sadness.

But you can't find an R/S on this pc. You cannot find an RR, you can't find a goal, you can't find anything, you see. Nothing reads. Well, you go back and you look for a list on which something was picked off and then the list was continued neglecting the thing that was picked off. Now, we're not interested in whether it was neglected. We're not interested in whether it was continued or which of these things caused the R/S and RR to turn off. We don't care whether it was the neglect of the item or the continuance of the list, you understand. But you're liable to turn the R/S and RR off of that pc and nobody will be able to get an R/S or RR on in that pc. And they – we goofed.

When I issued 2-12A, I had 2-12 – 2-12 was almost perfect. I said you'd better continue those source lists so that they were complete, because we were getting such wild variations on the rules. And on every one of those source lists where an item was grabbed prematurely and the pc had it as an item and something was done with the item and then it was abandoned and then the auditor went back and continued that list as in 2-12A to get a complete list, some of those R/Ses and RRs diminished or shut off.

Well, that's a very sad thing. 2-12A as an improvement on 2-12 is a symptom. It is a symptom. It's a case of my old enemy Alexander. You've heard of him, Iskander the Great of the Two Horns. Chesty chap. Probably not a bad fellow. But he went out to Injia and of course Western civilization, Western history doesn't realize he conquered India and settled it and gave it an administration that the Greek administration of India lasted. He – well history's forgotten that. They like to tell you that – because they're downgrading such chaps – that he went out there and he got as far as he could go and turned around and came home. About all we know about this, because it's Asiatic and we have never been interested in Asiatic history, was that he said he had no more worlds to conquer. Well, even though he was an old enemy of mine, I'm afraid I have to quote him. So far as processing as you have known it is concerned, let's look at this symptom. We had 2-12. I got some learning – learned some listing rules out of 2-12A, patted up the listing rules just a little bit, found out it was always the last R/S on a – on a complete list and so dispensed with nulling. But in actual fact beside that discovery of the frequency of the list – and on a source list it can be any place on the list, you understand, but on an oppose RI list it's always the last R/S. And we – we were at that point looking at no more worlds to conquer, as far as ordinary auditing is concerned.

In other words a fantastic thing has happened here. We had a more perfect process in 2-12 than in 2-12A. Isn't that interesting? I find it very interesting. I did a tremendous amount of research on 2-12. I knew about what 2-12 was all about and just because I discovered the frequency of listing applied, the frequency of listing in the GPM by the way, and then went – by doing 2-12A and discovering the frequency of listing on the 2, Routine 2 list, and applied it to the GPM and found out it was almost the same but that there was a frequency of listing. Aside from that – being able to spot it – there wasn't even an improvement, there was a worsening.
There's a time to come, there's a time when you are baking a cake when you have finished adding ingredients. And you add one more cup of flour and one more pint of cloves and one more keg of whisky and it spoils the cake.

See, there is a time to stop making a cake and start eating it. And I'm afraid that's now. Well, I'm always the first one to tell you when I've goofed. And well, I'm sure that's why – that I'm a friend of yours and you're a friend of mine. Because I wouldn't dare tell people who weren't my friends that I'd goofed, you know, they make too much out of it. But the truth of the matter is that we were there. And we are there, as far as that process is concerned.

But because this process is actually harder to do, if it is hard to do at all, it actually should be relegated to cases you can't get on the road and to rock slammers. Because it's too easy to do Routine 3M. Right after that, because I had the data now on listing, already had the data of the GPM, already had that pretty well neated up, I'd just been looking for the magic auditing commands and I found the frequency of the bank and that was it, we were there.

Well, it suddenly got easier than Routine 2, don't you see? And there we were, with a full Clear. Now, you understand that a Keyed-Out Clear parks you on the near side of the bank and that OT lies through the bank. This is a horrible thing to have to confront. When you've got a Keyed-Out Clear you still, to make an OT, have to go all the way through the bank and that's why we haven't made any OTs. You see that? So you can't afford a Keyed-Out Clear if you're going to send the guy all the way. Or you're not going to. Actually you don't want any Keyed-Out Clears because they don't last. They're like the Democratic Party in the United States.

Now, your Keyed-Out Clear still has, between himself and OT, the whole GPM. And he's not going to skirt it and go. Whenever he tries to do something that is an OT attribute and does it very much, heh-heh! Tsk! That bank keys in and he's no longer a Keyed-Out Clear, he's a mess. He's not as bad off as he was before but he simply no longer has a free needle.

In other words, we still had with Clear a barrier between Clear and OT and that barrier was the GPM. And the only answer to that is run the thing out. Well, if the frequency is better, as far as auditing is concerned, when I say frequency, it's how many items on the list and how sound and solid is it that you're going to find that the last RR on the list fires and all this sort of thing. In other words, these positive points, and if there are less variations in 3M than there are in Routine 2, and if you have to know less, what's the idea of taking the locks off the GPM if you can take away the GPM? All right.

Now, that means then, that Routine 2 should be relegated to a type of process or use for cases we can't get whizzing, can't find any goals on, can't do something with, or an out-and-out rock slammer who of course can't come anywhere near a session; you know, can't get an improvement in a session. But even an out-and-out rock slammer could probably be held in place long enough to find his goal and that probably would change him and finding his first few items would probably cure him from being a rock slammer. I just think it's more poetic to run Routine 2 on a rock slammer. That's pure sadism.

But anyway, the upshot of the situation is that Routine 3 turns out to be easier than Routine 2. But Routine 2 is actually easy enough. But there was that bug in Routine 2, that if
you don't complete a package and if you continue a list which at... the item has already been found on, you're very likely going to shut off the RR or R/S of the pc. You follow that?

I'll give you an idea. Supposing one day we found a great, big, slamming item called "mental science" on the List One and then with enthusiasm we abandoned it and completed List One. And took it on down and the... all of – pretty soon after a while we didn't have any more R/Ses and we said the list was complete and we went back and looked for other R/Ses and nothing was R/Sing, and the pc felt very sad. Well, that's a liability. That's a liability. It's only approximated in Routine 3M by neglecting to find the pc's goal. If you neglect to find the pc's goal and go on and on and on and on and on down into a GPM, eventually he'll get so jammed up his tone arm – his tone arm will be up here at 5, way up to the top of the dial, way up here. Somewhere up here, stuck, needle stuck, no more RRs, no R/Ses. How the hell are you going to find somebody's goal? Well, you already found his goal before you get him into this condition, it must be somewhere on your auditor's reports. It must be a rather recent thing to have done this to him, but you can on... that's about the only way I know of that you could shut off an R/S or an RR with Routine 3M. It's just utterly neglect to find the pc's goal and drive him all, oh, two-thirds of the way through a GPM with no goal found. That would louse him up but good. Next thing you know you haven't got any R/S, no RR, nothing like that, nothing fires on the list, the old list, everything is dead, the meter's totally flat. You get – you get the mess you'd be in. But then, of course, that's such a wild violation of it that one would hardly look for it.

But it's easier to do this with Routine 2. With Routine 2 you can goof. There's another thing that will happen with Routine 2, which gives it a liability and it'd be less than honest to tell you it wasn't a liability. You can get the fellow's item. You know, you got a – you found an item on a list and it was just a little old item and you've heard the third-of-a-dial rule, and it was the only R/S that could be found on the pc and you opposed it and he came up with another little R/S that didn't... "But I don't want anything to do with it, you know, just a bum R/S it says, aw, it's – skip it."

Now, you try to find goals on this poor sod. *Awk!* You will get the goal of the last terminal. That's the only goal you will get. Inevitably you will get the goal of the last terminal. If the last terminal is "the enlightened ones" you will get the goal "to enlighten." If the last terminal you found with Routine 2 – these are rock slamming things – if the last terminal or sometimes optterm that you get that's slamming as an item, even a little tiny one, you've hung him, see. He's hung up in the bank at that point. And you'll get – well, I'll give you – I'll give you one out of an R3M action.

Supposing it was "success." Supposing it was "success" that you found and you try to do a goal and you will only get the goal "to succeed." You understand? You've limited the view of the goal. Let me put this over again so as not to confuse you: Routine 2, we're talking about, Routine 2, you've taken a source list – you found a little old item on this source list that didn't amount to a hill of beans and you opposed it and then you heard that it had to be a third-of-a-dial rock slam, so you left it. Now, you try to find the pc's goal. I don't care how many other Routine 2 lists you did, you try to find the pc's goal and the last item in was "the enlightened ones," you're going to get a goal on this pc that isn't the goal, it's not going to rocket read, it's not going to behave like a goal either, so don't worry about that. But the only
thing that you could get to stay in and stick and mess up and that reads in any way whatsoever, looks promising, is this goal "to enlighten." It might even fire once, or a rock slam or something. It's the only goal you get to fire.

It's -- you got the... you got an incomplete package. Well, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't worry much about this, when I was doing Routine 2, but if I don't readily find a goal on a pc on whom Routine 2 has been run, I look for the package that wasn't carried around to four RR -- or RIs, because I, you know, I couldn't find the goal, I don't borrow trouble, ever. I couldn't find the goal, I'd look back for some Routine 2 that was... didn't have a four-way package, particularly a list on which a nice juicy item had been grabbed and it was incomplete and then the list had been continued. I'd look for this and repair that and then go on. There actually aren't a whole lot of other things that go wrong. I mean, you haven't got an unlimited number of things that go wrong.

But, you've done Routine 2, you've got a two-way package, now you can't find the pc's goal. Let me emphasize that, you can't find the pc's goal, you're just trying and you can't. Don't borrow trouble because this condition might exist and you still could find the pc's goal. Look there, the old Routine 2 and by George, what do you see? You see something on which they found two packages and neglected the last one. Or the last item they found on the thing, there were two items found and the last of them found didn't match up good, so they didn't go on. You find that list was incomplete and/or you got a four-way package the way I saw the other day. They got a four-item package except three of the items came off one list.

Sure enough, the only goal that the pc could give was the last item, the last Routine 2 item. He gave the goal of that item. That's the only thing that fired on the list. Interesting, huh? All you have to do is complete it, and make sure that you got it all the way around. But it has that liability. This can happen.

Now, if you see a pc who's very sad and continuously sad and has gone on being sad for a long time, then somebody has found an item on a list, monkeyed with the item and then continued the list, but that was the item on the list, you understand? The item will still be sitting there, the item will still have some R/S on it, even though it was opposed. It's abandoned. Or you will find that somebody has found an item on a list, has opposed it, got another item but hasn't completed the package. Those are about the only two things that can go wrong in Routine 2. If you know those things you can get R/Ses back on that have shut off and so forth.

But life also shuts off R/Ses, and fortunately there's another way of picking that all up and that's just give the pc marvelous, excellent auditing. Prepchecking and that sort of thing on and on and you make him feel better. But actually this is a much longer job and shouldn't be attempted. What should be attempted is the repair of the Routine 2. It's a mistake to leave extant any loose items in Routine 2. They should be completed. The package should be made up with four RIs and that way you won't have much trouble finding the pc's goal. But unless you complete that, such a package -- there might be one of them, there might be two of them left incomplete -- unless those are completed on the pc, whether now reading or not, the pc's RR or R/S may shut off and you'll not find the goal. Or you may just be able to find the goal of the last item there and you can't find any other goal because the pc's stuck. See that?
But at the same time this is a workable tool because we are not villains. In spite of the American Mess Association – that's a – that's an organization over there that owns the government. They operated on so many senators and left their tools in so many congressmen's guts they eventually now are able to take the companion tool which they keep in a laboratory and electric shock it and the tool left in the stomach of the senator or congressman vibrates, you see and they all vote the right way. That's the way that's done. It's whole track magic, actually.

Anyway, this organization – this organization to the contrary, things we do in Scientology are not evil. Life can wrap somebody's Routine 2 around the corner and that's why you must continue to know your Routine 2. You've got that?

So Routine 2 shouldn't exist actually as a process on which we would engage enthusiastically, unless we couldn't do 3M. And we've still got something however we can do, called Routine 2, that's so similar to 3M that it's very easy to know. It has a different frequency. It's fifty items instead of twenty-five beyond the last reading item. You're not operating against a goal, a few things like that. You get a package of four in Routine 2, you don't get packages of four in Routine 3M. Rrrrr. You get packages of thirty or packages of fifty or however many items there are in the GPM. That's the size of the package – is the GPM, see.

And Routine 2, when you can't get an R/S or an RR to turn on in 3M or Routine 2, it's been turned off by life. So therefore, you sure better know what Routine 2 is because Routine 2 applied against the person's life will turn back on the rock slam and rocket read. Life being much rougher in South Africa than other places, none of the offices down there are able to get on any R/Ses. I consider this very interesting because all they'd have to do is take some kind of an assessment of somebody's life.

You know, "What has your life consisted of?" Ha-ha! That's all they'd have to say, "What has your life consisted of?" And do a list or something like that. Or "What isn't part of your life?" Either one, one or the other. Life has turned off the person's R/S and RR. When you can't get an R/S and RR on a person then you must consider that life has turned it off.

Well, strangely enough the goal will usually shine through. That's weird, it's almost the last thing to go out, so you have a good chance that the goal will rocket read anyway. So you wouldn't start with Routine 2, you'd start with 3M. And then 3M is now unsuccessful because in listing goals on the meter, we see no R/Ses. No R/Ses. No RRs. And we continue to list until we get a motionless tone arm. We have no R/Ses; we have no RRs. We must assume at that point that life has turned this person's R/S and RR off to such a degree that the goal is not available. It's there, but it won't read. What do we do? What do we do?

I know that's a pretty – that's a pretty rough assignment. That's not going to happen in lots of cases. You had better choose some zone or area in that person's life where the person's Routine 2 has gone awry. And instead of giving you a long, long number of pat lists, just let me say that the Routine 2 has gone awry. What do you mean the Routine 2 has gone awry? Well, I don't know, he used to fight with his wife and she's dead. Well, isn't that an incomplete series of items? Hmm? He was in the army. And there aren't any battles anymore. And yet he had to be a member of the peacetime forces under duress for a long time. That sort of looks like he had an oppterm and then somebody continued the list.
Well, same condition. Well, knowing that and knowing that life is a Routine 2 in its way, and if there are incomplete packages and a lot of other things, it seems to me you could fool around with somebody that you couldn't get an RR on or an R/S on and you could get it back on just by going over his life and turning it back on by completing some of the items. How would you complete the items? Well, "Who or what in your life have you – would you rather not fight with? Who in your life have you fought with?" Something like this. And all of a sudden something starts firing. Well, carry the package on around the line. You get some... one thing to fire, carry it on around four times; you get back to the beginning on the thing, you'll be able to go down this old goals list that you did and just calling it off, maybe calling each goal twice or something like that, all of a sudden, just to be sure, why, one of those goals that didn't read before now RRs. Simple, huh? Well, that's why you should know Routine 2.

But – I would say this: If you can do 3M on somebody don't monkey with Routine 2. But if you can't do 3M on somebody and nobody can find the goal, then you've got to do Routine 2. You got that? So therefore you have to do Routine 2 well, so as not to cut off somebody's RR or R/S. That's about the size of it.

Now, the only thing that has to be corrected in 3M that I know of, that is anything serious that would cause 3M to go awry, is this one. Now, I'm going to give you this awful fast. I told Zed Unit there and they were all very happy about it, but let me give you what you have to do: Never, never, never, never prepcheck, never, never, never, never, never, never, list as a source list – you can list it as an items list when it comes up but not as a source list – with anything in it except the exact statement of the goal beginning with "to." Now, you got that? Never list anything else. Now, what do I mean by that? Don't ever list for a source list on the goal oppose list, step 2, the formation step there, that's what's changed. You don't take those four lines. I'll tell you why in a moment.

The source list is always on the goal, "to catch catfish" – "Who or what would 'to catch catfish' oppose?" I don't care if the pc can't answer it, that's all you dare list and you never prepcheck a goal in any other way than "On 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?" You see that? "On to catch catfish has anything...," you know, "...been...," you know? You never say, "On the goal to catch catfish..." You never list the source list, for instance, "Who or what would the goal to catch catfish oppose?" Never. Never, never. You never list, "Who or what would somebody or something with the goal to catch catfish oppose?" Never. Never. It's a goof.

And you never list "Who or what would catching catfish oppose?" Never, never, never. And you never prepcheck and you never call the goal and you never put the mid ruds in on the goal in any other way than "On 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?" You understand? Why? Well, I was swimming around the bottom of the GPM the other day – that's the third GPM, I'm almost there at the bottom of it – and I went twenty-four items deep in it without its goal and I know all about this. Ha-ha! Oh bla blob blub, see. Christ, don't let it happen to me again! This was wild. Awful! I never went down so far and came up so... I felt like one of these skin divers, you know, whose flask of air has been filled with chlorine gas, not oxygen, you know, something like that. I was down at the bottom of the... it's something like swimming in the bottom of the Philippine Deep. Swimming around down in the bottom of this thing, I was struck by something very peculiar, and you'll find this very, very interest-
ing, too. There are reliable items in, I dare say, everybody's GPM called, "the goal to catch catfish," whatever the goal is, you see.

Interesting, isn't it? That's an RI. It's not the goal. And there's a -- there'll be an item, "somebody with the goal to catch catfish." That will be an item, a reliable item, somewhere down near the bottom of the chain. And there'll be a reliable item, "catching catfish." There will be, "people who catch catfish," but there will also be "catching catfish." Hoooh! And way down at the bottom which started the whole thing, is just the goal all by itself, and that's all you can use, "to catch catfish." That starts the channel. You've got that at the bottom. But then up, just up from it somewhere is "somebody," "somebody with the goal to catch catfish," you understand and across from that or up the line a little bit further is "catching catfish." That's another terminal RI. And there'll be another one, pretty horrible to contemplate. There'll be another one there, "somebody or something with the goal to catch catfish," don't you see?

And there's -- in other words, anything but the goal is liable to be an RI. Now, the funny part of it is you won't run into this on the first -- you could get away with it almost all the way through, perhaps on the first GPM because in the first place the item is so deep that it won't read and isn't even restimulated on the first, second GPM, something like that. It's way down the line, it's maybe item twenty-three from the top. Terrific. Twenty-three RI's deep into the GPM you get this item, see. "Somebody with the goal to catch catfish." Or "the goal to catch catfish."

Twenty-three items deep. So you can of course find the goal and prepcheck it, you see, "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed?" And that will be just fine. But you get about halfway down through the bank and you're saying, "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed? Well, that didn't read." Needle's getting rather tight. "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed? Well, that needle is rather tight and so forth and there's nothing on this, has anything been suggested? Is there anything you've failed to reveal? Has a mistake been made? Is there anything you've been careless about? Anything you get..." There's no reads on this anyplace and the goal isn't firing, therefore it's gone. Well, yeah, you're not prepchecking the goal, you're prepchecking a reliable item, "the goal to catch catfish." Ha-ha-ha-ha.

Now, if you did a clear test, not knowing this, you would be in trouble. Because the line for the clear test must be "Who or what would 'to catch catfish' oppose?" Otherwise you're going to overlist the item by listing "Who or what would the goal to catch catfish oppose?" You're now going to overlist the item, which is in the bank, "the goal to catch catfish." And of course you're not going to get any reads, so you're going to say the guy is Clear as a bell. You hit him and he goes thud! You see? You see that thing?

Well, actually I probably never would have tumbled to this or really found it out or anything else, or had anything to do with it or had it get in my road in any way, if I hadn't goofed by going twenty-four items deep into the 3rd GPM without a goal. And then it was getting pretty desperate. Things were getting very desperate. And all of a sudden the tone arm went up to 5 and the R/S and the RR and everything else turned off and we were looking for the new goal and we listed about two hundred goals and I was going this way and this way
and whoa! Where... what's this and so forth and nothing moved, no TA action and then all of a sudden I cognited on the fact, well, that was the goal. We found it clear back there, only it has since been called "the goal." Ha-ha-ha! So therefore it wouldn't prepcheck because there is an item in here, ha-haha, which is the same as the auditor is using on the pc to find the goal. The pc of course, gets this confused with the item when the goal has been – so the goal won't read.

Well, you ordinarily wouldn't notice this because I would have... you had to have gotten into trouble. It isn't anything that is catastrophic, but nevertheless this could happen. That you're trying to clean up the goal to get it to fire and you're two RIs away from, "Somebody with the goal to catch catfish." And you want a list because you've run out of RR and so forth, and you want to list this again and you were using "Somebody or something with the goal to catch catfish," or something like that. You'd restimulate this item.

Actually, it has to be very exact. Well, I think that's very interesting. It's caught by a fluke. It isn't actually too much of a mistake, because right at the top, the goal "to catch catfish" is twenty-three RIs away. And it isn't likely to restimulate, so you ordinarily wouldn't notice this. You'd have to get into some kind of a jam down at the bottom of the bank without a goal and keep running into this foolish item. This item you see, this item. Well of course the... it was the goal. Except the goal to read had to have the garbage knocked off of it. And then if we just read the goal we were all set. Don't say the goal. So just leave out "Somebody or something with the goal," "the goal to..." All those things, because they're items.

You talk about – you talk about a gimmicked-up mess, you know, a thetan really gimmicked himself up with this kind of stuff, you know, man. I mean it's marvelous, the frequency with which he did it. But of course we're all traveling the same track, we've gotten into the same traps, we're ordinarily playing pretty much the same game and we've fallen for the same swindles and we've perpetrated the same swindles on one another. So it's no wonder that the thing compares as nicely in frequency, but this one is really one that if you – if I hadn't found it, if I hadn't found it, some of you guys would get looped around the telephone pole. You'd feel sad, "Well, the GPM isn't composed like this, see, it's all clear, there's no RR and no R/S on the pc's – on the pc's meter, so therefore, the pc must be Clear, except the tone arm is at 6.0 and the needle is stuck in the exact middle of the dial. And yet we can't get anything to read." No, you've shut off the pc's R/S and RR. The goal isn't even cleared up.

The rule is, don't use anything but "to..." when you're designating. It's always "Who or what would, 'to catch cat-...?'" I don't care if the pc can't list it, just bully him! He says, "Oh, you have to say the goal! The goal! I can read the goal! I can read 'something or somebody that would have this goal,' I can read that, I mean, I can answer that, but I can't – but I can. . ."

You say, "Son, I'm very, very sorry and life is sometimes cruel, many are called and few are chosen. You happen to be chosen because you're sitting in the auditing chair. Answer the question. 'Who or what would to catch catfish oppose?'"

"Oh, well, you put it that way" and he'll go ahead and do it.

Otherwise, you can collapse the bank, see, on something like this, you probably can restimulate it. If you pull this gag as a Prepcheck, halfway down through the bank, two items away from that, your Prepcheck would be beautifully flat, your needle would get beautifully stuck and you'd all come out all right because you'd find it in a couple of minutes anyway
when you went on down the line, but you would be upset for that length of time. And the possibility exists that you will sometimes miss a goal. That's a possibility. I... it wouldn't happen ordinarily, but you sometimes will miss a goal. You're saying, "All right. Now, we're going to check this out. Now, on the goal to catch catfish has anything been su..."

No, hell! Nothing's been suppressed on the goal to catch catfish, it's twenty-three items down the bank. How can anything be suppressed on it? It's just in total concrete, so you get no read and "On the goal to catch catfish, I'll now read the goal." And you say, "To catch catfish, to catch cat..."

You can also make a mistake. You say, "Well, we're checking an item. We're checking an item here." And the pc – and he thinks the item – when the auditor reads the item why, it doesn't rocket read, but when the pc thinks the item it does rocket read. No, the difference there is the auditor isn't calling the wording of the item. There's nothing like this, you understand? You understand? If the auditor calls the item correctly the item will read on the meter. But the pc is thinking something else, which is what causes the thing. He's got a word or two tacked onto it – ha-ha-ha-ha! That's why it's reading, see.

The pc thinks the goal "to never know my own mind," you see. And the auditor is... calls off, "to never know." And the pc thinks to himself, "to never know my own mind" – rocket read, you see. And the auditor notices then that when he – when the auditor calls the goal, "to never know," why, the pc gets no RR. But when the pc thinks the goal – the auditor dubs this in. He says, 'Well, the pc thinks the goal 'to never know' the pc thinks the goal 'to never know,' he gets a rocket read. But when I say the goal 'to never know' I don't get a rocket read. Now, what is all this about?"

Well, what it's all about is the pc is thinking, whether he knows it or not, "to never know my own mind." All right, now the auditor is calling off the goal which has ceased to rocket read because it's exhausted and the pc is thinking – the auditor's calling off, "to catch catfish" and the pc is thinking "the goal to catch catfish" which is rocket reading. In other words when the auditor calls something out and it doesn't read but when the pc thinks of it and it rocket reads, then the auditor isn't calling what the pc is thinking. You got that? You'll see that phenomenon in lots of cases. I don't think you can audit a case without running into that once or twice somewhere down the line. And just enquire what the pc's thinking. That's the one out of that.

But this other one – this other one, you got to lay that in, in brass. I'll get out a bulletin and correct the thing. There's only one other correction on that particular 3M bulletin that I might as well mention in parting here and that is that it says it only has to read once. There's four words missing out of that bulletin. It says it, in the checkout of the goal, it only has to read once. You understand? That's once in three times said consecutively. You see, on the original words, was once in three times read, see. It's the three times read consecutively, once. Only one of those needs to rocket read in order for a checkout to pass. Well, there's various reasons for that. It may read twice for the auditor and only once for the checkout person.

Now, checkouts in general are best done by the pc's auditor reading the thing to the pc in the auditing place – in their auditing places – and seen by an Instructor who is not auditing the pc. And that will save you a great deal of time on checkouts. In other words, the auditor
goes and gets a Supervisor or an Instructor and brings him back, sits down, straightens up the item and calls it on the pc and the thing is seen to rocket read by the Instructor who then reaches over and initials the auditor's report to the fact that he has checked it out, checked out item so-and-so, such-and-such. He's just seen it see. He's seen it read.

Now, I probably have mixed you up by talking about Routine 2 and Routine 3 indiscriminately. In actual fact these are simply, well, they're – they're cousins. Their rules are so faintly different that it is almost impossible to differentiate in other... any other way that one is the outside perimeter of the GPM and the other's the inside perimeter of the GPM.

Almost everything that you say about 3M is true about Routine 2. But there's one thing that isn't: You can always extend the 3M list. You found an item "fishhooks." And so you found it and there it sits and whether you did anything with it or not you could extend the goal oppose or the RI list and you can find "fishing lines." And it RRs and you can put them both on the line plot and the pc is not in the least bit damaged. In other words you can find a second item. If there's a tick left on the source you can always find a second item. You can even take a source-point with no tick on it and extend the list and very often wind up with another item and it won't jam up the pc and it won't upset him.

In actual fact, you should never do more than one goal oppose list, don't do more than one goal oppose list on 3M, because you get extra dead-ended things. But you can always extend 3M lists. You can't do that with Routine 2. You can't do it.

One other thing I'd like to say is when do you find the new goal? The new goal must be found at the rocket reading blowdown. There is a blowdown on the meter complete with rocket reads when you get down to the base of the goal. And it goes psww-psww-psww-psww, psww-psww-psww-psww. And it blows itself on down and it blows itself down from maybe 4.5 and it goes down, down, down. You will see a couple of these maybe. Early on it goes from 4.5 only to 4 with a psww-psww-psww. And you'll also see the pc cognize the thing with rocket reads, occasional rocket reads. But this is a real vicious one. And it goes right on down to Clear read from wherever you were. Psww-psww-psww-psww-psww-psww-psww-psww-psww. In other words, the meter's rocket reading all the way and you're bringing it down with the tone arm and you just see that thing firing, all by itself. The pc isn't thinking anything, man. It's just pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow. It looks like the dog-gonedest bunch of rocket reads you ever saw in your life. And it's all going off automatically. And it'll come right down to the pc's Clear read or somewhere near it, or even below it.

Well, at that point you stabilize the item you've just found, by just saying that's it and so forth, and that's fine and put it on the line plot, and that sort of thing. And right at that point you find the pc's next goal. That's the place to ask the pc for his next goal.

matter, you've probably got your goal on the list. So you go back over them rapidly and you just read them once and see which one RR's and the one that RR's you give it a Prepcheck.

Now, the funny part of it is that you actually can get the goal of an item if your pc is messed up in any way. You can get the goal of an item. And the way it'll behave is it rocket reads a little bit, you know. It may rocket read a half a dozen times, start R/Sing and then diminishes and then goes down and disappears. It's an... that's the goal of an item about to be found. So there's got to be a little Prepcheck on this goal, you see. Now, the real one just keeps rocket reading. It just keeps rocket reading and then it'll get suppressed and then it'll come back and it'll rocket read some more and it'll get suppressed and it'll come back and rocket read and the more you prepcheck it, why the better it rocket reads and so forth, and it doesn't go off into an R/S.

You can take an R/S and by a brief mid rud Prepcheck create right in front of you an RR. You can always do that.

But anyway, to be – to be very precise about this, that's when you ought to find the pc's goal, with a list and with a little Prepcheck of the new goal and all that sort of thing. And then you go right on doing what you were doing. You go right on down the same Spiral Staircase and you'll find out that there are various things there to be opposed. You don't do a new oppose list. It's just that the next item or two coming up are actually under this new goal, they're not under the old goal. And therefore you don't have to stop, you just go on down the Spiral Staircase.

But look, never go more than two items if you can help it and four at the absolute outside, into a GPM without finding somebody's goal. Don't go, absolutely don't ever go more than four, let me tell you! That's going to be tough enough. Preferably two is about all you want, and preferably find it when the needle goes free. And you get a free needle after – right after this blowdown. There's when you should find your next goal. Don't carry on into a GPM without a goal, because you're now dragging a thing called a missed withhold, called one goal. And that's really miserable.

Now, there's nothing more much that I have to communicate to you; I communicated it all at once here, except this. Except this: Just because a GPM formed by reason of your never having confronted these problems but only the solutions, just because a GPM formed, because you didn't ever confront it, is no reason you can't confront it and is no reason at all you can't audit it with great ease.

You hear me that? That – that's important. Because an auditor gets the idea, because of course the whole GPM is based on the fact that it is unconfrontable, because it had to have solutions, because one couldn't confront the problems, you understand? Therefore, the auditor being ordered to run it starts to get very nervy indeed. And he may think it's utterly impossible and that it goes by some other rules and goes into a terrific dispersal, simply because he's asking to be confronted to – being asked to confront this thing which he never before confronted. He's got a GPM so he's never confronted it. Well, my answer to that is, confront it! Just because you never have is no reason you can't. And the auditor as an auditor has simply got to confront it, that's all and clear up whoever he's clearing and so forth and then he'll have a Clear on his hands.
It is not only not impossible to do, it is probably the easiest and most rewarding auditing you will ever do, because there's actually nothing much there to confront. That's probably the biggest trick of all.

Okay? I hope that brought you up-to-date, I always try to give you the latest dope and in particular anywhere I have goofed even slightly, I tell you before you tell me, that's my motto.

Thank you very much, and good night.
WHEN FACED WITH THE UNUSUAL DO THE USUAL

A lecture given on 7 March 1963

They say "RHIR-RHIP." You ever hear of those? Well, work it out. "Rank Has Its Responsibilities. Rank Has Its Privileges." Amongst my privileges I don't rank being late.

Anyway – anyway, this is what? This is the 7th of March? Ah, there's going to be some people in Z Unit that wish this lecture never took place. Anyway, the 7th of March, AD 13, our lucky year. No sarcasm intended. And Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture.

We're going to take up this evening the subject of "When Faced With the Unusual, Do the Usual." This is a hard lesson to learn. Some of the people that have never learned this include psychiatry. That's why they never got anyplace. And hear me now. The more unusual the situation, the more usual the remedy. Don't go Qing-and-Aing. That's one thing you must not do. Just because the situation is a desperate – is no reason you should become desperate. Just because the situation is unusual is no reason you should become unusual.

Now, by George, when you look it over, you will see that every desperate remedy that has ever been developed by man stemmed from the fact that the practitioner simply Qed and Aed with the patient. It's gotten to the point in psychiatry where when the patient goes crazy the psychiatrist goes crazy. That's the way of it, so forth. They're always talking about they don't have enough psychiatrists. They should add to the line, "They don't have enough psychiatrists out of padded cells."

They have a supply of psychiatrists that's always being eaten up. Now nobody's running down psychiatry. I'm just telling you why they can't make people sane. It's a matter of: They're faced with the unusual, so they do the unusual. And they've always done the unusual. You go in and you say... This fellow's practicing Freudian analysis. Yes, he practices Freudian analysis, but he practices the Jungian twist on Adler's work as represented by Karen Horney. Only he does it a bit different.

I remember one psychiatrist I interviewed. These poor guys, man, they really need auditing. And we'll probably have that job one of these days. Anyhow, the guy told me he was a Horney man. I was very interested in his being a Horney man, and I said, "Well, good, I see you have a book there by Karen Horney. I... have you ever read it?" And he said, "No." And I said, "Have you ever read any books by Karen Horney?"

He said, "No."

I said, "Well, what type of analysis do you do?"

And he says, "Horney."
This same poor fellow was running up and down a corridor one day, and he says, "You've got to give me permission to electric shock that patient. You've got to give me permission to electric shock – you've got to, got to, got to give me permission to electric shock..."

I said, "What's the matter? What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"She won't eat."

"All right." I said, "Well, will she eat if you electric shock her?"

"Well, no."

I say, "Well, why do you want to electric shock her?"

"Well, you've got to."

And I said, "Well, what – now just a minute. What happens to these people when you don't electric shock them?"

"Oh, they get out of here three weeks before they do when you do electric shock them." He said, "If you're doing research you should keep records like that. We have all the records. I can show you. I can show you. We keep records. If you don't electric shock the patients here, they get out three weeks earlier."

I don't know. A little further sounding out, I find out he wasn't even supposed to be curing them. All he was doing – he was supposed to be electric shocking them.

Now, look-a-here! These fellows – these fellows need help, and one of these days they're going to get our help – unlike the AMA; they forfeited all the help they're ever going to get. But learn something from this, please; learn something from this. Every time something happened, they did something else equally unusual. And they were faced with plenty of un-usuality. And they kept on doing the unusual.

Now look, there might at one time or another, have been a technology known as psychiatry. See, there might have been one. Nobody would be able to trace what it is now. And it's certainly not being effective.

I know they're using their ineffectiveness right now to take about sixteen billion dollars off the US government in order to build more institutions to hold more people that they can't heal. There are more people insane today than there ever were before. The psychiatrists themselves say this. Psychiatrists also say that they don't know anything about what they should do to these people. They also say that they should be continued to be permitted to do it, which I don't think is reasonable. We'll have to help them out someday, too.

Now, look-a-here. If every time in some technique that you're doing on a pc, every time you see something that looks very unusual to you, if you go on and do something as unusual, you're going to have that pc wrapped around more telephone poles than there are. You're not going to make any Clears. That's the penalty you will pay for it. Just like that. You will not make any Clears – none. I'm telling you! I'm not kidding.

The reason I was late for this lecture is Mary Sue and I were going over the auditor reports, and – she'd gone over the auditor reports, she was going over these cases with me. She's getting to be the expert these days on 3M. She's cocky, you know. She's up there way beyond
any auditor in the business. Here she is, one of these old-time HDAs, you see, and she's way out in front. She probably has more experience now on 3M than any auditor anyplace. Oh, and... "probably" – she does have! She's found somewhere close to a hundred – a hundred RIs by 3M. She's also found a lot of goals. Not on just one case – she's found them on lots of cases. She knows what she's talking about.

And some of the things she's found going on here are quite interesting. One case going down the line, everything's working out all right more or less on this pc; he's going along okay. Let me say it's going along in spite of. And they go back to check out an item that was found earlier and the pc suddenly says, "I – here's a goal here. I don't want this on the list." But you know, "Here's a goal, I don – and – uh..." The auditor put it down on the list. It was an item, rather, and he says, "I don't want that on the list, that's a goal." So they put it over here.

They don't go on trying to find the item that they were looking for. They mess around with it. It's firing earlier and late. So everybody present all say, "Well, give this goal you just found a Prepcheck."

What? What's that? The pc's goal fired at the beginning of session, goal's still firing, pc comes up with another goal, auditor sees that it rocket reads while he's calling the item, and he says, "What are you thinking about?" because the fire is early or late.

Pc says, "Oh, I'm thinking about that other goal. What'll we do about it?"

"Well, we'll prepcheck the other goal."

Look, you could do this, too: You could not only prepcheck the other goal, you could run a goal oppose list on it and then abandon that halfway and not find any item on it. Oh yeah, you could. And then you could go on down the line and decide his 2-12 needed repairing and you could repair that. And then you could give him Problems Intensive one way or the other. And then you could run a couple of engrams, too. But that isn't what you're supposed to be doing! You're here finding an RI. Find it! That's all!

Well, what's this? So he thought of a goal. So it rocket read. So put it down in the auditor's report. What else? Nobody's seen any blowdown of this old goal, it's still rocket reading. You're going to abandon the goal and get off on another goal? Well, the clue of it is, is every goal that this pc's ever had has rocket read. You give him goals, they rocket read. What's all this? What would you do a thing like that for to a pc? You're in the middle of finding an RI. Well, find it, and then find another RI, and find another RI. So the pc says he's just had a cognition that his grandmother laid eggs. Well, don't run an engram of his grandmother laying eggs. Find some more RIs.

What's all this? What would you do a thing like that for to a pc? You're in the middle of finding an RI. Well, find it, and then find another RI, and find another RI. So the pc says he's just had a cognition that his grandmother laid eggs. Well, don't run an engram of his grandmother laying eggs. Find some more RIs.

Now, let me tell you something. We just had a goal found in New York. We just had a goal found in New York. I don't know who quite found or checked out the goal that ran a little bit of the end of the – of the line, but one of the staff members there received a Problems Intensive, went free needle on it. They did a couple of 2-12 items and his goal popped up and there it was. Tough, huh? Tough. Difficult. Very difficult. You know who did the auditing. A nine-year-old boy in the Academy. It's interesting, isn't it?
Now, nothing shows up an auditor – nothing shows up an auditor like a fantastically precise process. You recognize the trouble isn't with the process today. It's fantastically precise. And the more precise the process, the more you figure-figure on it, well, the goofier it's going to get. You understand the situation?

This is one of these situations whereby there is the process taped, taped, taped. Actually the RR always comes up with the same frequency, the same phenomena are always present, there it is, there it is, there it is, you do this, you do that, you do that. There's no variation on this. The only variation you put there is by going stone-blind and not watching the thing or running goals that don't fire and things like this, you run into trouble. Those are all unusual circumstances. They shouldn't exist.

Now, I'm going to talk with some of the auditors who have been doing some of this auditing, and I wish Allen would go back to the back of the room there and on the gray phone and dial "05." Dial "05." Wait for the dial tone and dial "05." And that'll phone me here, and then we'll have a little conversation.

We're getting very stylish on the radio these days, you know. We've – I don't know, I – I haven't had an accurate report on it but I think that radio broadcast went off just fine the other night in New York. I know I had a cable the following morning, that thanked me for my intervention. It wasn't a matter of me intervening; it was me making sure my orders were carried out. And I don't know how many hours we've been on the air now. Old Johnny and other people, getting on the air. They're doing a good job, too. They're doing a good job, too. [a phone rings, Ron picks it up]

Hello. How are you, Allen? Terrible situation here that puts you on the – on the tape and so forth this particular way. But you know, I was looking over Harold Duford's case here. All right. You got fifteen RIs found. And you've now run into no rocket reads. Isn't that right? That's great! How do you suppose that happened? What's your idea of it?

[...] Well, yeah, we know that, but what do you think happened?

He says he goofed somewhere. That's – that's, we know that.

What do – what do you think happened?

[...] Come on, come on, come on – you must have some idea of what happened, Allen. Don't be coy. Don't, don't be coy just because you're talking to every Central Organization in the world right now. I – I'm not trying to make you nervous, Allen! Your professional reputation isn't at stake yet, you're not out of Z Unit.

Come on, what do you think is wrong?

[...] Failed to complete one. All right. Let me read you the finding on this. "He has been instructed to check over the line plot." Is that right? "And pick up the item that was listed wrong way to or an incomplete list." Did you dig it?

[...] Well, what instructions did you get? You got instructions to check over the line plot – go on.

[...] Yeah, all right. Go on. You found no items reading.
WHEN FACED WITH THE UNUSUAL
DO THE USUAL

[...] You got nothing on this item, huh? Did you list it the same way to you did the day – the way before?

[...] Oh, you did, huh? Was it rocket reading? It was just a dirty read? Well, that's very interesting. You've had fifteen RIs off this case. Don't – you think one of these items back there is backwards?

[...] But you didn't think about that, did you Allen? Now, when you went over this list, when you went over this line plot, what did you do, Allen? How'd you go over it?

[...] How'd you check them over? He checked over every item.

[...] Gave a brief Tiger Drill on each item, and then what happened?

[...] You found one ticking. Yeah, all right [...] Yeah [...] Uh-huh [...] Yeah [...] Right [...] Yeah.

[...] It was just a dirty read on this line plot, and you went over it again today. You did yesterday and went over it, and it didn't tick when the Instructor was there, so you went over it all again today, and it did tick. All right, go on.

[...] A dirty read, incomplete list, so? [...] Uh-huh. You didn't get this idea of something being backwards, did you?

[...] All right. Now did you – did you get the goal to fire?

[...] Oh, the goal hasn't fired. Well, that's interesting. When was the goal last at the Clear read?

[...] Oh, he's never been at the Clear read throughout these whole fifteen items, huh? Where is he usually? At 7?

[...] He's around about 4 or 4.5, and never moves away from there?

[...] It did drop close to the Clear read at some point? When was that?

[...] All right. "An individualist." And how long ago was that? How many items ago?

[...] Six items ago. And it dropped to Clear read?

[...] And of course you get the goal to fire every session before you start listing or anything, don't you?

[...] Oh, you don't? Ohhhh. Oh, well! When was the last time you saw this goal fire? Or did you just bail out of the airplane without a parachute?

[...] Last Friday. How many items ago was that?

[...] The Friday before, you saw it fire? In other words, you've seen it fire before "an individualist" but haven't seen it fire since, is that right?

[...] It was after? How much did it fire?

[...] Very slight? Well, what is fire-a tick?
When Faced with the Unusual
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[...Quarter of an inch. And that was "an individualist." [...] Yeah, well it was after the "individualist" you saw this goal fire a quarter of an inch? [...] Before or after? You're sure it was after he found "an individualist"?

[...Not 100 percent sure?

[...] Well, the only way you can wrap somebody around a telephone pole like this is run into a GPM without a goal. Otherwise it all goes off according to Hoyle. Looks like to me you missed step 15 somehow or another. But because the pc's rudiments are out and everything is all jammed up and the goal hasn't been cleared, it looks to me like you just got yourself a beautiful case here of having run off over the edge. That's the only thing it looks like to me. Now, you go any further over that, you're going to turn off the pc's RR. And where where you be? You'll not only be hunting, you'll have a hell of a time, man. Well, what's his next goal?

[...What's the goal of the next GPM? You're fifteen items down the line-you should be in sight of it.

[...] Ah! He said today his goal was "to be a prime cause." Did it rocket read?

[...] He never said it?

[...] Yeah, what did it do?

[...] He did what?

[...] Just roughed the needle up.

Well, here you go. The only thing I know that could happen like this is your GPM went Clear several items ago. Exactly at the point of what? Probably "an individualist." You saw it blow down to Clear read.

[...] And then you went tearing right on down the line, into the next one — and the next one, and the next one and the next one, and the next one and your rocket reads have been getting smaller and smaller ever since "an individualist," haven't they? [...] Yeah.

Why don't you find the pc's goal, unwrap him from the telephone pole and get the show on the road, huh?

[...] All right. You'll find it very easy to find his goal, by the way — very, very easy to find his goal. You just have to find where the other goal finished. And then take the goal for the items afterwards. And when you give good Prepchecks — if you give a good Prepcheck now, Allen — any time you give a good Prepcheck on that sort of thing, you'll have your needle free enough and the rudiments are in enough so that you get the free needle phenomena.

[...] All right — yeah, yeah! It's a fact. As you go by it. But you're dealing with 3M, man, and the only thing I know that can lock a tone arm up that high — and have no goal reading, and no items found, and everything closing down — the shades of night are falling — actually, the only thing that'll turn back on the RR is he hits dead on his goal. He probably already knows what it is and you'll find out you've gone several items by it.

There is no number of items in a GPM. See, no constant number. Do you know there can be only two items in a GPM?
Hm-hm! That's grim, isn't it?

All right. Well, I'm sure you'll get ahold of it. And don't think I'm scolding you. And this won't damage your reputation. They'll say, "Well, he's a good auditor. Ron kept giving him hell until he finally could audit." Okay, Allen. Bye now. [hangs up]

All right. I hope you got that now, did you? It's interesting, isn't it? It's not very mysterious. I don't think it's mysterious. Of course, you could say that the – you never did have the pc's goal. That would be pretty desperate. But I don't think a pc could go on having an RR that long without it shutting off, if you didn't have his goal.

No, somewhere up the line he finished off – somewhere up the line, six, seven, eight items, ten items, something like that, that was the end of that GPM, only he didn't get his free needle phenomena, he didn't see his blowdown, he didn't see all these things happen, because apparently – perhaps his rudiments weren't in enough for him to notice it. And he's not seen it before, so he might not even have known what it was. And he said, "Yes, well it did, on an individualist,' blowdown. Get down to Clear read." That was probably it. Every item he's gone since that point from there on has been an item in the direction of disaster. Oh, he's got these items, they are the items of the next goal, everything is fine, it won't kill the pc. But undoubtedly, since GPMs don't act in several different ways, he's just gone past the second goal, that's all.

Now, how he managed it, I don't know. But he'll get the pc back on the road again. He'll get a goal and it'll turn on again.

It's quite interesting, though, that you can shut the whole thing right off – just like that. No rocket reads, nothing. Bang – off. Meter frozen up here at 5, won't move. Nothing. Gone. What? Well, you went through one GPM and landed in another GPM, and if you weren't alert you didn't see the free needle, and you didn't see the blowdown. The free needle may only last for three and a half seconds. And if you're not accustomed to looking at a meter while the pc is cogniting, you'd never see the rocket reading blowdown.

That's all I can think of would have occurred, that ever since that time the needle has been getting smaller and smaller, and the reads smaller and smaller, and now they're gone. Well, the only thing I know of can happen is you jammed the second goal. I know. I've got experience on it. You overrun one of these GPMs into the next line, you're in trouble.

All right. Let's see, where's another goof on this? Where's another goof? "On reviewing the list..."

Oh, I'll just read you this next one, this isn't too bad. Maybe I'll take this up. Maybe I'll take it up with the auditor. Seventeen RIs have been found. That's pretty good, huh? Seventeen of them. Right down into that goal. But the auditor may have goofed at the last reliable RR found, as he abandoned the list. "And on reviewing the list, I (Mary Sue) note that he failed to check two items marked with an RR (question mark), about twenty-eight items from the end of the list, and I see no markings around the last RR to indicate that he has checked these." And he's abandoned the list.
Well, I don't know, we probably would better let the boy speak for himself. Dick, go to the back of the room there and ring up "05."

Now, listen. Let me tell you something about a list. You could do a wrong way to on which you see few or none reads [phone rings] and have no item on the list, but that's very, very unusual. Any list has an item on it - complete or not complete. You see the item doesn't appear after you've completed the list. It was on it. Actually, the definition of a complete list is one item reading, don't you see? Just one.

Hiya, Dick. Sorry, take some time here. I don't mean to scold you, Dick. You've probably run into something here that's over your head. Let me – let me tell you something. You're running into one here that auditors just keep running into and running into. And that is they abandon lists before they check over and under and on and so forth. In other words, they don't examine the whole list. You don't casually abandon a list, you understand? What you do – what you do is check your last rock slamming item on the list; it shouldn't read. Check the next to the last RR; it shouldn't read. Check the last RR; it should read. All right. Now, you've given – told the pc each time that it did or didn't. And if you've checked that last RR, it didn't read. But it's the last RR.

We're dealing with terrific mathematical precision. It's the last RR on the list. And if you were on the ball on listing, you'd know which one was the last RR to list, you see?

All right. Now, what you do then if that last RR doesn't list, as it occasionally does, you go over it and under it. But this is not a source list, so it's down there toward the end of the list, isn't it? Now, you don't take these lists that oppose rocket... reliable items – you don't take these lists, you know, and just say, "Well, it can be any place on the list," because it never is. It's always the last on the list. The last RR on the list, see?

If that last RR doesn't read, you read one above, one below. Two above, two below. That's items, you see. If you haven't got it then, and your next to the last rocket reading item didn't read, then it's obvious that the read is not any earlier on the list, right?

So the read must be somewhere from two above or three above to the end of your list, right? So you just go on down that, one by one, if that kind of a situation happens. And you just go down one by one, and you see any kind of a needle tick or anything of the sort like that, give it a brief Tiger Drill. And you'll find your RR. But don't ever abandon one of these lists.

Now, you're seventeen items deep. And you're liable to be running into trouble here. Where is this tone arm running?

[...] Well, your case is in wonderful shape. You must be doing an awful good job. Watch for that blowdown, though, man. Is that goal reading at the beginning of every session?

[...] All right, but it is reading? And you do check it at the beginning of every session? All right, now, don't fool with this one, that thing's going to blow down to 3, that needle's going to go briefly loose, and you're into the next bank here before you know it. You're in a danger zone right now, you know? Got it? [...] Yeah?
[...] All right, for God sakes, take it. I – I tell you, there's one thing you always take off a pc – a goal. Yeah, okay! Good enough, Dick. You'll make it with this one. You, and if – is the needle pretty loose?

[...] What?

[...] Yeah, his tone arm's been well up – well below.

[...] Yeah. About five items ago he had a blowdown of that character. Ha-ha-ha – how do you know you're not into the second GPM?

[...] Yeah, he couldn't quite fit – he couldn't quite fit – a couple of items ago he couldn't quite fit one to the goal. Man, you're in the next GPM already; get out of there. Just get his goal, get it all polished up, and keep on going. You'll have nice big rocket reads and everything'll be fine. Okay? All right, Dick. You're not doing too bad.

You would have – you would have drowned in another about three items, you would have said, "Where's the man's rocket read? Where's his goal? Where's this? Where's it? Where? Where?" Then you would have been saying, "Mary Sue – the pc's rocket read is shut off."

Okay, Dick. Bye now. [hangs up]

All right. Now you see, consistently and continually on these reports we find auditors are not checking the list thoroughly. You understand there are two types of list. There's a source list and there is an RI oppose list. Now an RI oppose list is always the same. If your item was listed right way to, it's the last RR on the list – bang, every time – just like that.

But if that last thing doesn't RR, the pc could have been thinking another item while he listed an item, don't you see, and it could have been slightly above and below. So you always go over and under on these RI oppose lists. Over and under one, over and under two. Not two RIs or two R/Ses, you know – but just items. If that's not it, just let's make sure, there, in that zone from the next-to-the-last RR – actually, if you want to be awfully safe it's from the next-to-the-last RR to the end of the list. The item is there someplace. That's a matter of about thirty items. So you have to read them down, take the one that dirty reads, prepcheck it and you'll find your item.

But you have to be awfully wrong to find no item. Do you know that the only time you ever find no item on a list – you've got to get this through your heads; this is Routine 2, Routine 3 – the only time you ever find an item on – no item on a list – the only time you ever find no item on the list is when the item's already been found. Then you will – if the item's already been found. You're joining two lists. But the pc will put the found item on the list – and if it's already been opposed someplace else it won't fire. You understand that?

But that doesn't mean that just because some item that's already been found goes on the list that you won't find an item on the list, you understand, because pcs habitually are putting their old GPM items on the new lists. They just do that. They say, "That also fits," see. But don't easily abandon a list, see, just don't do that.

Now, a source list of course is something else. And in both Routine 2 and Routine 3 you will find your source lists are consistently and continually difficult. Who ever said a
source list wasn't difficult? Well, who ever said it wasn't difficult to make a Clear? It's easy to follow directions. But it's a miracle that you can do it!

Now look, all you're doing is producing, every time you produce a Clear, a miracle the like of which has never been seen before on Earth. So you want to do it easy? All right. I'm trying to make it – I'll cooperate with you. I'm trying to – trying to make it so you'll do it very easily. There's no doubt about this. I'm not being uncooperative in this. But you cooperate with me! And when – when I tell you it's the last RR on the list, and if it isn't, you go over and under until you find that thing – why, do it! Don't go off, abandoning lists.

Now look, consistently, here's case after case, this same thing is being done with.

Source list is something different. You check over those rocket reads on a source list. You've also got to check over the R/Ses on a source list. And here we find the most heinous crime of all. Terrible. The auditor has already gone to no TA motion, and gone her – I assume, fifty beyond the last R/S on the list, and couldn't find the item on the list, so is continuing the list. No, no, no, no, no! You can't do that.

How can you find no item on a source list? You tell me! There's always an item on a source list. The only thing can be wrong with a source list is there are too many items firing on the source list. You're trying to cut it down to one. Well, it's on that list someplace, that's all. Don't go continuing the list! Not on a goal oppose.

What do you mean, you can't find an item on the list? That's impossible. It would mean the whole GPM had already been cleared. And therefore, why are you auditing it? You're going to find an item on a goal oppose list. When you find no item on the list, why continue it? No item is going to appear on it magically, because there is an item on it all the time.

Haven't you realized that that read is moving down that list as the pc lists? The read moves right down that list just as nice as you ever saw. It's always on the list, or it's a wrong list or a wrong goal.

But you're not accustomed yet to checking over and under these – these rocket reads. Now, that's as elementary a thing as that. There is a read on the list, you're not accustomed to checking them. The read is there, there it is.

There are goofy things going on. I won't particularly go into these things, but they are all kind of wild departures from the situation. It says you read over and under. Well, if it says you read over and under, you read over and under. There's no reason to do something else.

So the item you're getting from the pc looks kind of shaky. You know, you're not getting your rocket reads in the right place. And you say to the pc, "Are you thinking about something else?"

"Yes," he says, "I'm thinking about the goal, 'to catch catfish'."

Now, you – what are you going to do then? What are you going to do, huh? You're going to dump this RI – the thing that's going to make him Clear – and pick up this goal?

Oh, he says he's thinking about the goal. All right. Write it down over here and say, "I got that. I got that. Now we're going right on with this RI," and check that RI out. That's the
business you're on. Look, don't disperse! And this business of overlisting because there's no item on the list is utterly silly. There's always an item on the list. The trouble is with a list there are too many items on the list. That's always the trouble with a list – too many items on the list. And you pick up the wrong item.

You've got to null these source lists, man. You've got to null them all the way down. You can't go monkeying around with those things. If you don't know what RRed, you don't immediately pick up an RR, bang, bang, off the source list and find out that nothing else is RRing on the source list, you've got to null the lot. Don't fool with it.

And as far as – as far as a pc is concerned – as far as a pc is concerned, he isn't different. He's not different! He talks different. He talks with a different accent. He talks this way, he talks that way. Some are slow to give items, some are fast to give items. It's all the same bank or he wouldn't be here in this time strata at this time. You understand? So what are you doing looking for differences?

Now, your willingness to persist on a case is something I congratulate you on. I think it's remarkable. I congratulate you on your persistence on a case. But do you know that persisting on a case because you don't know what else to do is doing the unusual?

Look, what are you – what are you – what are you trying to do with a GPM, huh? What are you trying to do with one? You're trying to run it out. Well, you say you're trying to find RIs. Now, if you go on the basis that all you have to do to clear somebody is to find RIs, you're going to get in real trouble. Because that isn't what you're trying to do. You're trying to find RIs in order to knock out a GPM.

Well, what built the GPM? A goal built the GPM. So therefore you've got to knock out RIs aligned to a certain definite goal – somebody's going to make too much out of this because they always align automatically to the goal – but you're going to find... you're finding RIs aligned to a certain goal, which results in the disappearance of the GPM. And that's all there is to that. That's all.

Well, what if you've done it? What if you did it? We've apparently got two cases here at Saint Hill right this minute, who were Saint Hill Clears, and two auditors have very happily passed up full honors. Because I would have shaken them by the paw and given them a send-off to end all send-offs, you see.

First one on 3M, see, on the course. See, I think that would be terrific, see. I made it some time ago. I had the same trouble. The auditor plunged on through. Only I was very alert, and I said, "That has went!"

Fortunately, I labeled my items when I came up the track very exactly. I labeled them very, very carefully. But the auditor who made the first Saint Hill Special Briefing Course student Clear on 3M might have been Dick, or it might have been Allen. And that's why I had these two gentlemen on the telephone tonight.

But unfortunately instead of being able to congratulate them for having made the first – I don't know which one did it, you see. We could probably compare the auditor's reports or something like that. And we might be able to find it, which one really drags the honors. But the reason I had them on is to see if either one of them would claim the honor. Isn't that nasty?
Instead of that you heard them apologetically protesting, "I'm sorry I've done wrong, Ron. I'll do better in the future," and so forth. Yeah, this was just expected, of course. But the point I'm making here is that these two guys, either one of them had the honor of making the first 3M Clear on this course. There are other Clears have been made on the course, but by other processes. And they passed it up.

We can't give them the honor now because they never reported it. Now, you're witnesses! You're witnesses! I called them up. You saw me, right on the phone here. I called them up – I talked to them, you know? And you know what was waiting for them? You know what was waiting for them? A Class IV with honors. And they'd be lucky now to get a Class III, I think. But anyhow... No, they'll probably do better than that.

But if either one of them had said, "Hey, Ron, you know, I was auditing this afternoon. I suddenly found out – I suddenly found out that we'd left the other goal, and it was all run out, and it didn't read anymore." And it, by the way, it continues to tick. The old goal continues to tick. You've actually got to prepcheck the lot sometimes to get it out, unless it's closed out, you understand.

And the fellow, all he had to say – all Allen had to say was, "Hey, Ron, you know I was checking over the case this afternoon, and I accidentally happened to read the February 22nd bulletin. And it was lying there and I didn't have anything to do, and I happened to read it. And I noticed that last Friday, or I think Friday a week ago, I had a blowdown to 3 from a normally high-tone-armed pc, and so forth. And I checked it out today and I found I couldn't find the old goal. The pc gave me an old – new goal. It's rocket reading. I – I may not have been able to prepcheck one out and straighten him out, but I've made a first-goal Clear." What do you know! Pc won't feel very good unless it's prepchecked out. It's all right to avoid it at this particular stand. It's just an interim state of making the pc feel better.

Or Dick could have said, "Say, Ron. You know, pc's been worrying – worrying me the last few days. But, by golly, this afternoon I figured out what happened. I - I looked, I saw this bulletin, you know; it was lying there. And it was in red ink on white paper, and – and I picked it up. And I was checking into it, you know, and so forth. And there was another bulletin there, and it said something about a Clear test and so on. So I just for fun ran down a goal oppose on the old goal, you know, and nothing read! And nothing read. And the pc gave me his new goal. And apparently last week some time we had a first-goal Clear."

And I would have said – I would have said, "Well, Dick, a Class IV with honors." Yes. Well, we can all look back on our track – we can all look back on our track and recall what might have been – what might have been. That doesn't mean these boys aren't doing a job; they're doing a perfectly good job. But I had to have witnesses. I had to have witnesses here to the effect that they could have made a claim, and so forth.

I just had a dispatch from Suzie. I'm sorry, but Allen – Allen doesn't have – have any luck these days. He's only getting Clear. I suppose that's lucky. But here's a long report on Allen's case. Now, this is a wonderful example in doing the unusual now.

"Nineteen items have been found and the auditor's gone back to the first RI found on the goal oppose list, which was 'barren planets.' And while listing on it the pc put item 'to be alone' on list and then told the auditor to remove it. And when the auditor tried to check the
last RR on the list item, 'barren planets,' pc began to RR priorly and latently on item. And the auditor asked what was happening. And the pc said he was thinking of the goal 'to be alone.' And the auditor consulted with Fred, and Fred did not check up the item found but told the auditor to do a brief mid rud Prepcheck on the goal 'to be certain.' And it had only a needle agitation on it. And I checked with the auditor, and the auditor has seen no free needle or on goal 'to be certain' or on any item list off the goal 'to be certain,' nor has there been any constant RR-RR. (You mean the blowdown by RR phenomena.) And yesterday and today at the start of the session the goal 'to be certain' was RRing and I told the auditor to get them from 'barren planets' and continue on more items. There are several possibilities here, that this and that and the other thing and the other thing and the other thing...

Well, I'll tell you what it is. Allen went Clear and nobody noticed. See, it happened to me. You know, I was a first-goal Clear and for just time enough to eat a few peanuts and drink a Coca-Cola. But I was smart enough to recognize it and the auditor was smart enough to notice, and so we had a third candidate and so forth – we had a third candidate on this. Pedro, get on the phone. Get on the phone and call me at "05." Would you do that Pedro? ...

Come on, Pedro. Come on. I'm waiting! Everybody's waiting. Do you realize every Central Organization in the world is waiting for you to get ... [phone rings] There we are!

Hello, Pedro. Pedro, I just wanted to tell you because you didn't report to me a first-goal Clear I won't be able to give you Class IV with honors for it either.

[...] You – you reported a possibility of one? You did? When did you report it? You did? You reported a possibility of it on your auditor's report today?

[...] You hadn't seen the blowdown or the rock slam? You hadn't seen the rocket read blowdown? Oh, well, it's awful murky in the chapel in there sometimes.

*Voice on phone:* Yeah... No! There wasn't one!

You don't think there was one?

*Voice on phone:* No. I know for sure that as far as when the preclear was on the meter there wasn't one.

And you took this as a possibility but you didn't check it out, is that right?

*Voice on phone:* No, no, no, no. What happened was this: Um – we re... uh – redid the – whole line plot ...

Yeah.

*Voice on phone:* ... this morning ...

Yeah.

*Voice on phone:* ... you see, at the beginning of the session.

Right.

*Voice on phone:* So, after we had done it ...

Redid the whole line plot this morning at the beginning of the session, and after you'd done it?
Voice on phone: After we'd done it, I checked the goal before I started listing.
And you checked the goal before you started listing?
Voice on phone: Yes. The goal didn't read.
And it didn't read?
Voice on phone: Yes. I gave it a light Prepcheck.
Uh-huh.
Voice on phone: Still didn't read.
Uh-huh.
Voice on phone: Uh – and as the case had been difficult before and rocket reads had been vanishing, Mary Sue had said that there was a possibility of items being represented. And all the rest – and I had a good rocket reading item, too.
Yeah.
Voice on phone: I just went on without the goal reading.
You went on without the goal reading.
Voice on phone: Yes, I went on with what I had rocket reading to oppose.
Yeah. Yeah.
Voice on phone: Now, in opposing that the preclear just said to me, "I thought of the goal 'to be alone. '"
All right. And while you were doing this, opposing the next one, the pc thought of this goal.
Voice on phone: Yeah, and then I supposed, "All right. Now, is that an item on the list?"
Yeah.
Voice on phone: And he said, "No, it's not."
Yeah.
Voice on phone: So I said, "All right. Now, who or what oppose barren planets?" - which was the item that – uh, was opposed.
Yeah.
Voice on phone: And carried on from there not taking any notice of the goal.
Took no notice of the goal?
Voice on phone: No. Just said, "All right, all right. I've got it here that you thought of it. But now carry on listing."
All right. What'd you put on your auditor's report about Clear?
Voice on phone: No, no. I mean uh – one minute ...
Boy, he's trying to talk his way out of this one! All right, go on, Pedro.

Voice on phone: That's all right. I'll manage it.

Yeah. You – you... very good, huh? Go on, Pedro.

Voice on phone: No, after that, when the list went twenty-five items on top of the last RR and all the rest of it, and the list was left to be checked till the last item – so – uh – the last item did not check.

The last item didn't check, huh?

Voice on phone: Yeah. And we checked around it, all the rest of it – two up, two down – and there wasn't anything there.

Uh-huh.

Voice on phone: So – uh – after we had this checked ...

That wasn't, by the way – just for the record, here, that wasn't a continuing RR spiral staircase. That was an item he'd grabbed off an old goal oppose list which was still firing.

Voice on phone: Yeah.

Yes, and he found its oppterm and it all went *whir-clank*, and he couldn't get anyplace from there.

Voice on phone: Yeah.

Okay.

Voice on phone: Well, after that – uh – uh – I – I gave the preclear a break and I mentioned to Fred what had happened about the goal.

Yeah.

Voice on phone: And Fred said, "All right. You carry on with your list, get your item out of this list, and then we'll have to check the goal."

Yeah. Yeah, yeah, you have to check the goal. Go on.

Voice on phone: Which was what we did.

Yeah.

Voice on phone: And on checking the last item on the second time, uh – uh – after having added to the list, and checking the last RR on the list ...

This was back – this last item that you found on the list is back on this old goal oppose list that had been bypassed?

Voice on phone: Yes.

Yes. It had been bypassed, and then you had opposed it.

Voice on phone: Yes. Yes.

And it all blew up in smoke.

Voice on phone: No. No, no. Wait a minute -then ...
He – you won't – you won't make it, Pedro, but go ahead.

*Voice on phone:* Yeah, I will. [LRH laughs] *And I was checking this item.*

Yeah, you're checking the item.

[...] Yeah.

[...] All right. That's all right. That's fine. Yeah. Fine. Fine. It's all right.

[...] Yeah. I'm still waiting to find out if you put on your auditor's report that your pc was a first-goal Clear. That's what I'm waiting for.

*Voice on phone:* Well, I didn't observe it...

Yeah. All right.

*Voice on phone:* ... but then there was this possibility and that his old goal wasn't reading anymore.

His old goal wasn't reading anymore.

[...] Yeah.

[...] Well, then you – you passed up the Class IV with honors. I'm sorry, Pedro. I'm sorry, Pedro. I don't know anybody I would rather have seen get it, really. That's all right. But clean him up tomorrow, you'll find out you too have shot several items beyond the vanishing of the old goal. You've – you're several items beyond it.

And there – for some little time your pc has not quite been able to fit the old goal to the new items you were finding.

[...] Yeah, he wasn't able to fit that in?

[...] All right. All right. Maybe – maybe so. Maybe so. Too bad, Pedro! Anyway, that's the way it is. Okay, Pedro. Good night now. [hangs up]

Well, there we are, there we are. Tonight, I could announce to you and can announce to you, that three first-goal Clears have been made on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course in the last week or so, and because everybody was being unusual, nobody noticed it.

Now, what I want you to do now on those auditors is let's – let's dust up this old goal and let's get a bit of a Prepcheck in – tomorrow's Prepcheck day anyway – and get the old goal cleaned up and sparked off. Except everybody but Duford. Now, we don't want Duford getting pushed around on anything. We simply – who – it's his – he's the one that's losing the ... Yeah. Yeah, it's Duford. He's got his rocket read almost squeezed out. He's gone that far beyond the first GPM. So what he's got to do is – just spend your whole time tomorrow in getting Harold's goal. The sooner – the quicker. And when you've got his goal and got him going, why, you can clean up the old GPM sometime or other – we don't care when. Because you're many items deep, and you'll turn off his RR if you don't find that goal in a hurry.

All right. So this is sort of like this. The road now is so easy and it is so straight that an auditor going down it doesn't even notice when he's gone by the milepost, but keeps on going a half a GPM before the vanishing of RR's and the difficulty of the case and the high tone arm
alerts to him that he has already made a first-goal Clear and never gotten any plaudits for it of any kind whatsoever. You'll find this is quite ordinary. But please, for gosh sakes, realize it.

And to the three I talked to tonight, my deepest condolences, and in actual fact, my heartiest congratulations in spite of the fact that I had to tell you about it without even examining your pcs.

Thank you very much. Good night.
R3M: HOW TO FIND GOALS

A lecture given on 19 March 1963

Well, good evening. Good evening. We – I haven't seen you for a while, and you look – you look better. You look better.

All right. This is the what? This is the 19th?

*Male voice: 19th.*

Nineteenth of March, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture.

Well, I'm glad you're here. And in the old days – in the old days – it was much tougher at Saint Hill. The new star-rating system – rating system on bulletins, tapes and so forth – will make an enormous difference, because it takes off the equalized importance of all books and tapes. Permits you to get through many more tapes and bulletins and acquaint yourself with material that you might not get acquainted with and puts the stress and emphasis on exactly the material which you are using. And you will find that is very handy.

So we expect, we expect all these new students – we expect all of you new students to get up into Z Unit at the end of about the fifth week and quickly bypass the remainder of those who are now in V and X Units – and Y, yes. So do that for me, will you? All right.

Now, the lecture this evening has to do with how to find goals. I think you'll find that's a very important lecture – how to find goals.

But before we go into that, why, I would like to give you – I would like to give you a little brief rundown on what's happened in clearing. I just had a telex from London. Ray is holding the fort. She only has one Class IV I think at the moment. And she's having a terrible time because people are finding goals and items in an awful rush. And they had one girl who has been stuck at 5 TA and there've been telexes back and forth between me and London concerning this girl and so on. And they finally found her goal. So that's the end of that, and so on. Actually, nothing worked on her, you know; 2-12 didn't work and nothing worked; a real sad tomato the whole way. Well, they found her goal.

Well, anyway, Ray is in bad trouble because she's so much on the qui vive checking out other people's goals. And there are several people right on the verge of first-goal Clear, you see, and she's keeping an eye on these people and so forth. And she's got supervisitis, see, and she hasn't had any time to worry about her own case or get any auditing on it. And this is bothering her considerably.

And this state of affairs, actually, is happening in a great many places.

South Africa doesn't seem to be worried about Clears at the present time, and – sssssss – South Africa. Melbourne – Melbourne is having a spate of enthusiasm here on the subject of clearing. Also Sydney and also Perth. And they're being just a little bit enthusiastic.
Every once in a while one of you guys out in Z or something: "We've just blown Joe's second goal. Ha-ha!" You haven't even found all the items in the first goal, you see? "We've just blown the second goal!"

Mary Sue gets one about every three or four days. "Dear Mary Sue: We have just blown my second goal. The auditor found it. It rocket read twice and so forth and then it blew. So that's my second goal."

Well, it isn't done that way. If you can't present a line plot that looks like the March 13th line plot* to accompany each goal blown, it hasn't blown. A line plot just like that, by the way. The items can have different names. We'll permit that. They can be different goals. But don't you vary from that line plot.

So we take these two-goals things with a bit of reservation. Do you understand? We take that with a bit of reservation. But, nevertheless, we have to congratulate them.

Actually, what happened is, is we finished training up Ross Turnbull and Denny was already holding the fort out there, and Ross Turnbull has been straightening up things in Melbourne very nicely and doing a beautiful job. And he went up to Sydney and, all in a space of about an hour and a half or something like that, found about forty or fifty items, goals; got all kinds of people auditing again. It was the most fantastic record you ever saw. I mean, an hour and a half, no; it was several days. But he really did a job, see. And that's the immediate result of that. Pretty good, huh?

Melbourne, HGC pcs. Now, they have a new idea in Melbourne. They have a new idea in Melbourne I want to call to your attention. They're starting to give good auditing on clearing to HGC pcs. And I would like to recommend this as a new and novel policy.

Well, allowing for the fact they haven't even found all the items in the first GPM, we know they're doing it right because we trained Ross up pretty well. So there you are. There you are. What have you got to say about that, huh? I think that's a good – a good send-off down there in view of that fact that they've just had a lot of upsets and troubles of one kind or another, why, to get technical up like that, that would – took quite a lot of doing.

And now, of course, we're changing Academy programs so that with this new bulletin rating system works in these Academy programs – similarly to Saint Hill – they'll be graduating students around there. Next thing you know clearing is going to be a great reality.

You know this is the dark – the dark time for Scientology, actually. You probably don't recognize that because it all looks bright from where you sit. But as we go forward, the mere fact of having made the grade puts in a stable datum that causes a tremendous amount of confusion. There's the "Foolish Drug Administration" in Washington, DC, knocking the spots off of all Scientology in the United States. They've even stolen our last Ability out of the mails in the post office and copied the names and addresses off of it. Interesting, isn't it? Something like that.

---

* Editor's note: refers to HCOB 13 March 1963 II which isn't in the Red Volumes. The line plot referred to is given in the appendix of this transcript.
And then their FDA agents at vast expense are going all over the country visiting all the Scientologists in this country asking them to make incriminating statements about the amount of polio money that they get. You know? Of course, we don't do any of these things so it must be very disheartening to them. But I think they can probably invent enough to cause us trouble.

In Australia, our firm of solicitors in Australia, "Rylah and Rylah" – because we don't dare mention solicitors' names, you know, the implicating, you know, slander, and that sort of thing. Anyhow, this firm "Rylah and Rylah," who are related to the attorney general of Victoria, failed to ask for an extension for the filing of HASI, Limited. Understand Limited – HASI Limited. No, it is not in business in Australia and actually isn't in business in active trading in other parts of the world to amount to anything. And they were supposed to ask for an extension. And the accountants – our accountants down there told them to ask for an extension and they didn't do it. And now they've resigned off the case because we're going to be sued for not having asked for an extension. I think that stinks. They'll be sued of course. But that permits the newspapers to come out, "HASI, A Big Swindle!" See? Ah, it's nonsense. Of course, we sue the newspapers.

Here stateside, in the States we've got plenty of suits coming straight up against papers and that sort of thing. We're in for a fight.

But the main thing that's wrong is Scientologists are being hit individually. Not anything happening to them; they're just being questioned and mauled around. And, of course, one doesn't really care to associate with a government investigator. I mean, you know – smell, you know, and so forth.

And the difficulty with this whole thing: its commotion. Just commotion. Doesn't mean any real trouble in Australia. I mean, what can they do? In the final analysis they could fine HASI or something like that – HASI, Limited. It isn't even trading in Australia. It hasn't committed any crime. We haven't done any of the things that the Food and Drug Administration of the United States says we've done, you see. They are actually doing us a big favor but it – because they are suing us for things they can't prove.

Now, the Food and Drug Administration can lose suits. That's an interesting, too. They just lost one in Florida in a federal court which had been two years in length and is a food against Dextra Sugar. And Dextra had claimed that sugar contains vitamins which act as a food supplement. And the Food and Drug Administration sued them. And that's been going forward for two years and all this sugar is still seized – was still seized in warehouses. And finally the judge says, "You guys are nuts." You know, he said it in some legal language or another, but he – in essence he said, "You guys are nuts," and gave Dextra back its sugar and that was that. In other words, FDA can lose in a federal court.

Now, that suit that they brought was far more convincing than the suit they brought against us. And we're very, very active about this and we're going to have a few heads.

But, understand me, at this time, just at the time clearing, actual clearing, has emerged on Earth, after having been sighted diffidently, twenty-five hundred years ago, first time, why, here's all this organizational commotion going on. Some of the principals involved, like
Denny Gogerly blames himself for not having run out items out of his bank which he found which made him wide open for motivators of being sued.

Well, that's all right. You needn't blame yourself for it. We've all got these things. The sooner we get rid of them, the less motivators we're going to collect. That's for sure.

But look. Here's the technology. The organizations are still there. Excellence of technology and clearing people and getting right down to it and really doing a fine technical job is the only thing that's going to beat this rap. Because you think that's just – that's just two activities going on in the world.

Don't you think there'll be others? Yes, indeed, there will be others. And we had better be strong enough and good enough to meet them. Therefore, our technical has got to be up; and our technical is our only saving grace. And that's the only thing that'll save our bacon.

And we're running a race right now between the commotion and enturbulation which can be generated in a highly psychotic world. And, of course, both of these suits in Australia and the United States are suits brought by psychotics. I say that advisedly, because they aren't even at the firm that is doing the business. How much more psychotic can you be than that? They're going to squash Scientology by suing some Scientology organization or issuing warrants against one which doesn't exist. That's just one of the things.

But, look, if we don't get ahead technically and if we don't just get right down to it and every pc we audit, bang, bang, bang, bang, clear them – no nonsense about this, just clear them – why, this enturbulance that we generate by putting this stable datum in the world could actually swamp us. I say that advisedly. These are actually the dark days of Scientology. I see them from where I sit. You don't see them from where you sit.

If you did, every session you gave would not be some session wherein you hoped Ron was right or that 3M worked. It would be a session for blood, man! If we don't operate in that operating climate, we can be heard of no more. This is touch and go.

All right. So it's very appropriate in that atmosphere – don't let me worry you. Don't let me worry you. But don't sit around so darn complacent about the whole thing. And when you give somebody a session and you don't get any win for the pc and he's not any closer to Clear by the end of that session, realize you're playing with fire. I don't care what pc it is or why you're auditing the pc, that pc is no closer to clearing at the end of that session then at the beginning, you're playing with fire. You haven't got that time to burn, that's all. You just haven't got that time to burn.

Next time you sit down in front of a pc here on course, do the usual in the direction of Clear. Things happen – things happen in your sessions. Aaaah! Fft! Psft! An auditor does a – does an RI oppose list and he gets to a flat spot. He's got twenty-five items. No RR. He got no tone arm action. Nothing. He goes back, he takes an R/S and starts nulling forward and doesn't bother to do anything. Goes right over this flat spot and nulls on down into the rest of the list – this with 3M? Aw, for God sakes!

Let's take the next to the last RR on the list and walk forward from there, I mean, down the list from there and if we haven't found a DR that we can drill, that we can put the big mid ruds on and get to fire – there's something on that list firing because the list RRed.
And if we haven't found a dirty needle or something that we can get to fire in just those few short items, we're wasting time.

The way you people overlist these days – aaah! What are you doing? What are you doing? Do you know how long a 3M list is? Huh? Do you know really how long a 3M list should be? Oh, about, absolute outside about – this is not a source list because you only do one of those on a case and that can be nineteen, twenty pages – your ordinary 3M list is something on the order of sixty items, fifty items.

What you doing, man? There's a little short list and, bang, there it is! And what's the matter with you that you keep going by – keep going by items?

Do you realize that you take a terminal – you're trying to find the oppterm – you overlist from that terminal: you not only go past the oppterm, you go into the next terminal and can go into the next oppterm and can go into the next terminal? Do you realize that? Well, what have you done? You've just lost about four items for the pc, just like that. What are you doing all this overlisting stuff for? It's nonsense, you know? Nonsense. Bypassed items – you won't clear any pc that way! You're just there to find items.

You get down to your fundamentals and you find out that your fundamentals are very simple. There's nothing much to these fundamentals. They're very simple. You're supposed to sit there and do a list and when you see the meter rocket read or R/S when the pc says an item you mark the item and you go down here. Actually, what you're trying to do is get the read off the question you're answering the pc and get the item you want on the list. That's what you're trying to do. You make me give you all sorts of mechanical rules by which to do this, but in essence, that's all you're trying to do. You're trying to list something down long enough so there's no read left on the question, "Who or what would oppose a screamer?", or "Who or what would a screamer oppose?" – using that line plot – and you're just listing until there's no read left on that question and until you've got an item that reads.

And do you know that by the time you get to the third bank that can be as few as four or five items? What are you doing with these fifty-page lists, man? What are you trying to do? It's incredible. Get on the ball, use some of your native initiative. What are you trying to do?

You've got a question here and you're just trying to list this question down until you get an item on that list. That's – that's all you're trying to do. You're trying to list the question until it doesn't read. That it stops reading is no guarantee you've got the item on the list because it may take you three or four more items before it goes down. And you're not trying to bypass oppterm... you find – find a terminal on a list on which you're supposed to get an oppterm.

Do you know the oppterm is on that list? You've just gone by it. You've got to go back and pick it up. It's an RR item earlier on the list. And you – it'll only tick now. You've got to tiger drill it. You've got to get the big mid ruds in on the thing. And it'll fire again.

What are you doing losing the pc's items for him? It's overlisting. You're just going down the line fifty pages, a hundred pages, thousand pages, and so on. What are you trying to do? I don't know what you're trying to do.
Actually, all you're supposed to do is find the exact pattern of items that I gave you in HCOB, March the 13th.

Now, how do you go about doing that?

Well, you'd better go about doing that the simplest way you can to do that and do it the most accurately you can. So, get on the ball, man.

I admit that it was a patch-up of a bank, but the other evening Suzie found in a five-and-a-half-hour session nineteen items. That's interesting, isn't it?

Well, what you doing?

One item per week! Now look, an item is a thirty-five minute proposition.

But I'm not berating you on the subject of items. And I've given you a lot of preliminary this lecture and you're probably all hanging on the rails – how to find goals.

I've had a remarkable breakthrough here on the subject of finding goals. Now, there is the tough area. That's the rough one: finding somebody's goal. Because it's an absolute necessity that you find this person's goal. You've got to find this person's goal; there's no monkey business about this. You can't go on finding items without finding somebody's goal; you're going to shut off his RR and R/S.

So I've been working on how to find goals. It's very easy to find goals. But after you've found goals – after you've found somebody's goal – it is no trick to clear him.

Do you remember that squirrel process that we had – I talked to you about in Washington? You know? The little girl was okay, that's perfectly all right to use initiative on that line. Show you where these things wind up: it took thirty hours to patch up the case she cleared in seven and a half hours. I think that was pretty good, huh? They found the rest of the items and straightened it up. They – she'd done a key-out on these things.

So you can do foolish things with this; but only when you're trying to shortcut and monkey up the basics and fundamentals of what you're trying to do.

Now, finding goals is the first step of 3M. And your next step, of course, is simply finding the items in the GPM and getting those all listed up. And the only way you're missing doing that is by overlisting.

A year and a half ago we beat everybody over the head consistently and continually because they all – always underlisted. They'd have twelve items on the list and, 3D Criss Cross, they did nothing but underlist. See?

And we beat everybody over the head for underlisting and screamed at them and so forth and gave infractions and raised the devil, and now all they can do is turn us in hundred-page lists. I think maybe we trained everybody too well. Something on that order.

But the truth of the matter is, what does clearing consist of? It consists of finding a goal and listing it out to get the items in 3M. Oh, yeah, it's not – it's not easy, but it is just an action. And if you could grip what you're trying to do, you'll do it fairly rapidly. But if you don't get a grip on what you're trying to do, you're not going to do it rapidly.
Now, your biggest barrier has been in finding goals. That's the biggest barrier and will continue to be the biggest and hardest job. But people can find goals. People have consistently been finding goals for a long period of time.

Now it's become absolutely vital that we find goals rather fast. And I've been studying this very hard. I've been trying to get a bulletin out on it for the last few days and it's so easily and quickly said, however, that I'm sort of defeated at getting this bulletin out. I try to list all the number of ways of finding goals and all that sort of thing. Seems rather arduous and I don't want to get out a goals bulletin that just gives us just this one little piece of information. I'd like to get out a more embracive bulletin.

But the truth of the matter is, goals is just another specialized method of listing. And that's all it is. And it's listing against a certain result. And goals listing is far, far, far more difficult than listing items out of a GPM. That's simple. There's nothing to it unless the auditor is just totally knuckleheaded and hasn't a clue what he's doing. Goals, though, this is something else. This is something else.

We've had various methods of goals listing. One of the most easy and certain ways we had in the past to find a goal was in 3GA – 3GA goals methods. There we did something like, "Who or what have you detested?" got a list, did a represent of the resulting item and listed goals against that. That was more complicated than we needed, by the way. All you had to do was say, "Who or what have you detested?" and do a list and list goals against the resulting item. It was quite interesting to do this.

Well, that was one of the soundest methods. But people have trouble finding rock slams and so forth on some cases. And on some cases the goal, well... the R/S and RR have already been shut off, so that method is not particularly open. So it is in many cases limited.

So how do you go about finding somebody's goal? Now, that's the main trouble. Now, you're making trouble out of finding items in the GPM. You can make lots of trouble out of finding goals because it's an infinitely harder operation. More difficult. It's tough. And the penalty for running the wrong goal is fry your scalp. Not my penalty. It's what'll happen to the pc if you run the wrong goal on him. So this is a very important technology.

Now, you've got, in your bulletin and things, almost anything you need to – well, you've got anything you need now to run (with the issuance of the last bulletins) to run 3M flawlessly, making no mistakes. See, this is easy. I can tell you how to clean up a GPM after you've found the items in it and how to patch it up and missing items and do various things like this and how to run Clear tests and all various things like this. But the technology's been released now. Well, this isn't true of goals.

Now, you can learn to do that listing after you've got the goal. But, remember, everything depends on the goal. So you'd better straighten yourself up on the subject of listing and get so that you can list just like that, man! And just get the item, bang, you know, and know that's it and fill in your line plot – bzzzt-bzzzt-bzzzt-bzzzt, bang-bang-bang, that's the end of that GPM. See? That's easy.

Why?
You have a guide. You have a guide. And that guide is a goal. You know exactly where you are going.

Oddly enough, you only run into trouble when you run over the bottom border of the GPM into the next GPM. As soon as you run over the border into the next GPM you're without a goal so you're in trouble because you have no guide.

You keep finding items in 2-12, you keep finding items just on and on and on in 3M without a goal – and you can do it too: you can have the pc's goal for the first GPM and with great enthusiasm and unbeknownst to either you or the pc run right over into a foreign GPM and start finding items in this foreign GPM. And all of a sudden nothing rocket reads and the pc's rocket read is gone and the pc's been all ARC broke for the last couple of sessions and the auditor says, "Well, we just should keep on going because it's just his meanness; he is dramatizing some of the items." Well, he might be dramatizing some of the items but what you've done is you've run into a GPM without a goal and you're finding items without the pc's goal.

That's the only thing that can really hang a case up, is running items without a goal. And you can take that and mark it down in letters of fire inside your skull. You find items without a goal, you're in trouble. Therefore, a goal is very important. A goal is a very important activity.

So, therefore, there will probably be lots of work done on how to find goals. I would say there's tremendous quantities of work.

We did a lot of electronics work on this and Dale just wrote me and told me that he had a better method of reading an oscilloscope and he could read things with a magnitude of about one to a hundred with a Mark V. That's pretty good. He could read a hundred times more sensitive than a Mark V. That's fine. I'm glad of it.

But that is not the zone of expansion. That is a zone of expansion; be very valuable if we could do it. That isn't what we need! I don't care how sensitive an instrument you've got – if the pc has not told you his goal, you're not going to get a read on it. Now, just figure that out.

Oh, it'd be nice. It'd be nice. You could probably detect – it would be very useful. Don't let me run it down. But what you need is a method of getting the pc to put his goal on a list. And I've been developing information along this line and I've been putting some things together with this. And I'm quite cheerful about the whole thing.

Seems to me – seems to me that getting the pc to put his goal on the list is far, far more important than any other activity that we could conduct.

Now, I expect to see goals finding move up into a very fine art and a very exact science and so forth. And I've made a breakthrough which puts it through in that direction. We've got lots of methods of finding goals, you understand that? But you need some very positive methods of finding goals.

Now, one of the methods of finding goals is to take – I'll show you how (just an adventure in goals finding; method of finding goals) – you get the pc to do a goals list and then you keep nulling goals on the goals list until the pc ARC breaks. And then go back through...
the last session's auditing and find out which goals still tick and do a represent on those goals until the pc gets the right goal. You see, he'll ARC break not because his goal is on the list but because a near miss is on the list.

All right. That would be a method of goals finding. I'm just showing you some adventurous lines of doing this. You'll use this, by the way. I've used it myself. I find it quite fascinating. If you go by a near wording of the pc's goal on a list, the pc can be expected to ARC break in the next session. That or the next session, see, he'll ARC break on it. Well, that's a goal's method. Show you how wild these methods could be.

You'll use the method some time; don't just laugh at it. You'll say, "Well, gee, you know, this pc has been all ARC broke ever since the November 3rd session. Look at these folders! You know? Look at the folder. Look at the auditor's reports here. Look at these auditor reports. Been a sad character and hasn't been reading on the meter and had upsets with the auditor ever since that session. Oh, he was finding goals in that session and here are the goals list of that session. And they all went out."

Well, yes, they all went out. But the auditor wasn't quite watching as closely as he might have been because one of them was still ticking. And that was not the pc's goal; that was a near miss.

I'll give you an idea. The one of them the pc put on the list was "to eat catfish." And the pc's goal is "to catch catfish." And you go over the top of it, the pc'll ARC break because, you see, it's a near miss. It's a nearly found out. And it acts just like any other withheld... missed withheld and the pc gets upset. So it's a near wording of the goal.

I have actually had a... looked back into this and this is a fact. This is a fact. We thought before and were defeated on this, that we'd gone over the actual goal. We knew that was the case. That always ARC breaks the pc. His goal is "to catch catfish." The auditor goes down the line, "To catch catfish," you know? "To catch catfish. Anything on this goal been suppressed?" You know, and the meter falls, you know, off the pin. And the auditor says, "That's clean," and goes on to the next goal. Heh-heh-heh-heh. Sometime during the next half an hour the pc's going to say, "You know, the way you're acknowledging me is terrible! Your meter is – your hand on the meter is bothering me." This, that, criticism, criticism and the next thing you know a full-blown ARC break. That was the exact goal that was gone over.

But, look, it's more intimate than that. It's more intimate than that. You can go over the goal "to catch fish," and the pc's goal is "to catch catfish," see, and the pc will ARC break. Well, that's a method of goals finding, then, isn't it? I consider that fascinating. It opens the door more ways than one.

It tells us – although we're never supposed to represent a rock slamming item – you can always write three or four or five goals after any goal. We're not representing it; we're trying to get various wordings of that exact goal. That's interesting, isn't it? More goals are missed by not quite the right wording.

What happens when you take the pc's first GPM goal – it's all ready to be found, you see, and there it is – and this GPM goal is "to scream." That's going to be the goal you're going to find. And you get the goal "to be a screamer."
Do you know when you tiger drill that thing it fires, bang! "To be a screamer" is what you've found. The actual goal is "to scream." See? "To be a screamer" – bang, rocket read, bang! Then it doesn't rocket read. The rocket read now disappears. It R/Ses. R/Ses. "To be a screamer" – R/S, R/S, R/S. And sometimes you even get a dwindling R/S; on a goal that close you'll get a dwindling R/S. Next thing you know it only goes tick, tick, tick. Where did it go?

That was the pc's actual goal, it should have ticked, then when drilled with the left-hand buttons – Suppressed, Careful of and Failed to reveal – should have given a rocket read and then when prepchecked should have given a much better rocket read on it. Should have kept on rocket reading. That's the pc's goal, see?

But this goal, it didn't behave that way. It goes bang, bang, tick. Well, it ticked in the first place, you drilled it, it went rocket read, rocket read, rock-rock-rock-rock-rock slam, rock slam, rock slam, narrower rock slam, narrower rock slam, narrower rock slam, tick. Right in front of your eyes. You've got a goal there which is almost the wording but isn't quite.

So when you see that, don't blow your brains out. Say, "Give me some other wordings for this goal." And amongst them he will give you "to scream." And when he gives you that, if you're... list on the meter, see, he gives you that, that goal is going to go psheew! It'll be a little bit suppressed, however; and it'll only go that one fire maybe and then it doesn't fire and it doesn't fire. And then you get the buttons in on it, the left-hand buttons, just the three of them – Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal; just those – and it just sits there and rocket reads from there on out. Interesting, isn't it?

Has your pc's goal been a near miss? Huh? Have you nearly found it?

Now, there's one type of goal that's probably very easy to find, and that's an Axiom 10 goal. Let's say, "To impress people," and it goes psheew! psheew! rrump, tick, rocket read, tick, tick, tick, slight blowdown, reads with a slight DR, nothing can be done with this thing now. You see? "To impress people."

"To shoot people." Rocket read, tick, gone.

"To drown people." You can get off on the line of doing something to people, don't you see? Actually, it's an Axiom 10 type of goal.

If he was a Scientologist you say, "Give me some Axiom 10 goals." Just do a little list of Axiom 10 goals. You get something like "to create effects." Bow! It rocket reads every time. You see? See what you've been doing?

Now therefore, in finding goals you must maintain an out-hard list. And not spend the rest of your life tiger drilling something that only gives a consistent tick. You understand? You get a goal – you list a goal (I don't care now what method you're using) you list the goal against the meter. You take this list and null it by elimination. Take the last three or four in, put in the left-hand buttons on them (Suppress, Careful of, Fail to reveal), do a Prepcheck with those, you know – repetitive, repetitive buttons, not just fast check on those last three. And one of them goes psheew!

Well, now you've got a career. Now you've got a career. If your... if you don't care what happens to Scientology and you don't... it doesn't seem to matter whether we ever clear
anybody up or not, this is the course you will take: "Oh, well, I saw it rocket read once!" I know because I myself have made this mistake, see. I'm not now talking without experience in this. You can invest the next twenty-five or thirty hours on that damn goal. You can! You saw it rocket read. Wow! Cut my throat, see? You saw it rocket read. Ahhhaaa.

Now just go on and prepcheck it. Give it another Prepcheck. You know? Then give it another Prepcheck. Then you don't know what to do, so give it another Prepcheck. See? And then put in the session rudiments for all those sessions and give it another Prepcheck. It won't go out! It now only ticks, but it just won't go out. You understand? Well, just call that a goal that goes out hard. And you put it over here on the goal-that-goes-out-hard list. And don't you spend more than about fifteen minutes on the thing. That's the secret. It rocket reads, you polish it up, can't get it to rocket read again but it still ticks, it isn't going to go out, so forth; put it over here on this goals-that-went-out-hard list. John Jones, pc. And put the date each one of them went out hard. And when you're doing this list – you're doing his lists – no matter what else you're doing, keep that goals-that-went-out-hard list. You understand?

Now, if the goal was ever seen to rocket read, also mention that on your goals-that-went-out-hard list. "Rocket read, March the 3rd," so forth. See? It doesn't mean anything that it rocket read beyond that it's a near miss.

You keep trying to find the pc's goal and every time you get one that, when you put in the left-hand buttons on, you can't get it to rocket read again but it did something interesting. Actually the whole definition is that you can't get it to disappear. You put it over here on this list.

Now of course, if you find a goal that not only won't disappear but sporadically, every now and then, rocket reads, you've got the pc's goal. So don't put it on the goals-that-went-out-hard list. Understand? You put that on your auditor's report as the pc's goal found. And then get it checked out by somebody. And it'll rocket read for that person, too.

Now, if it doesn't rocket read for that person, don't immediately assign the fact that the Instructor or the Auditing Supervisor is suppressive. The facts of the case are if it won't rocket read for the person who is checking it out, it just belongs over here on the goals-that-went-out-hard list. You understand?

Don't make a career out of it. There's how you fail to find goals – by making a career out of those that go out hard. No. Put them on a special list – and I'll show you the reason for that in a moment – put them over here on a special list, give any data about that goal, "The goal 'to catch catfish' fired three times in tiger drilling and R/Sed."

Of course, you're a complete knucklehead if you actually didn't do something else right there at that moment, see. "It fired three times and R/Sed and finally dwindled and..." whuuuuh! Probably the goal is "to catch fish." See, it's near; it's almost dead-on. See? But it's just enough off so that it doesn't keep rocket reading.

Now therefore, let's lay down a few principles here. First and foremost: The pc does have a goal that can be found relatively easily. That's your first principle.

Now, it's taken me a long time to learn that principle, so it'll take you a long time to learn that principle, too, so that you get a good subjective reality on it. The pc does have a
goal that can be found! That's an interesting principle to lay down with that amount of vio-

But you know the auditor that isn't used to finding goals, he sits there and he says, "Uhh-hhu. Um – well, I don't know whether this... maybe the pc's goal can't be found, you

Now, you know, the goal is the only part of the case that is instantly findable if it is on

It is the easiest thing to find on the case if the case is in shocking bad shape. That's an-

Now, here's another basic principle: Goals processing is the only processing that is to-

What's going to limit you?

Well, for instance, until you find a goal and get a bank clear, you can get one of the
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In other words, it's like any other Prehav level: it's been overrun. You understand that? So it's a limited action. It's not something you're going to run into. So stop worrying. Because you're going to clear this guy, you see. Soon as you get a GPM out of the way, why, the ceiling is off. All of the Prehav buttons are now completely free again and they'll all run to flat spots.

But I'm just telling you that even Prepchecking of that particular type, depending as it does on what were originally Prehav level buttons, has a zenith. But goals processing does not have. You can always find a goal.

Now, there's only one reservation, is at any given time there is only one goal to be found. So we reverse what we just said and say that it is unlimited. I'm saying you're trying, you see, can be unlimited. But it does have a ceiling, which is finding the pc's goal. After you've found the pc's goal you won't be able to find the pc's goal. You won't be able to stall anymore. You'll have to clear him now.

Now take it over into overlisting. Take it out on him by overlisting, bypassing items in the GPM. That's all you can do after you've found his goal. That's the only way... That's mean of me, isn't it? I actually have more confidence in you than that and I'm not sarcastic that way about your auditing. His, yes. But – you know, or – and his, yes, but not – not yours. Okay? You'll go right on and clear him, won't you? All right. Thank you.

After you've found the pc's goal, you can't find the pc's goal. The only thing you can do from there on is clear him. You got that? That is the goal.

But there is a point just short of finding the pc's goal which you can go on forever. And it's one of those things – Mary Sue in instructing here and so forth has gotten very tired of this one. In fact, she – I'd say every few weeks I hear this remark, "Prepchecking it forever!"

Some pc is doing some hard sell, you know: "My goal is to enliven space opera." See? And you know, he'll – in there with the hard sell. Well, it was seen to rocket read in 1961, early in the year, once. And they have now run up 275 Prepchecking hours on this goal and the pc is turned over to a new auditor. And the new auditor starts to prepcheck this goal. Oh yes, it happens. Now, that's a method of not finding the pc's goal: prepchecking things that aren't his goal, that he merely hopes is.

So we get the next principle: It is up to the auditor to find out if it is the pc's goal. See? That's up to the auditor to find it out. It isn't the responsibility of the pc. It's the auditor's responsibility.

Now, if you look over goals finding in these various lights, you will find out that it's a rather simple activity, providing you're in there trying to find the pc's goal.

Now, I'm working on Routine 2GX. And I'll be talking to you about that later. Now, that is a Prepcheck which possibly will make the pc spit his goal out. And very possibly it will work and possibly it won't work.

But there is a workable process now on the subject of goals which is a relatively simple process. And this can be run forever – until, of course, you find the pc's goal. If you're
unlucky enough to find the pc's goal, of course, you can't run this process anymore. Because the only way you can find the pc's goal again and do all that again is after you've gotten rid of the whole GPM that that goal is connected with, which is seventeen, twenty, thirty items, something like this. And when you've gotten rid of that GPM, see, then you can go through it all over again. But you have to get rid of this – well, you have to go to the work of getting rid of this GPM before you can go at the endless business of finding the pc's goal again. See? So it's... it'd be happy... I'm happy to be able to tell you that it doesn't completely end with the finding of one goal.

Now, how do you go about finding this goal?

Well, you'd better find it.

Well, how do you find it?

Take the oldest item, valid, invalid, rumored, thought of, hoped for, rocket read or rock slammed or was never even found on a meter – we don't care what or under whose authority it was found or anything else; we care nothing about these things. Found in some ACC, you see, we don't care where. Let's get that one. That's the first one ever found; that's the first reliable item for goals finding as far as we're concerned. See? Probably doesn't even belong to the bank, but it might. Who knows? It doesn't now have to read, no other conditions attached to this thing. We don't have to know if it's a terminal, if it's an oppterm, anything. Don't have to know anything about this. And we find this, get the pc to tell us or get it out of his auditor's reports. We take that one.

We find the next item of this character and the next item of this... anything ever found on this pc. We don't care if it was a Dynamic Assessment. We don't know how it was found. We don't care if somebody dreamed it up. We don't care if it was something an auditor got a tick on so that he could one day run O/W on it. We don't care what it is. It's anything that was ever found on that pc.

And we put this on a list. We put these items on a list as accurately as we can, but regardless and without losing any. Get a whole list of these things and bring it right on down to present time. And include on it all R2-12, 2-10, 3GA Criss Cross, whether gotten from a rock slamming item or not, we don't care. In other words, let's just pick up all this debris, let's get the whole lot. That's our first step in modernly finding goals.

Our next step is an elementary one that is so elementary it's horrible. We take the meter and we put down a sheet of paper and we take the first terminal and we simply list from the question, "What might the goal of a (whatever the item is) be?" That's our question, "What might the goal of a..." You know? Let's say the first item ever found was a rock. "What might the goal of a rock be?" See? Get the idea?

And now, how long do we list that?

Well, there's a couple of you – I'm kind of mad about overlisting, so I won't make any bright cracks about it. But if I catch you going nineteen, twenty, thirty, seventy, eighty, ninety, two hundred pages with that goals list off of the rock, I'm going to – well, I'll give you a psychiatric consultation. How's that? Because it's a little, short list. It's a little dinky list, you know, about so. Maybe two columns, maybe two sheets of paper.
And, look, every few items the pc gives you... You've got to learn this trick because it's a new trick in listing, and it's a trick which is in goals finding and it'll be a trick in the later banks of the GPM and so forth. Not for the first one; you can still count on your twenty-five for the first one. Twenty-five after the last R/S or whatever – or last RR. But it's the trick of reading a question to see if it reads. Not tiger drilling it so it will read, but seeing if the question will read. "What might the goal of a rock be?" That's your question. And you're only going to list goals until that question reads clean. Got it?

That doesn't absolutely guarantee that the goal, if it is to be on that list, is on the list. There's no absolute guarantee of it. So do two, three more. You get the idea. You'll find out that if it reads, the list is not complete, but that it is clean does not mean the item is on the list yet. It's almost, maybe. Do two or three more. Do a few more beyond this – beyond this clean point for that item. And then knock it off. You're through with that item until you – unless you just have completely horrible, bad luck.

Now, you listed these things on the meter, didn't you? And you watched this meter carefully for RRs and R/Ses. And you marked each one of those goals when they R/Sed and RRed. You got it? "What might the goals of a rock be?" And you read that occasionally asking the pc the question. You also read it on the meter, don't you see. You say, "What might the goal of a rock be?" And you see that that doesn't read and so you say, "All right. Well, give me two or three more and I'll end this list." Something like that. And you do. And make sure that you get the RRs and R/Ses, see?

And then – you got that now? You got that?

Now, you don't pick the R/Ses and RRs off or do anything stupid like that. You take this sheet of paper which is in front of you now and you simply put your meter right back where it was and you null that list by elimination pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. You'll find it's a clean needle list. Just null them. And any read of any kind that you get, you leave it in. You call each one three times. Remember the old three bark proposition? Maybe the pc didn't hear it the first time. So you say, "To be a catfish. To be a catfish. To be a catfish." Don't say – don't scream it at the pc; use a fairly normal tone of voice. "To be a catfish. To be a catfish. To be a catfish. All right." And don't bother to tell him it read or it didn't read. You don't care anything about that.

Now, if it got no read of any kind – and there's big adjudications on this. "Well, let's see, if it ticked once and then didn't tick twice, then is it in or is it out?" You know? Well, we'll hold some courts on that so that we can finally decide some findings concerning it. I just tell you the thing has to be in. Actually, if it reads two times out of the three, it's for sure in. And if it reads on a tick on the third one, it's probably in, too. But it's adjudications of that character you'll have to get used to.

Now those things, we take them down the line and we take them – the whole list. We've done this item, "What might the goal of a rock be?" We've done a list on the thing against the meter. Those things are marked with RRs and R/Ses. We don't pay any attention to the RRs and R/Ses. All we do is null the whole list by elimination, bang. That leaves us maybe – we go over it maybe twice and things go out and we're left there with maybe three goals.
And on those three goals we put in the left-hand buttons of the big mid ruds – Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal – and we do it more or less by a Precheck basis. And – simple. This is real simple. Because if it's ever going to rocket read, it's going to rocket read because you got those three buttons off of it. You understand? You can put in all the rest of it, but that's after a goal has proved itself up a bit and you're curious about it.

All right. And none of those three fired. They didn't fire, didn't respond, didn't anything. But also one of them didn't lose its tick. Got that? Didn't lose its tick. Never fired. It falls occasionally, it behaves peculiarly, but you don't have rocket reads on it. You transfer that goal over to the goals-that-went-out-hard list, say what item it came from, that it did or didn't rocket read and so forth. And you put it over there and then you take this whole sheet and you attach it to your goals folder for the pc and you forget about the rock. You got it? You just forget about that. That's gone now. That's gone.

And you take the next item in sequence, that is the next oldest item the pc has had, and you do exactly the same thing. You got it? And you exhaust all of the items you've got for that pc up to the time when you actually do find the pc's goal. You got it?

Now, the only variation that happens is if you get one that rocket reads, rock slams, fires, doesn't fire, ticks, get all the big mid ruds in on the thing again and see if it does anything else. And if it just ticks, you say, "This goal is awful close to it." So you do a little represent on that goal. You got it? You take another little sheet of paper, see, and you say, "All right. Now, we have this goal here 'to be a screamer.' Can you state this in other ways? Or can you give the same sense in other ways?"

And he finally says, "Uh – to listen, to howl, to screech, uh – to scream, uh – to yell, uh – to make a noise, to be noisy, uh..." and so forth.

You say, "That's fine." Because, of course, in the meantime listing on the meter you've seen this thing, "to scream," rocket read. And you say, "All right. Now, I want to give you this goal. I want to give you these goals." And you just do the same action you've done with the other goals. In other words, you go over them, you null them, and so on. And you'll see this goal, "to scream," fire. And you say, "All right." And you null them out. And now we... Three of them fire, now one of them is firing. To scream. You say, "All right. Now, on 'to scream'..." Remember, today, it isn't ever, "On the goal 'to scream,'" or anything like that. It's 'On 'to scream,' has anything been suppressed?' You know? "Is there anything you've been careful of? Is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And this thing is firing on its mid rud buttons. And you say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha, it's firing on its mid rud buttons!" And bang, bang. And then all of a sudden it fires because of course, it's been suppressed by finding the near miss. Don't you see? And it'll fire and it'll fire and it'll fire and it'll fire and it'll fire and that's it. And you take it and get it checked out and it'll fire and it'll fire and it'll fire. And the real goal on a case is the only thing that just keeps on firing from there on out. Got that?

We do that to every item the guy's got. Every item you can dig up on the case. Don't find new items because someday you'll turn off his RR and R/S.

What if the RR and R/S has been turned off on the case by finding too many items by some eager beaver?
It doesn't matter. The goal will still RR. If you find it, it will RR. See, it's the only safe process there is, actually, is finding goals. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, I've said it's the only safe process there is. Let me emphasize it just a little bit further. It is one of the best processes there is. If you were never going to find a goal, it would be good auditing. Because every goal you find and everything you straighten out for this pc and every goal you get rid of for the pc and every goal the pc lists makes him read a little better on the meter, feel a little better, get rid of a few more somatics.

One of the – one of the rules that goes with this – there aren't very many rules; there aren't any beyond what I've told you – the pc turns on a severe somatic or sen on a goal, why, run the buttons. Run the buttons on the thing till it goes off. But that can get you in a trap. The pc can sell you a goal that way and it never rocket reads. So clean it up as best you can.

Actually, you can practically cripple a pc, but also you can run a goal like "to create" and almost take his head off. It never rocket read, but you just for some reason or other keep on drilling it and, of course, it is the pc's goal – in the tenth GPM. Of course that's a strong enough goal to blow his head off anyhow.

Now, you keep putting these goals-that-went-out-hard over on this list. And you don't forget that goals-that-went-out-hard list, because you probably – you very well may have his second goal or his third goal or his fifth goal for the GPM on that first list. That's very interesting. And one of the things that auditors are doing is finding the goal that belongs to the second GPM before finding the goal on the first GPM and therefore they don't get beautiful rocket reads and the pc just gets prepchecked forever and this is a bunch of nonsense.

Why?

Well, it's the pc's goal all right. And of course he'll ARC break if you tell him it isn't his goal because it is his goal. But it belongs to the second GPM or the third or the fourth or the fifth. You see? Of course it won't go out. But it won't rocket read either. And it's sure not ready to run, man. If you were to run that you'd plow him straight in, because he's no more ready to go into that second GPM than he is to jump off the Empire State Building with complete impunity. That's too much for him. So you keep that goals-that-go-out-hard list and you'll eventually find the pc's goal.

Now, this is a terrific way to do an intensive. Terrific way to do an intensive.

Now, what about raw meat? What about raw meat?

They don't have a bunch of items, do they? Well, why don't you find some? Why don't you find some?

How would you go about finding these?

Actually, you don't have to do very much to find some kind of items. You could – you could find them as lously and as sloppily and as stupidly as some items have been found in the history of Scientology. You know? You could do that. You could say, "Well, who haven't you really liked?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I don't know. Do-do-do-do-do. Oh, Aunt Jezebel. Oh, yeah, sure hated her guts."
Didn't RR. Doesn't R/S. Doesn't do anything. He hated Aunt Jezebel.

So you ask, "Well, what's Aunt Jezebel's goal?"

You ask why. Well, you only need to look at the March 13th line plot to find out why. The oppterm is far more likely, you see, to carry the pc's goal than the terminal. And the older it is, the earlier it was found on the pc's case, the more likely it is to be an oppterm that carries the goal.

Now, what if you went through all these lists and all of these items – suppose you only had five – and you went through all of these and you didn't find them; you didn't find anything.

You know, the least productive lists and the lists that'll give you the least action were the terminals. And the lists which gave you the most action were the oppterms. That's interesting, isn't it?

So you now could take this hatful of items that you found, separate out those that didn't give anything that even whispered, and call those things terminals and then list goals with another question. "What goal would 'a failure' be an overt against?"

Now, you can almost take the very low-toned sounding items, and those too would probably be the end-of-bank terminals, and you can run that question. You run it the same way. You do exactly the same things. You just make a little list here, "What goal would 'a failure' be an overt against?" And, of course, the pc gives you the proper goal for that. You've got another crack at it with the same terminals. You got the idea?

We just list them at first, though, and your most success will simply be treat them all as just items. List them all with the same question, "What might be the goal of" You'll find that. You'll at least find the family of the pc's goals because eventually you'll have them sitting over here on the goals-that-went-out-hard list. And that will give you the family of goals that the pc has.

I wouldn't depend too much on deduction of this sort of thing. But anything I ever saw rocket read, I'd get different versions of. You follow that?

Well now, that is actually a goals intensive. And it's not the action to find the pc's goal; it is auditing to better the pc. You see that? It's just auditing to better the pc. He'll get closer and closer to realizing his goal the more of this auditing you do. The more goals you process, the more goals you get rid of, the more goals you straighten up, the happier you make the pc in this, the less you worry him, the more likely he is to put his goal on the list. So the action is to get the pc straightened up so that he will put his goal on the list. You see that?

The biggest trouble in goal finding is the pc has not put his goal on the list! You see that? That's the trouble with goal finding.

Why hasn't he?

Well, he isn't close enough to it yet.

How do you put him close enough to it?
Get him to go through goals. And drill them and straighten them up and he'll have a ball. In other words, a goals intensive. Just sit down and audit him through finding goals.

And fortunately, that has a termination point. Because when you find the PC's goal – as you will – why, you can't do any more goals finding; you'll have to run 3M and clear him. I'm sorry, but that's true. Because the only time you can do more goals finding and run this goals intensive on him, of course, is when you've gotten rid of all of the first GPM. And now, when you've gotten rid of that, of course, you can go back and give him some real auditing, which is goals finding again.

The trouble is it gets interrupted after the first GPM. The pc's – you're just about to go through this and list goals on the next oppterm that you found and the next bank and you're just all straightened out and he says, "My goal is to catch catfish."

And you, "Aaaah, damn. Nuts!"

Once in a while, though, you'll lay an egg. PC puts his – puts his goal on the goal-as-an-RI-oppose list. That's the last item on the bank. It doesn't fire on that list. You go over the top of it, the PC ARC breaks, you can't understand what's wrong. You have to take it off the list before it fires again. It's very interesting. It won't fire while on the list; you've got to take it off the list to make it fire again. Little oddities of that character you'll run into.

Now, what happens if the PC doesn't have any items at all? And you don't care to go into any old 3GA or any action to get some items off the PC to list goals against?

There is still the oldest known goals method, which is, you just list a whole bunch of goals, list them on the meter just as you would, watch for your RRs, keep the PC listing goals, keep him listing goals, listing goals, listing goals and eventually, why, tone arm action tends to go out of the thing and the thing fires and you explore around and follow the same rules I gave you for the other one. You can then even find goals without finding any items.

This PC gets a favorite goal, he gets stuck on the goal, you say, "Well..."

You can even move him off that by listing a bunch of goals, "What goal would you have after the goal (something) had failed?" (The one he's stuck on.) And he'll move into the next bank and you got TA action back on your goals.

You can always restore TA action back on your goals by getting the bank before or the bank after the goal he is enamored with. See? And you'll get all kinds of interesting combinations of things.

The point I'm making here is that goals finding is processing. You had better treat it as processing. And the better it is as processing, the more likely you are to find the pc's goal. That is the basic message in all this. Goals shouldn't be a hectic, screaming finding that only has a result if you find the pc's goal. It is actually processing. It is good processing. If it is well done, the pc comes way up scale – even when you haven't found his goal, you see, if you're really doing it well and not annoying the pc. The pc comes way up and all of a sudden, one day, he says, "Oh," he says, "Waaaah! My goal is..." and you've got it. More than one pc has done that.
You can actually bring the pc into a frame of mind where he'll present you with his goal if you just keep finding his goals efficiently and handling them efficiently and so forth.

Now, that's the biggest barrier in clearing people, is finding people's goals. And the basic breakthrough on this thing is just a simplification of how you do it and using the oldest items that a pc has and listing them in that fact and nulling his list in little, short lists and listing the questions clean, getting enough goals to clean the question. You'll eventually find the

---

**A LINE PLOT**

**Goal: To scream**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oppterm</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE MOST SCREAMISH</td>
<td>A MUTE R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUD VOICES</td>
<td>SOMEBODY WHO CAN'T WHISPER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNARES</td>
<td>A WHISPERER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SOUND</td>
<td>A FAINTER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETHING THAT MAKES A NOISE</td>
<td>A PLEADER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHATEVER MIGHT MAKE A SOUND</td>
<td>A YOUNG GIRL R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOCATION</td>
<td>A LADY R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A HOSTILE AUDIENCE</td>
<td>A CABARET SINGER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A FRIGHTENING SIGHT</td>
<td>A LOUD MAN R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A REPROVER</td>
<td>A SCREAMER R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEBODY OR SOMETHING THAT DISL</td>
<td>SOMEbody OR SOMETHING WITH THE GOAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO SCREAM</td>
<td>TO SCREAM R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILENCE</td>
<td>THE GOAL TO SCREAM R I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY PEOPLE</td>
<td>TO SCREAM R I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TV Demo: Rudiments and Havingness Session and Short Lecture

A lecture and demonstration given on 20 March 1963

LRH: We're going to give you a demonstration of rudiments and havingness. Just simple; put in the rudiments and run a bit of Havingness and that's it. Now, I'm not going to follow any particular breed of session or anything, I'm just going to do it the way it's being done these days. That's good enough, isn't it?

Now, we've got a bit of randomity here, perhaps. I think you can see the meter however, and you've got another picture, and all this should work out very well. Okay?

There's actually nothing very fancy going to happen here, so don't hold your breath. But you might notice, you might notice as we went along that it is an auditing session, and actually, we got tired of looking at those X Unit sessions so we decided we'd do one for you, okay? All right.

All right, now let's forget about the audience. And your chair's okay?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Room all right to audit in?

PC: Yes.

LRH: After all this sweat?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay. Pick up the cans, please. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Good enough. What I'm going to do here is just put in your rudiments.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you.

PC: Oh, dear! [PC and LRH laugh]

LRH: And run a bit of Havingness.

PC: Right.

LRH: And perhaps put the rudiments in for the session, we'll see how that is – get very redundant here – and end it down. How's that?

PC: It's fine.

LRH: Very good. All right. All right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, here it is. Start of session.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right, has the session started for you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. All right. What goals would you like to set for this ses-
PC: Well, to clean up the period since the last time you audited me.

LRH: All right.

PC: And, oh, feel better at the end of the session.

LRH: Very good. All right. All right, here is the first question here. When is the last time I audited you?

PC: Must be about three weeks ago.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Three weeks ago in this very room.

LRH: Mm-hm. All right, very good. You got that spotted.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?

PC: Well, my auditor must have been a – done a good job on me because I don't see a thing in... see anything there. But undoubtedly I have suppressed a lot. Um – suppressed – um – I was going to say – um – well, suppressed concern over the way the staff co-audit's being going at times. Um – suppressed – um – well, suppressed worrying you about it occa... on occasions. Um – I don't get anything else that I've deliberately suppressed, there's nothing readily coming to mind here.

LRH: All right, all right, thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed? All right, I have a read here. There it is. There. There.

PC: Well, that was right at the beginning of the – when you said you were going to audit me. I – um – suppressed looking at anything I'd done recently so that...

LRH: Oh, all right!

PC: You very – you very considerably sort of left it to the last minute so I didn't stir everything up beforehand. But even in that second, as I went out to the – to phone over about this picture, I can recall sort of thinking, well, have I not suppressed it, anything – any thoughts of looking back at all over anything that would likely come up in this session at all.

LRH: All right. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed? All right, did you think of anything?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Now, since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have been careful of?

PC: Well, I've been careful – um – as far as my auditing has gone, not to – um – self-audit out of session. And I have quite a thing on this, I don't like – I like to forget the session as soon as I've gone out of it and some people think it – may think this is not interested in my case, but I am, but I don't like to think about it too much out of session, I think that's the place to do it. An ideal preclear, you see?

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: But I've been careful not to overdo this anyway because inevitably something does come up, you do start to look at these things, but there's one way I've been careful. Something I've been careful of. Um – I was careful of the way I drove my car, I just remembered. I did tell you something about this when a police-man pulled me up and thought I was a new
driver. After thirty years I thought this was a bit much. Um – uh – very careful, possibly too careful over – in auditing, and – um – very careful in the – in the checks I've done to really make sure that these things are reading and so on and to go over them. Careful to try and – try and get all the data that you've given us lately. Um – I feel quite free otherwise on my carefulness.

**LRH:** Very good. All right, I'll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have been careful of? I have a read there. What have you been careful of? There. There. There. There.

**PC:** Um – this was careful not to worry you today – um – about this uh – what you're going to do on TV tonight, and I left – consequently I left it last minute, probably by design on your part, but anyway, that's how it went. That's what I've got there.

**LRH:** Um-mm.

**PC:** I was careful not to bother you earlier on, and – oh, I made and – with that I made all the provisions that I possibly could so that whatever you decided to do, it only meant a little bit of sweat to get it on.

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have been careful of? All right, I have another one here.

**PC:** Well, that is careful not to – um – uh – not to upset people – um – by reason of my job, or go over – go offline as it were.

**LRH:** Mm, mm-hm. All right. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have been careful of? Have you thought of another one there?

**PC:** No, I haven't thought of anything else there.

**LRH:** All right, all right, good. Good. It's a very equivocal read and we'll just skip it. All right. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

**PC:** I've failed to reveal where I'm uh – um – living to my wife and family. Um – I've failed to – well, I've failed to reveal on quite a lot of occasions what I'm really – what I'm really thinking. I've – I do that quite a lot, but it's uh – um – if I disagree with somebody I might not come right out with it and say so, that's – uh – I just don't reveal it. I find this is a very dangerous thing to do, because I find that later on, that I've uh – uh – said something that is wrong anyway and so that it's not a good idea to go and blurt out immediately what you think.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** I think that's it.

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** I think that's the lot.

**LRH:** All right. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, do you have another answer there of any kind?

**PC:** I don't have one ready.

**LRH:** All right. Take up the next one. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been invalidated? Think of one offhand?

**PC:** Uh – I've invalidated Peter's auditing on occasions, to him. Um – I've invalidated myself a lot, but this is – this I think – I can't think of the things now, because I've cleared these pretty well in session with Peter because they've been com-
ing up on these various goals we've been running. So I can't think of anything else right away. Not unless I dig, dig, dig.

**LRH:** All right. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been invalidated? I have a read there.

**PC:** Well I got – I immediately get this – my driving with this policeman when he came and told me that I'd gone around the corner too slowly or something. Um – now that also... I was involved – I was involved in a slight accident going back last Friday, going back to London. Somebody hit me smack in the b... in the rear, and – um – I invalidated myself because when I got out of the car, there's a pathetic guy, he'd smashed his car – the front of his car – like nobody's business. All I've got is a little bit of beading damaged on mine. Good old Jags, they've taken it. But – um – I invalidated myself because when I thought I must have done something wrong for this guy to have hit me in the rear. I mean, the insurance was a cut- and-dried case in my favor. But I thought, well, what did I do here, didn't I give enough warning I was going to pull up or something like that, and so on. But there was an invalidation there. This came up after the other car incident.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been invalidated? All right, did you have an answer?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Very good. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suggested? I think that's one.

**PC:** Well, I'm always suggesting things. I've made lots of suggestions – send you up suggestions, you must get fed up about various things. And they uh – to do with the congress that's coming, to do with this course and so on. Yes, there's lots been suggested. Um – don't think there's any bad suggestions done there, I just think that's the lot.

**LRH:** All right. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suggested? I think there's another read there.

**PC:** Well, you're suggesting now that there's trouble up in that corner, because it's rattling, I think. You seem to be looking at it. Actually it's the pipes cooling off and it's one of the ghosties of this room.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Sorry for that!

**LRH:** Okay. All right. Did you have another one?

**PC:** Um – I didn't have another one, but I'll find one. Um – well, I've suggested – um – uh – various courses of action to students when they've come up with their uh – preclear's cases to me during the day.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Check that again. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suggested? All right, I don't think there was a read there. Did you have an answer? All right. Now, since the last time I audited you, has a mistake been made? Equivocal. Think of an answer?

**PC:** I didn't have one.

**LRH:** All right. All right. Let me check it again. Since the last time I audited you, has a mistake been made? I don't think there's a read there. All right. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been protested?

**PC:** I don't think so. I don't do much protesting, really. Um – no, I don't
LRH: All right, all right. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been protested? Oh, I think that probably was clean. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you've been anxious about? You got an answer?

PC: Uh – anxious for some of the students on this course, at times and their progress. Um – I'm anxious now uh – with the, um – slightly, with the uh – doing these rudiments in front of everybody. Um – I don't get anything else here that I'm really anxious about.

LRH: All right, very good. See if I have a read here. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you've been anxious about? I'm afraid there is a read there.

PC: [laughs] Um ...

LRH: There. There.

PC: Um – yes. This is – um – yes, this was an anxiety that came up to do with the course today, following on the – um – new system of checkouts, and also the new s – new pro... the new – um – timetable. And I was a little bit anxious lest we got off too far uh – from what – went too far and – um – got too much again onto the checksheets as – in various ways, do you see?

LRH: Hm.

PC: I could see this possibility happening today.

LRH: All right. Since the last time I audited you, is there anything you've been anxious about? I don't think there's much, unless you've got an answer straight off.

PC: No, I haven't. No.

LRH: All right, okay. Now, one more. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been decided?

PC: Um – well, yes, I – well, lots of things have been decided, um – what comes immediately to mind – I – um – decided to rearrange the co-audit schedule um – decided to make suggestions to you about the timetable and so on. Um – I don't get anything else beyond – I mean, one can go into such things, "Well, I decided to get up this morning." But I can't remember sort of making that decision. I can sort of recall making the decision to alter the – alter the – um – timetable and so on, and – um – and to despatch you on various things and other people. Um – oh, I decided today to go to the post office to collect some cigarettes that were sent to me from America at long last. Uh – that's about it, I think.

LRH: All right. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been decided? I have a reaction on that.

PC: Well...

LRH: There... There... There.

PC: Um – yes, I think I'm getting on this. It's – um – my father telephoned me on last Saturday morning. I haven't seen him for some while and he was – um – had got a very good excuse for me to go over and see him because he wanted something signed and I decided I didn't want to go over there. Uh – this is an overt, this decision as I see it, and – um – so I just said, "Well, put it in the post and so on, and I'll handle it." Um – which I did. I think that must be the decision. Mm-hm.

LRH: All right, good enough. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been decided? All right, there is another decision.
PC: Yes, I – this comes off on the same thing. It's – um – the – uh – this is the, uh – Norman, my boy – um – he'll be home soon and I was wondering – um – whether to uh – see him – um – whether to sort of arrange to see him, and I decided to make no move in the matter.

LRH: To make no...?

PC: No move...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... in that direction.

LRH: Very good. Okay. Since the last time I audited you, has anything been decided? All right, I don't think there was a read on that.

PC: Good.

LRH: Okay. Now, let's get in the random rudiment.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. [PC and LRH laugh] All right, I'll take it easy on this. [PC laughs] All right, since the last time I audited you, has anything nearly been found out? Probably a read there.

PC: Well, I – I – um – I seem to give myself away all over the place. I don't think anything has been nearly found out. Hm – there's something around. Um – yeah ... um – yes, it's – it was Norman again, he came up – he came up to my office last Saturday morning and – um – uh – he – I wasn't there or – I don't know what time he came. I heard afterwards he'd been up. And – um – he nearly found out I was there and it's – more or less found out what I'd been doing and so on, had he come along. I felt, you know, when I'd heard he'd been up, well, you know, what would have happened? And – um – I think that was what was kicking there.

LRH: All right. Now, what made you believe it was nearly found out? Anybody say or do anything there?

PC: Yeah – um – Marjorie, my wife, wrote to me and said he'd been up, you see, and so on, and that was the thing that made me – that was the moment when I wondered, "Corbli" you know, "what did he..."

LRH: All right.

PC: "... what would have happened then?"

LRH: Okay. Now, let me see this. Since the last time I audited you, has anything nearly been found out? There may or may not be a read there.

PC: Well, I think this is possibly the – um – the rest of the last answer, that...

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: ... sort of came up. I was about – I was looking at it and – um – one doesn't feel too good about this and uh – about the family situation and uh – I suppose had he come up, I felt I might have shone up in a bad light, and that's what was...

LRH: All right.

PC: ...nearly – nearly found out, you see.

LRH: I see, all right. Okay. Let me check that again. Since the last time I audited you, has anything nearly been found out? All right, you had an afterthought there, what was it?

PC: Just I think it's clean.

LRH: All right.

PC: I didn't – um...

LRH: All right.
PC: I didn't have anything else there at all.

LRH: All right. Well, we're going to let that go for now. Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. Now, let's go on – we're going to run a little bit of Havingness here.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Now, I want you to squeeze the cans. Boy! Put your cans up on the table. Give us a can squeeze. Are we even plugged in? It's pretty bad. Give us a – squeeze the cans again. Uh-huh, all right. Now, I've just shot your havingness to ribbons with those.

PC: All right.

LRH: Yeah, well, how did I do that?

PC: Uh – I think this is my uh – um – inherent fear that I get of audiences, comes up.

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: I mean, I'm never comfortable. I mean, you're – uh – always terrific envy of you, you can go and sit, an audience and – or anywhere and just talk away. I mean, I can do – uh - I can talk away if I'm on my little room or to a very small circle. But put me in front and most times I'm lost, and I just – one of these guys who always makes the speech afterwards that one should have made on the occasion when it's much better, you know?

LRH: All right. Let's take a look at that again, squeeze the cans. All right, well that's very good. Now, put your cans down. And our Havingness Process here is "Feel that object," isn't it?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, very good. Feel that cloth.

PC: Right.

LRH: Thank you. Feel that can.

PC: All right.

LRH: Thank you. Feel the top of the microphone. Thank you. Feel that ashtray.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you. And feel that can. Okay, pick up the cans would you? Now, squeeze the cans.

Oh, that seems to be much better. That's going to be improving very nicely. All right, put them down. We'll run some more of this, okay?

PC: All right.

LRH: It's working.

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. Feel your lapel. Thank you. Feel the badge. Thank you. Feel your hair.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you. Feel your necktie. Thank you. Feel that curtain. Thank you. Feel that wall.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you. Feel that cloth. Thank you. Feel that ashtray. Thank you. Feel your tie clip.

PC: All right.

LRH: Thank you. Feel the back of the meter. Thank you. All right, feel the table cover. Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right, squeeze the cans.

Oh, that's getting fine now. We'll run some more of this, you're doing won-
derful. Put the cans down. All right, feel your watch. Thank you. Now with your right hand feel your left hand. Thank you. Now with your left hand feel your right hand. Thank you. With your right hand feel your left hand. Thank you. With your left hand feel your right hand. Thank you. Feel the top button of your jacket. Thank you. Feel the ashtray. Thank you. Feel your right shoulder. Thank you. Feel your left shoulder. Thank you. Feel your right ear. Thank you. Feel your left ear. Thank you. What have you got?

PC: *Nothing.*

LRH: All right. Feel the cloth. Okay. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Oh, that's getting fine, that's fine. That's fine, all right, put them down again. All right, feel the cloth. Thank you. Now feel the desk through the cloth.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Now feel your right knee through your trousers.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel your left knee through your trousers.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the curtain.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the wall underneath the window.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the base of the microphone.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, feel those two cans.

PC: *Mm-hm*

LRH: Thank you. Feel your right index finger fingernail.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, feel your left index finger fingernail.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the back of the E-Meter. All right. Feel your right sleeve. Thank you. Feel your left sleeve. Thank you. Feel your right shirt cuff.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel your left shirt cuff.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the desk through the cloth.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Pick up the cans. Hurray! All right, squeeze the cans. Ah, that's good, that's good. That's fine. All right, let's run a little more of this tone arm action out of that. Are you doing all right?

PC: *Yes, very well.*

LRH: Anything you care to say?

PC: *No, going very well.*

LRH: All right, that's fine. Let's run some TA action out of this.

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: All right, put the cans down. All right. Feel the two cords.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the base of the microphone.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel the microphone cord.
PC: All right.
LRH: Okay. Feel the spread there – the backdrop.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay, feel this end of the table.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: All right, feel this end of the table.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Feel the underside of the cloth.

PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Now, up underneath the cloth, feel the top of the table.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right, very good. Now, through your jacket and shirt, feel your left shoulder.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Through your jacket and shirt, feel your right shoulder.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Feel the end of your nose.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay. Feel your forehead.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Feel your right eyelid.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay. Feel your left eyelid.

PC: Right.
LRH: Okay. Feel the center of your forehead.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay. Feel your chin.

PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Feel the back of your head.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: All right. Feel your tie.

PC: All right.
LRH: Okay. Through the cloth, feel the desk.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Feel that edge top of the E-Meter.

PC: Right.
LRH: All right. Feel this side of the E-Meter.

PC: Yes.
LRH: Okay. Feel this side of the E-Meter.

PC: Yes.
LRH: All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Let's do that again. Squeeze the cans. Well, that's pretty loose. Once more, squeeze the cans. That's increasing your havingness but I'm going to try another process, okay?

PC: Right.
LRH: It's not stabilizing it.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: All right, put the cans down, now we're just going to run "Notice that"

PC: Right.
LRH: And we're only going to run five commands of it.

PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: All right. Notice that fire.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay. Notice the TV screen.

PC: Right.

LRH: Okay. Notice the overhead lamp.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. Notice the backdrop.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Notice the table.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Pick up the cans. Squeeze the cans. Well, that's very interesting but that reduces your havingness.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right, very good. All right, put the cans down. All right. And now we're going to run "Touch that object."

PC: All right.


All right. Squeeze the cans. That's pretty good! That's pretty good. Let's squeeze the cans again. Yeah, that seems to be pretty good. Now, let's go on with that a bit, huh? All right, put the cans down.

All right. Touch the top of your head. Okay. Touch your right eyelid. All right. Touch your left eyelid. Okay. Touch this cloth. Okay. Touch that ashtray. All right. Touch that can. Okay. Touch that can. Okay. Touch that wire. Okay. Touch that wire. All right. Touch the top of the E-Meter. Okay. Touch that badge. Okay. Touch your right ear. Okay. Touch your left ear. Okay. Touch your nose. Okay. Touch your forehead. All right. Touch your chin. All right. Touch your tie. All right. Touch your jacket. All right. Touch the cloth. All right.

Pick up the cans and we'll see if we're – this winning streak is holding. All right. Squeeze the cans. That's the process! All right, that's fine. Put the cans down, we're going to run this one some more. This is a good one.

PC: Good!

LRH: All right. Now, touch that microphone. Okay. Touch the top of the E-Meter. All right. Touch the glass face of that dial. All right. Touch the E-Meter tone arm. Okay. Touch the sensitivity knob. All right. Touch the auxiliary sensitivity control. All right. Touch the Transit-Set-Test. All right. Touch the trim knob. All right. Touch the back. All right. Touch that hook. All right. Touch that hook. All right. Touch that hook. All right. Touch the E-Meter cord – or cords. All right. Touch your tie clasp. All right. Touch the badge on your jacket. Okay. Touch your tie. All right. Touch the microphone. All right. Touch your hair. All right. What have you got there?

PC: I don't know, this seems much easier. I had a little cognition that uh – there seems to be less contact with stuff than "feeling." Feeling is – touching is a briefer thing...

LRH: Mm.

PC: ...briefer contact with what we're doing.

LRH: Right. All right. Touch that ashtray. All right. Touch that can. Okay.
Touch that can. All right. Touch the end of
the table through the cloth. All right. Touch
the other end of the table through the cloth. All right. Touch the back of the
table. All right. Touch this edge of the ta-
ble. All right. Very good. Touch your
chair. Okay. Touch your right shoulder
through your jacket and shirt. All right. Touch your left shoulder through your
jacket and shirt. All right. Touch your
chin. Good. Touch your right cheek. Good. Touch your left cheek. Good. Touch your
right ear. Good. Touch your left ear. All
right. Touch the microphone. All right.
Touch this cloth. All right. Now, how are
you feeling?

PC: Well, very good.

LRH: All right. You're feeling a bit better, aren't you?

PC: Yes, much better!

LRH: All right, pick up the cans
and let's check this process. Yeah, that's
giving you a little more stability of tone
arm. All right, squeeze the cans. All right,
that's fine. All right. One more time,
squeeze the cans. All right, that's fine. All
right. Now, that was the last command of
that process. All right?

PC: What happened, did it...?

LRH: It's fine. It still works.

PC: Good.

LRH: It still works. All right, now how are you doing in general?

PC: Very well.

LRH: All right.

PC: Very well.

LRH: I notice your needle seems
to have calmed down, here. Looks pretty
good. Looks better. You're thinking some-
thing, what are you thinking?

PC: Nothing.

LRH: All right. Now, the only
thing I am going to do now is just end the
body of the session.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right? Okay?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right, have you made
any part of your goals for this session?

PC: Yes, I feel better, certainly.

LRH: All right.

PC: And, uh – done some clean-
ing up of the intervening period. Yes.

LRH: Okay. All right. I did that in
reverse because it's a rudiments and hav-
ingness session, you know?

PC: Right, yes.

LRH: All right, now, is there any-
thing you care to ask or say before I end
this session?

PC: Well, thank you very much.

LRH: All right. All right if I end
this session now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay, here it is. End of ses-
session.

PC: Right.

LRH: All right, session ended for
you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, tell me I'm no
longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing
me.

LRH: Very good. Very good.
Okay. Now, we'll give these good people a break, and we'll excuse you from the auditing room. I'll just talk to them here for a minute, you don't have to go.

All right, let's take a look at this now. The pc's Havingness Process is almost equal between "to feel" and "to touch." But there was less stability in the one than the other – less stability in "to feel" than "to touch" – and you could run either one of them or back and forth. But "to touch" was giving him a better stable gain than "to feel." I think you saw it.

In other words, pc's Havingness Process can look to be perfectly all right and there is a better one. Interesting, eh? All right, the rest of the situation here, as far as rudiments and havingness are concerned, is you saw there at the beginning – if you'll excuse my saying so – because of not liking to be in session, particularly, for a large audience – and I think it's very decent of him to volunteer for these sessions. Let's give him a hand, shall we? All right, thank you.

Now, it's very decent of him to volunteer this way, because he has his own problems with stage fright and that sort of thing, and you noticed that needle. You noticed that needle. Well, that tells you – that tells you that his auditor's been nagging him a little bit on the subject of rudiments or something. There's something going on there, otherwise that needle would have been glacially smooth, or should have been. Or, we'll give his auditor a break and simply say that the needle was simply rough because of the audience.

But you noticed at the end of the session, beyond his wondering about something – which you saw as a tick – tick which was spottable there otherwise the needle was clean and flowing.

Now, exactly what did we do? Were there any great significances came off in this session? No. Was he badgered? Did I nag and nag and nag? Well, actually, the needle there at the beginning of session practically couldn't be read. So who am I to nag him because I can't read his needle? You understand? You get that point of view?

Now, a lot of auditors simply punish the pc because they can't read his needle. Well, look, if you can't read a pc's needle easily he's in a state of mind when you mustn't punish him! So, therefore, take what he says and get out of there. He might even have had a missed withhold, but look, here's the test – he's not mad at me, is he? See, he's not mad at me. So he couldn't have had a missed withhold. You see, that's a better test.

And, there we had some rudiments and we had some Havingness and the pc's happy about it and he didn't get nagged and his needle smoothed out. I want to show you that you don't need an axe to clean up a needle. That's what's important. You think that a needle gets cleaned up because you pick up all the thoughts of the pc, see? That's wrong.

A needle cleans up because the pc has more confidence and more ARC with the auditor. Just put it down to more basically, more ARC. That needle is as clean as the pc feels ARC with his auditor. Now, just think of that for a minute. It isn't cleaned up on the significance of
what he told me. Do you understand? The whole operation was he was more willing to talk to me in spite of you. Now, when you look that over, it cleaned up his needle. Do you see that?

Now, of course this can go too far the other way. A fellow has a very dirty needle and he won't talk to the auditor. Funny part of it is if his ARC eventually comes up, he will then tell the auditor. But he won't. So the first requisite of a rudiments and Havingness session is always, always, always, always, always to build ARC with the pc by reason of auditing.

You can give a pc with a dirty needle and bad havingness and low tone arm and a high tone arm, anything else, you give that pc three nice rudiments and Havingness sessions. At the end of that he ought to have a smooth needle, his tone arm ought to be more stable and more reasonable and the pc's havingness ought to be more stable. Now, that's just a fact, that's all. I mean, it's not what you did, don't you see - it is how you did it.

This raised havingness because it raised ARC. But look, I want to show you something. I was taking all of these answers and his havingness dropped. Why did his havingness drop? Well actually, he was having to answer them to you, too. That's basically why. But I could have gone ahead and raised that up again in spite of all that, don't you see?

The significance of all this is that the Havingness Process which didn't require him to divulge anything to all of you was then more instrumental in smoothing out the needle than the mid ruds were. Hey, how do you account for that? You see, that's no significance, you see? Now do you understand a little bit more about rudiments and Havingness and the why of rudiments and Havingness? It isn't the significance of what you get. It's that the pc feels more confident in being audited by you. And if you're the kind of an auditor who cleans cleans and the pc's got a thought that he wants to tell you and you won't let him tell you, you see, he says -- you say, "Well, is there anything been suppressed?"

And the pc says, "Well – uh..."

And you say, "Oh, well, I didn't get a read here. Thank you."

Well, bang! There goes the whole thing, you see? It requires very adroit and very smooth handling.

But you should be able to take a pc and give him one, two, three sessions, with just rudiments and Havingness, make him feel better, and his ARC will increase. That is not because he feels better; he feels better because his ARC increases to a point where the pc reads very beautifully on the meter and has a very smooth meter, you see? Where his havingness stays up and so forth. You should be able to do that.

You see, it's not what you got done with the pc – not what you got done in terms of significance. Not what big withheld did you get off of him in terms of significance, but just that you gave him a very smooth session. Now, that is the first requisite of all auditing. If you cannot give a pc a rudiments and Havingness session which winds up with a smoother, cleaner needle at the end than at the beginning, then brother, you're not going to be able to do 3M. Do you follow that? You're not going to be, because it's a first requisite of auditing is to be able to audit.
I hate to give these horrible platitudes away with... But the first requisite of auditing is to be able to audit. It is not what you audit, it's if you can audit. Do you see that?

Now, on that firm foundation you can do anything. The pc will go over Niagara Falls in a barrel, as far as the bank is concerned for you, because he's got confidence. He knows you're not going to desert him and you can pull him out. In other words, you have to get a pc to be able to confront his auditor before he can then confront his bank. Do you see that?

So, it is just this basic fundamental idea of auditing. It is just how you audit. It's just the smoothness with which you audit. And it's just that your pc is – feels better at the end of it and he has been able to confront your auditing, he's been able to confront your auditing session, and as soon as he's able to confront your auditing session he feels that, oh, you can throw him into the bank, you see?

The big mistake most people make with raw meat is not to audit raw meat. They really don't audit. They kind of monkey around, you know? They just fool around. They don't really put them into session, they sort of... No, give the guy a full dress parade auditing session, but do something relatively insignificant or nonsignificant. And you'll find out he feels quite good. Why? It's the old effect scale at work, isn't it? The person gives this feather touch and he feels better. The auditor's in there with a battering ram doesn't make the pc feel better. So what are we looking for here? In the rudiments and Havingness or in that type of session, all we want is basic auditing to work to make the pc feel better. That's all. Do you see that?

Well, you should have been able to get out of this session tonight that the pc felt better on the Havingness than he did out of the rudiments and Havingness – I mean, he did out of the rudiments. Why? Well, he had all of you to get his rudiments off to and he didn't know what that – well, level was, because he's been mean to you all week. So as – in short, why, his havingness tended to drop a little bit there. All right, but that wasn't because we missed any reads or anything like that, there's no significance to it.

If I were to give him two, three TV sessions, just rudiments and Havingness, you'd find out that the rudiments would have increased his havingness. Why? Well, because he then would find out that he could get these things off in front of you. You see? In other words, he didn't feel he could get them off – I've tried to make an objective example of this tonight – he didn't feel totally that he could get them off and his havingness fell.

All right. I gave him straight Havingness and he's not having to get anything off with you, he's just responding to my auditing command and I'm not getting him in trouble and his havingness goes up. I even changed his auditing command. I've run three auditing commands on him; three different processes. Doesn't make for any constancy or stability. Still it came up.

And what's all this mean? It means that if your basic auditing is excellent and if you are excellent as a basic auditor, making the pc feel better and smoothing out the behavior of that needle – if you can do that you can run any process in the world. But if you're not a smooth basic auditor, God help your pc when you're trying to run 3M and you've "cleaned up" all – except for three quarters of its items – the first bank, and you've "cleaned up" all – except for half of its items – the second bank, and you've gone fifteen items into the third bank without its goal – oh, you'll do things like this, I know. I know you!
All right, listen. Look, if you're basically a good auditor and if you're smooth, hah! You say, "Hey, wait a minute! I – something's goofed around here somewhere." And you can find the pc's third goal and go back and put the other two GPMs together and he'll be smiling the whole time.

He'll be telling his friends, "Well, my auditor's doing a wonderful job!" You're doing a lousy job, you see? You should be hanged for the job you're doing; leaving half-cleaned-up things behind you and all that sort of thing. But no, your basic auditing was so good you could get away with it, you follow that? You'll find some people, (quote) "do 3M perfectly," and their pcs are in agony, and some people do 3M terribly and their pcs feel fine. What's the variable? Well, the variable is the fact that some auditors can audit very smoothly and make people feel better and others can't. And, the pcs of people who are having a hard time with their basic and fundamental auditing, of course, feel worse than the others. Do you get the difference?

This is an important factor for you, and if you at any one time think that rudiments and Havingness is a practice session, then you will never find out how to clean up a pc's needle.

Now, it's true that you can occasionally find an item that cleans up a needle right now. That's true. But in actual fact your most consistent method of cleaning up a needle and making a pc read on a meter is to raise the pc's ARC. A pc – ARC determines whether or not he reads on the meter. When he – you ever notice, a pc in an ARC break does not read on the meter. All right, we'll take that as a gradient scale of auditing. If a pc doesn't have high ARC with the auditor, he doesn't read on the meter. If he has ARC with the auditor, he reads on the meter. And if he has marvelous ARC with the auditor, he reads marvelously on the meter and that's all you can say about it.

So your basic auditing is where you take off from. If you think you can fly airplanes with no landing fields, well, more power to you! More power to you! But when you run out of gas, don't tell me I didn't tell you. Because you will be in a bad way because you haven't got basic auditing to fall back on. Now, there's what you should be studying when you audit: smooth auditing, basic auditing and so forth.

I'm not setting up this session particularly as a paragon of virtue in the way of auditing, but you noticed the pc was not worried, he wasn't harassed, he felt fine about things, he was willing to talk to me.

Now, that's all I have to say on the subject. But that's a rudiments and Havingness session. I leave it to you whether the session you have just seen bears any resemblance to the rudiments and Havingness sessions which we have seen recently on TV. And frankly, I gave this demonstration tonight because I couldn't stand it anymore! Okay?

So, on a lecture like this we always end with "Go thou and audit badly no more!" Okay? That's it. Thank you very much, that's all of the program for this evening.

Good night.
Good evening. How are you? This is the 21st of March, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay, well, how are you? Oh, that's – that's good. That's good, fine.

Well now, this evening's lecture concerns the 2Gs. The 2Gs. Routine 2Gs. And this lecture is an off-the-cuff lecture about these very valuable processes, but the first announcement on it that has some importance is that goals finding – goals finding – not goal running – goal finding becomes a Routine 2 process.

Now, why is that? Probably startles you a little bit, but the reason for this is that the most therapeutic and the least dangerous auditing that you can give anybody is finding goals. That's very interesting, isn't it? In other words, the most unlimited – up to the point of finding his goal, of course – and least dangerous process is goals finding.

Now, if you do something with the goal, that becomes very horrifying if it's the wrong goal. You – you understand that? That – nothing has changed about that at all. But because things were so terrible and so grim and so awful, and pcs caved in so hard when you ran them on a wrong goal, our tendency up to now has been to safeguard goals, just as an identified subject. Just safeguard goals, you know? And that's been the... an identification. But actually there's nothing, nothing dangerous at all about finding goals. And therefore, it is quite safe to put goals finding in the hands of the most amateur auditor. So he goes over the goal. So he leaves the goal behind him. Well, so the pc will ARC break. But we can even teach him this datum.

Now, that's about the only dangerous thing that will happen in finding goals. It's running goals that is dangerous. You take a wrong goal and run it, and you'll wish you hadn't. Therefore, with this distinct proviso that one must not run the goal he has found, a Routine 2 trained auditor is now authorized to find goals.

You see, something funny here has happened. Something very remarkable has happened. It takes, now, much more time to find the goal in some cases than it does to run the goal. And some goals are very, very hard to find indeed. And a great deal of preliminary work has to go in on the case and so forth, so this puts a tremendous burden on Saint Hill auditors.

Well, their function – a Class IV Auditor – of course is to check out goals and to see that they get run properly, but when you give them the whole burden of finding goals, and they have no assistance in finding goals at all, it puts an immediate ceiling on the amount of service which a district office, a Central Organization or a field auditor can provide.

Now, goals finding can be taught, and you find that it's quite simple. It doesn't mean, however, that it is easy to find a goal. That is to say, "It is easy to find a goal on every pre-
clear." This – this is not the message. It – on some preclears it is very, very far from easy to find a goal.

But let's look at it this way: The actions now entailed in finding a goal are relatively easy. All you have to do is do those actions and you will find somebody's goal.

Now, it may take – it may take hours, but that's unlikely – more likely tens of hours, and in some cases weeks and weeks and weeks, and in some cases months, to find a goal. This is – this is according to our findings on this. But this, of course, makes it very feasible to turn loose HPAs/HCAs onto the action and operation of finding goals and getting them checked out and so forth.

Now, you notice there's been very, very little released on the subject of finding goals here for the last few months. I've actually been working on processes which found goals. And in working on those processes, I've made some interesting discoveries, and some of those discoveries are very oversetting to some of the older things which we believed.

Such as this: The first one I gave you, that you can go on finding goals and trying to find goals and trying to find goals, and you deliver more gain auditing to the pc than in doing anything else. That's interesting, isn't it? You'll do him more good than even a Problems Intensive. And that's rather considerable.

So what – what do we – what do we find ourselves with, here? The necessity to codify goals-finding processes and reduce them to a very precise activity that can be taught, and make those processes relatively simple, and train people in them. Now, they're about to teach some HCS Courses in the United States, and I think about as far as they'll get in teaching these is teaching somebody to find a goal.

Now, this discovery that goals finding is the least damaging and the most therapeutic – short of clearing – auditing that a pc can have, winds us up with this consideration: that we should have a series of designations which are simply goals-finding designations, and include in those everything that we do on the subject of finding goals. And use in them everything that is of use and interest on this subject.

Now, a Problems Intensive has never had a designating number. It was just a twenty-five-hour intensive that they found would be of some use. Now this – this intensive, this Problems Intensive, we have to include in our general, overall scheme of things, so long as it is problems that we are addressing in that. But in actual sober fact there are a few pcs that you will find around that, the moment we address this Problems Intensive wholly and completely to the subject of goals, will plow in, just like that. Why?

In other words, we'll give some pc a Problems Intensive that is addressed in the direction of purposes, you know, and we give it across a span of time. That is to say, we say, "Since 1950, has... how has a purpose been suppressed?" – something like that. Well, unfortunately we're going to find that some banks are messed up. The person possibly might be living his second GPM in his present time existence. In other words, he already – he has sort of suspended efforts on the first GPM and he isn't increasing that, and he's in actual fact sort of living in the second GPM.
In other words, it's been terrifically restimulated, and the more we run Problems Intensives on a period of time having to do with present time, you understand — present time — the more we have to do with present time on this person. You know, "In present time on this problem" or something like that, or "...on this purpose has anything been suppressed?" — why, the better off we'll be at large.

Now, this doesn't mean that it wouldn't operate on many pcs and so forth, but in view of the fact that it, on a few of them, it won't operate, that is enough to sweep away a time consideration with regard to a goals-type Problems Intensive.

You probably don't completely grasp what I'm talking about, and some of you — one of you had a new one going the other day. You give me a hard time, you know, trying to catch up with you, you know? You — you — as the one you got going out there now, I mean not "you," all of you — just — just — just you — there, that's sitting in that chair there. "It read for me, it rocket read for me, but it doesn't rocket read for the Instructor." I — I — that's — that's the sort of thing we get going.

But on this matter of the first GPM and the second GPM, we'd better clarify. We mean the first GPM contacted by the auditor. We cannot number the GPMs from the year 200 trillion years ago — the year zero, in other words — we can't number them forward as the first GPM, the second GPM, the third GPM, so forth, because we don't know how many there are — so therefore we could never number the present time GPM.

Now, the case is entered at the present time GPM, the one he is in now, and that is the first GPM. On some cases, however, the present time GPM is the second GPM — the person has suspended operation on the first GPM — and so we have to have a better definition.

And we'd say the first GPM is the latest GPM on the track, and the second GPM is the next to the latest on the track, and the third GPM is third from the latest on the track, and I don't know what number the GPM is back at the year 200 trillion. On some pcs it will probably be number 52; and on some pcs it'll be number 31, don't you see? So to get a consistent numbering, when we say the first GPM, we mean the one which is nearest or the latest formed — let us say, that way — it's the latest-formed one.

It's the goal of that one that you have to have, but some pcs have skidded their wheels. They've listened to speeches by the Democrats or they've — they've looked over Australian legal procedure or something like that, and they've skidded their wheels. And they've gone back to the second GPM and are living this life in the second GPM. You understand that?

They've met an oppterm, let us say, in the second GPM of sufficient magnitude to cause them to be the terminal of the second GPM. You understand? That's horrifying, isn't it? Well, I'll tell you why it's horrifying. Because if you found the goal that they are living at this moment, it wouldn't run. That makes some pcs more difficult to find goals on than others. You follow that?

Now, what — what is more complicated is that the first GPM may or may not be fully formed. You may have only the first eight items of the first GPM formed, or you may have only the first sixteen items of the first GPM formed — because of course the pc, normally is forming these things progressively as you move on up the track. Well, as we were saying last
night, it is really too bad that we didn't have somebody at various points of the track, and he
took a gun and he said – he said with this gun – he said, "Everyone will now postulate his
sixty-fifth GPM goal" – bang! You see, and we all did it at once. Only it didn't work that way.

Some fellows postulated theirs thousands of years ago, some billions of years ago, and
some trillions of years ago. So this of course makes – this of course makes it an uneven num-
ber.

Now, the only thing missing, if you look in the May – March 13th bulletin 63, and you
look at that line plot, some GPMs aren't formed – let us say, theoretically – they aren't formed
any further forward than "a cabaret singer." That's the top item you find in the thing. So it's
not very reliable finding it, we'd ask him – we'd find this terminal; we'd say, "Well, what is
the goal of a cabaret singer?" or "What is the goal of a hostile audience?" don't you see, and it
doesn't answer up well for the goal. Cabaret singer, they'd say, "To sing; to exhibit myself; to
experience life; to appear on TV, you see; to be Miss America," – something like that. And
pretty soon, why they'd come around on it and they'd – "Ah, well, it – there isn't any goal
there." Don't you see?

If it was formed all the way to the top, of course, because you've got the overt – the
goal as an overt at the top – against "a mute." What goal would be an overt against a mute?
And the pc would tell you almost at once "To scream." And what is the goal of the most
screamish? Naturally, "to scream." But halfway down the bank what have we got? Hooh-
hooh. We've got a cabaret singer versus a hostile audience. That's the pair. Interesting.

What is the goal of a hostile audience? "To hiss, to boo." "Never to scream."

So it's tough to find these things when they're amputated. That's an amputated GPM.
You'll find everything below that, however, is – is quite standard. It's just that it's bobtailed.

Now, that's a complication. Now, the pc let us say, who has one of these bobtailed
GPMs, easily skids. And let us say that – that next goal below there, by the way, is "to be
happy." It was never put in on that March the 13th bulletin – and you get "a miserable sod."
That's the – the terminal, you see, "a miserable sod." And the pc is accustomed to being a
miserable sod, he was that for quite a while, and he didn't complete the thing "to scream."
He'll move on forward there, his next life or something like that.

But just at the present time he's grinding to a slow halt being a miserable sod and "be
part of the Kennedy clan in Ireland," you know, something like this. And there he is, a mis-
erable sod. And he's confronted all the time with happy people – happy people. Oh-ho, brother!
He can't stand it, you know? Just happy people – rrr-rrr-rrr! Maybe he had an aunt or some-
thing who was a happy person, you know, who went around all the time being happy, you
know, with exclamation points, you see. You couldn't hear yourself think in the house, you
know? She, of course, his – his aunt would just be mad at everybody who wasn't happy, you
see.

And so here you've got this oppterms, "happy people," and you've got the terminal, "a
miserable sod," and you go listing terminals – and you've done some 2-12 on this character or
something, you see – you get this goal "to be happy." Well, it ticks and it clicks, and it – zzzt,
goes out. And you spend thirty-six hours prechecking it, and it doesn't shape up.
And finally somebody sees it rocket read a couple of times, and they say, "Well, let's list it. Let's list it." So you start listing the thing with a heavy grind, and you – it finally delivers up – finally delivers up "happy people." And the rocket read on the goal was about three-eighths of an inch. By the time you get to "happy people," well, it'll be about a quarter of an inch. And you get "a miserable sod," and it's going to be about an eighth of an inch, and then you get your next item; and – and so on, and the pc has got somatics and so forth.

Funny part of it is, it almost runs, but you've just got trouble, trouble, trouble. What'd you do? By accident you have picked up the second GPM. You haven't picked up the first GPM.

By the way, the goals that go out hard – the goals that go out hard – are very often goals of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth GPM, you see.

But you start – you're trying to run this second GPM. Well, my golly, there's all those terminals in the first GPM above it, don't you see? The second GPM with one of these bobtailed first GPMs will almost run. But you've got bypassed items. As a matter of fact, you haven't just got bypassed items, you've got a bypassed GPM. And life can look pretty grim to the pc. But the goal is not behaving well.

One of the things that this goal has to do is fire better. If properly handled and not overlisted, not overlisted – you get too long a source list, and you get all the G... all the items, all the RIs in the bank are on the goal oppose list, you know. You could practically go back down the thing and find every RR item that gave a dirty read. Drill the thing, you get it to fire nicely, and so forth, it'll be... you could almost dissemble a whole GPM off one of these overlists, you know? And bypassed items like mad. Sometimes there'll be as many as two and three items, additional on one of these item oppose lists which are overlisted.

The gaiety with which some auditors run through flat spots and get more RRs and all this sort of thing, the way they fool around, of course they get bypassed items. Well, getting a lot of bypassed items will upset a pc, but nothing will upset a pc more than missing a whole GPM.

Well, this makes the finding of goals difficult on some pcs. The average pc that you run into – he'll be in his first GPM and you list the goals one way or another, and you find his goal, bang – and it rocket reads a little bit occasionally, and then you list it and it gets rocket reading items and it's all better. And how you go on down the bank and the rocket read now is a half an inch and the rocket read is an inch and a quarter, and the rocket read is two inches. See, the more items you find, the more it rocket reads. And then the goal starts to fire with an R/S and an RR alternately. You know, you call it, bang-bang-bang, and "to scream," RR; "to scream," R/S; "to scream," RR. And next thing you know, why this thing is firing early and late. It's "to scream" ... pssww! And "to..." – pssww! It doesn't fire on time. It's in a messed-up bank.

See, I mean the bank is unable to support that charge any more, and then the goal goes to a tick and you keep running it and you get on out the bottom of the bank and you're away. That's the way a goal should behave as it goes on down the line. It's all given in that March 13th bulletin.
But some pc, you get ahold of him, you get this goal, you see, "to be happy." It rocket reads. You precheck it, it rocket reads, it's okay. It does all right. It checks out. Pc is kind of unhappy about it, but it checks out. And you get the first item and you get the second item and you get the third item, and by that time the goal read is almost microscopic. And you get the fourth item, you get the fifth item, you get the sixth item – you can't detect anything on the list. Everything is disappearing. Pc's RR is going off, and so forth. It's a mess.

And so you slug away; you've got headaches, you know. Eventually you get smart and decide that you're going to find another goal, and you do, and you find something that practically explodes in your face, see. And it just runs like mad. And you find a few items, they all rocket read and it all comes off and the goal does a blowdown and so forth; you've gotten rid of your first GPM.

But that a pc can be dramatizing a terminal or oppterm of the second GPM, and actually have a first GPM where the goal is to be found, adds randomness. What kind of randomness? It means you try to precheck his present time, and you're prechecking the second GPM. I think – think that's quite fascinating, don't you? All of present time is connected with the second GPM. At least that appears to me to be the way some of these banks may lie.

So you try to do a Prepcheck, you try to do a Problems Intensive, you try to do auditing on this character – and he's always ARC broke. Why? Because you're in the middle of the second GPM. That's life. Life to him is the second GPM. Well, he was busy forming the first GPM and he was going on all right, but because the second one is so handy he dropped back into the second one's goal. He said... his mama, for instance, told him he had to be good, and so forth, and the second GPM's goal is "to be good." In other words, he gets dropped back.

Well, you try to do a Problems Intensive on this person, from a date, you'll get away with it as long as it's problems. But the second it becomes purposes, you're in trouble. You're in bad trouble. Because you say, "Since 1950, how has a purpose been suppressed?" And it darn near tears the pc's head off. Why? Because since 1950 they've been living in the purpose of the second GPM and that is an intolerable area. It's just as though he were trying to run the first GPM while the p... or trying to run the pc through the third GPM, you see, while you had the second GPM intact. Oh man, it – it's just blahh!

So what's this mean? Well, in the first place – in the first place, it means that goals finding is very difficult on some pcs. And this isn't any majority of pcs. And it means that a pc you're having trouble – an awful lot of trouble finding the goal on by standard methods, has got the – a couple of GPMs mixed up and you're having trouble with him that way. It also means that you have to be terribly permissive the way you run any kind of an intensive. And a goals intensive would have to be run without regard to a time span.

So we get what is designated right now as 2GX1. And that is a Goals Intensive by Prepcheck. And that is very, very, very, very permissive.

Now, eventually a bunch of reworked buttons will be put out, but the... you can use those eighteen buttons. You have to have "blunted," "thwarted," "perverted" in there as buttons when you're handling purposes.
The way you do this is you just sit the pc down in a chair whether he's connected to the E-Meter or not, and you give him a Purpose Intensive there. That's the Goals Intensive by Prepcheck – 2GX1.

How do you do it? Now listen to me. Now listen to me. The commands of this are very dangerous – and they mustn't be changed around. You change them around and you're going to wind that pc around a – the nearest telegraph pole. If you were to say, "What purpose have you suppressed?" you're going to run up stacks and stacks and stacks of missed withholds because he won't tell you how he suppressed it. And that'll all amount to missed withholds and your pc practically goes rigid, turns into board, and he'll eventually not even be able to talk. Why? Because you're running five, six, eight, twelve missed withholds every command that you give him.

So it's very important to follow this command. It's very tricky the way it's been worked out. You've got to get the overt against the purpose, but it is not necessary to get the purpose. You understand? You're not interested in what the purpose in the answer is – you are interested in the overt. You have to stay interested in the overt. Otherwise – otherwise, the pc is going to have the overt from you as a missed withhold. That's one important fact. And the next important fact I've already given you, is it mustn't be run against a time span. There must be no present-time time span. Why? Pc might be in the second GPM. You don't know.

So, give him a very, very permissive type. That doesn't mean that he doesn't have to answer the questions. But give him a very permissive type of command. See, the wording of the thing's got to be very permissive. It's got to get the overt. It doesn't have to get the purpose.

All right. The command, then, is precisely this command: It's not "since" anything, it is simply "How has a purpose been (mid rud button)" by permissive Repetitive Prepcheck. Keep driving him on. This thing is going to take a long time. You get the idea? You're not going to clean up this first button on Suppress – well, under three hours, or something like that. It's going to take time.

And you're actually looking at about a twenty-five-hour intensive. And you just take all of those mid rud buttons, which of course in 2GX1 will be shifted around to fit the idea of purpose. Most of the old ones are left in, and these new goals things are added. And you just run this as a Prepcheck. It's just, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" see, and then, "How has a purpose been invalidated?" And, "How have you been careful of a purpose?" See, it all must be "How – how," not ever "What" – never. Never, never, never, never, "What" – it's catastrophic.

Now, supervised – supervised to the degree that they flatten these questions, and that the auditor stays pretty muzzled, and that that auditing command never, never, never varies over to a "What" – "What purpose" you see – but must stay on "How a purpose ______?" You've got just about the finest co-audit process you ever wanted to look at. And that is a natural for co-audits. Pc finally runs down and doesn't have any more, and so forth – well, let him go on to the next button. You see, it can be run actually meterless, if you're running that kind of a co-audit.
Now, that's going to show you up some – some interesting views. In actual fact, the person whose goal is in an area he has now retreated from, temporarily, will actually be able to find enough in present time that is an harmonic on the first GPM to be able to run it. But if you force it with the present time or an "In this lifetime" or "Since 1950," or anything of that character – if you enforce this, and force him to answer that auditing command as though it is with an ax – this lifetime – you're making him run the wrong goal. Interesting, isn't it? On some cases you'll actually run the wrong goal.

It's taken quite a bit of threading around and that sort of thing to – to get these data, and they're quite valuable.

But then on the surface of it, Routine 2GX1 is just about the simplest idiot's delight that you ever had anything to do with. That's just that – there it is. It is just, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" for about three hours, you see. And then "How has a purpose been invalidated?" "How has a purpose been invalidated?" you see, and on and on and on.

And you'll find the pc cycles, and you want to cycle him back up to present time; you use the cyclic rules in this thing, you know. I mean a lot of the old auditing rules come in. But actually you can't go very wrong with the thing, providing you don't say, "In present time." Got it?

Well, that's 2GX1. That's conditional numbering, too, by the way. But probably hold true. Now, you say, well what happens to the Problems Intensive? Well, we've had a Problems Intensive for quite a while and hasn't had a number, and it is not vital that you run a Problems Intensive to find the goal. You'll find Problems Intensives on a great many people will locate the goal, but on some people, because you're using present time, you're not going to find the goal, and it's not going to unburden. It'll do them a lot of good, but it's not going to find any goal.

So therefore, the old twenty-five-hour Problems Intensive does not belong in the 2G series. What's the G stand for? "Goals," of course.

All right. Now, that sets the case up, loosens them up so they can get an idea of goals. And that basically is the most elementary process I know to set a case up to find goals. Now, that's still got an X on it, and that'll be taken off in due course, or the process will be shifted or adjusted to account for any other variables. But as far as I can see at this present moment, early tests – not on that process but on all the processes that didn't work – demonstrate that that's about the only one that will.

Now, our next – our next item here on these is what for years has simply been listing and finding goals. You've all been doing that. You know all about it. But that becomes 2G2. There doesn't have to be any X connected with it because we know it of old. Well, what does it consist of? You write a list of goals – you take a list of goals off the pc – and you null the list, and you put in the big mid ruds on the goals which remain ticking on the list. That's the most elementary form of it. There is a more elementary form, but it very often misses the
goal. So we're not going to say that it is the most elementary form. It isn't the most elementary form.

It's simply the oldest. And that is to say we write a list of goals – the oldest form was we took a short list of goals, read them over, found out which one dived the most on the meter and called that the pc's goal. It's not very accurate.

The next one is we made a long list of goals and we eliminated, and that one – with no Tiger Drill; we didn't have it then – and that one which still ticked we called the pc's goal. That was very susceptible to wrong goals. An awful lot of right goals were found that way, but some wrong ones were found that way, too.

Now, that old elementary system – that old elementary system is not the best goals system. Nor is it the most elementary or fundamental. The most fundamental system on finding goals is simply to list some goals on the pc – null those goals by elimination, calling each goal three times in case the pc's attention is wandering; take those that still tick – because you see, the odd part of it is, is even though the goal has been invalidated and that sort of thing the invalidations add up to a read by elimination; and do the whole lot, get two, three, four, five, something like this, that have a DR on them or a tick left on them that didn't go out by elimination; and just put in the big mid ruds on each one of those.

There's a shorter method than that, which is just to put in the left-hand buttons on each one, which is Suppress, Careful of, and Fail to reveal. But on an operation of this character you'd better put in the big mid ruds, because you may have a pc who's protesting or deciding or that sort of thing, and it's safest to put in the big mid ruds.

So that is, in actual fact, the most elementary goals finding method. Now, when we list the goals if we list them on a meter, we don't change the process. It is simply that we can mark in an RR if we see it or an R/S if we see it. And that helps the auditor because he's not going to take a goal that he saw an RR on and give it a light dust-off, don't you see? So that is simply a security. You need a meter, but the listing on the meter is not absolutely essential to 2G2. Not absolutely essential, but a neat 2G2 would list it on the meter, and you would see whether or not these goals RRed or R/Sed as you wrote the things down. You got that? And when it's being done by an auditor, that – that would be – that would be fine.

In actual fact, the reason why we say it isn't absolutely essential that we do that is you're going to find a co-audit practice occasionally will be to list somebody's goals, and even though we give the person a meter to list them on, the designations which they give are not necessarily accurate. And therefore it doesn't matter what these things are designated, you still do the same things. See, whether it's listed on the meter or not listed on the meter, you do the same action. Just listing it on the meter helps you out. And that action consists of first, to list the goals from the pc. Some pcs have goals lists they've already done and that sort of thing, well, that can be included, but shouldn't at this stage of the game be encouraged. That's not 2G2.

And you take some goals; you list them, then when you've got this list in a section or a full list or with tone arm action or without tone arm action – we don't care anything about the tone arm action – we don't care how many goals we list, we don't care if we list a hundred goals, we don't care if we list a thousand goals; we don't care anything about that at all. But
the suggestion is to keep it down – keep it down to a couple of pages. Just keep it down to a couple of pages. In other words, we do a couple of pages of goals, we null those two pages of goals, we put in the big mid ruds on those that still DRed or ticked. And then we take another couple of pages of goals, and then we null that couple of pages of goals and so forth, and put in the big mid ruds.

In other words, this is based on a finding. Over the years we have found that, as one of you is doing to a pc at the present time, about the cruelest thing you could do to the pc is to list goals and never null them. That's a very cruel thing. And if you've got a long cumbersome list, the auditor's tendency is not to null it because it is just too long and hard.

Now, in view of the fact that in most pcs the goal occurs in the first 150 goals listed, you can see there that – that's a fact; they're the first 150 listed. That if you list those things in little sections – you know, just a couple of pages, front and back of the page, you know, that sort of thing, and then null them, and so on – you're never going to get into a big high-tension situation with the pc. Pcs get very anxious. They put their goal on the list and you're nulling this 500 goals list, don't you see. You say, what happened to the 850 goals list? Well, what happened to yesterday, see? We're talking now about 2G2. And it has nothing to do with what we were doing.

So you list this list; you null this list; you put in the big mid ruds on what you've got left. You watch – bang, you'll eventually see some fireworks on the thing. Well, most of your goals are going to be found that way. Just as elementary as that. Just no more – no more upset than that.

When you've got 2G2 up to a thousand goals and you haven't got the pc's goal, let me tell you something: That pc is in the second or third GPM in present time and present time has nothing to do with the first GPM. You see this? So this pc is dislocated as far as the bank is concerned, and the goal isn't readily available. This is your first conclusion.

Now, what do you do? Well, you could keep this up – I don't really see any reason to keep it up beyond about a thousand goals because I've seen those pcs who have gone above a thousand goals still haven't put their goal on the list. I haven't seen them put their goal on the list till up to about three thousand goals. Five thous... I know one pc who had about five thousand goals and didn't get his goal on the list. I finally had to dig it up out of a – so on, by other means.

But there – there's a limit then to 2G2. If you easily find the pc's goal by this method why do anything else? If you don't easily find the pc's goal by this method, and the auditor actually knew when the meter read and when it didn't and actually could null a list somewhat, there isn't really any point in continuing 2G2. Frankly, to continue it beyond five hundred, you start wasting time.

But let's put it on as an absolute limit of a thousand. And let's put it on, if you're going to do 2G2, at an absolute minimum – absolute, just minimum, minimum of two hundred. Because the average is that, well, it's some percentage of pcs – I don't know, some guess – half the pcs you run into have their first goal in the first 150 goals they give you. And that actually is the totality of this action. That's the totality of it.
Now, administration enters in here. You're going to turn goals-finding loose, for God's sakes preserve the lists. Impress people with the necessity of writing down the full goal, as given by the pre-c. I ran into some old South African ACC goals lists. Goals lists? That was pretty good. I mean, it was the first ones taken down there. This is what taught me. They took a piece of paper, see – they took this piece of paper – and they... let's take a goal, "to be a railroad foreman," see, and it says, "RR 4." And that's written this way, see. And then over here it's "to be a kchunh!" And then over here, it's "like run like anything." And over here someplace is "queen." To be a queen? To shoot a queen? What? See?

No, get them to take the full goals down in an orderly column, with the pc's name and the date of the list on the top, and null it with the standard method of nulling. X's and slants in other words – R/S, RR, and so forth. And preserve that list. It's valuable.

That's the main danger in goals finding is not that some student auditor or HPA or somebody like that is going to goof and not find the fellow's goal. We don't – couldn't care less. So he goes over the top of the fellow's goal. The trouble – the trouble that comes up ...

We've had – we've had goals list after goals list that somebody's gone back and nulled the goals list and they found the goal in the first seventy-five goals. You know, somebody had just ridden right over the top of it, reading like mad.

No, the trouble comes when they take that piece of paper and don't put it in a folder, and when they wrote it down in the first place didn't write the full goal down and didn't date it and didn't put the pc's name on it, and didn't put it in the folder. And when they didn't do that they put the pc in trouble. That's what made the trouble.

The only way you can get a pc in trouble, then, with 2G2 – the only way you can get him into trouble – is to fail to write down the full goal as given by the pc, put the pc's name and date on the thing, and to put it in a folder, and then to keep the folder and don't lose it. That's the main – the main thing that has to be taught on that along with everything else you teach. Don't fool with that, because a pc is actually put in danger by this.

The odd part of it is, is sometimes it's such a failure to them not to have their goals found that they – they never put it on a list again. For instance, I've looked over I don't know how many thousands of goals; and you know, I never put my first goal down on a list the second time. It wasn't until the auditor was one day nulling or listing – listing some goals, and listed another goal, and I'd spotted a spot where I'd thought of the first goal, and all of a sudden gave the first goal, and I think the thing read a dial-wide rocket read. I – I said, "That's – that's – that's my goal, you know. That's – that... Wait! Whoa, whoa, whoa! That's my goal, see?" It had already been checked out and hadn't fired, about – I don't know, three, four, five times. Been on a – it had been on a list for over a year. It's within I think the first 130 goals or something like that. It's one of the very, very early goals. I've forgotten what number it is; maybe it's number 98 or something like that.

Now, all during that year I'd – just had never put it on another list. I put everything else on lists, but not that one. So those early lists are quite important, and they must be kept, and you must impress on anybody who does this that the list must be accurate, must be dated, must have the pc's name on it, and must be kept and made available to future auditors. That pc must know that that is a valuable piece of paper. He won't think it is, but he's got to have it
that way. He's got to realize that it is available and the auditor must, must realize that it is very valuable. That's 2G2.

All right. Now, 2G3 consists of taking any and all items that have ever been found on the pc – I just described it to you in the last lecture I gave you – any and all items ever found on a pc by any means or any method of any kind, and you list goals on them, "What might be the goal of a" – just as though they were all oppters. You know, the oppters – the early oppters have the pc's goal. And then, if you don't find it then, why then you list every item of any kind ever found on the pc, and anybody used it for anything whatsoever, you list it with "What goal would be an overt against it?" and "What goal would be an overt against a...", you know. And you – you list every item that way. Why? You list terms and oppters.

In other words, 2G3 does not differentiate between a term and oppterms. It only differentiates between two actions: Listing any item ever found on the pc – "What goal might be the goal of" or "What might be the goal of a" whatever the item is. And then if the goal is not found in that way, then we treat the whole thing as an oppterms, the way we used to treat oppters. That is, "What goal would be an overt against" every item on the list. Actually, that's best used for terminals. As you look at that March 13th line plot you'll find out why.

So anyway, this operation is a very easy operation. And once more, about the only crime you can commit with it is not to null the pc's goals once listed. So you actually don't write down the goals of fifteen items, and then null them all. You don't do that – you don't do that. You – you write down the "What might the goal of a catfish be?" You write and list until the question is clean, and usually that is never more than fifty, sixty goals, something like that, at the absolute outside. Then you take that fifty or sixty goals as a unit and you don't go on to something else now – you take that one and you null it, and you put the big mid ruds against the ones that are still left. And you're going to get some commotion there and that will be it.

All right. You go on and on and on that way. And eventually if you don't find the pc's goals using all these things ever found and so forth – if you don't find the pc's goal, by saying "What might the goal be?" you see – you say, "What goal would be an overt against" and you list them all that way. And you eventually pick up the person's goal. But take one item at a time, and list it as though that's all you're ever going to do, and finish up that cycle of action and so forth.

It's a very cruel thing to list goals on a pc and then not null them. This is a very bad thing. I know, because my pc has done a lot of long lists, wrote in her own time and so forth, and I've never nulled these things. She, I mean, every once in a while is bringing these things up, and that sort of thing.

Now, you do that piece by piece, then. It's all little piecework. And any moment you're liable to turn up – well, you list from the earliest item forward. Earliest item. Why? Well, it's much more likely to have been the top item – the top oppterms of the GPM if it was found on the pc a long time ago.

So 2G3 takes care of old-time people who have had a lot of things found on them, so therefore is a somewhat specialized process. Well, where does that put us with raw meat that has no items of any kind whatsoever? Well, it puts us into 2G4. And 2G4 is the new name of
Routine 2-12. Only it's a different process than Routine 2-12, because it does not require that you find any item on it and oppose it. Now, it's merely the first stages of 2-12, but actually it's also 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, I don't mean to leave you in a confusion, because it's one of these – one of these elementary actions – elementary action indeed. You make a list, use the 3GA titles. For the same reasons I gave you earlier in the lecture, you do not use present time or present lifetime or any such questions, because you're dealing with goals and the pc might be elsewhere than in the first GPM.

So here we have a situation where we make a list. Well, those are the old 3GA Lists. There's no particular reason I should give you a whole bunch of lists on this. But I'll give you an idea of the type of list these things are. "Who does everybody more or less dislike?" or "Who or what does everybody more or less dislike?" And you'll find the pc will give you the top oppterm. You see, it's simple, huh?

Well, you lo... you run a list, and you hope that the auditor will see it RR or R/S or do something active, and find out that that is the item. But in actual fact, in actual fact – I correct something here. I said it's the – it's – it's not the full of 2-12 in this 2G4 – it's only the vague shadowings because there's more of it as you go up in higher numbers. This one – this one is very simple – very simple. You have the guy, "Who or what does most everybody dislike?" or "detest?" or something of this sort, and you hope he sees some of these things R/S. And he gives you a long list of these things, and you hope that the R/S is more or less accurate. So we get in agreement with the pc. We don't depend upon the auditor's meter read, see. We don't depend on his nulling the list, we don't depend on him finding items. We have him get in cahoots with the pc and have the pc agree that certain one of these things certainly are... do match up to the situation. In other words, we let the pc examine the list. They go over it to-gether.

And he'll usually pick the rock slamming items, but that's beside the point. Do you know how many items we can pick off that list? Well, we can use five, we can use six items off that one list. Then, of course, we had our old headings "Who or what have you detested?" and "Who would you rather not associate with?" and also "Who do people not associate with?" you see, "Who or what do people not associate with?" You've got various types of 3GA headings. But none of these are present life, see. You don't say, "In this lifetime," or "In present time" or anything like that, because you might run into this scrambled GPM phenomena.

And how do you use those? How do you use those? I know it horrifies you. You say you take five items off this list and list goals against each one of the five items. Yes. You don't find the item for the list. You got the idea? That's left to 2G5.

Now, if somebody's really sailing, he notices there's some R/Ses on this thing, he can make a four-way package if he hasn't found the goal yet. He can actually find the item on this, oppose it, oppose it, and oppose it – and get a four-way package, and you have 2-12 in full. Total use of 2-12. That's what it's relegated to.
Now, because its numbers have been popularized so, we'll keep on calling it that. We'll keep on calling it 2-12, but remember that in goals finding, and when it is used for goals finding, it is totally dedicated just to finding some items on which you can list goals.

And you see now, that's a built-up series of added complications. You see that? The actual action of listing some goals and then nulling the goals and putting in the big mid rud, you see – that was 2G2. The actual action of taking a hatful of items and listing goals against those, and doing 2G2 on them, see? And then the actual action of getting a list and picking some things off of this list to list goals against, you see, is actually 2, 3 and 4. And now taking that and building a four-way package with it is 2G5. You got it? So actually it's the same item with the added complication of an additional number, the added complication of additional number, the added complication of additional number, and of course you get the tougher and tougher case. You see that?

So if you don't find the goal by this method, then you find the goal by the next method. And if you don't find the goal by the next method you find the next method. Well, how low down does this start? It starts with 2G1. And you'll find out a certain number of pcs after you have given them 2G1, all of a sudden look at you fixedly, their eyes widen, and they say, "My goal is:"

So that, of course, is the simplest method of goals finding. You didn't – you didn't do anything. And there it rocket reads and everything, and it – and you're all set. So that's – of course that is the most fundamental method of goals finding.

Of course, 2G1 can be so simple that you say, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "Well, with you sitting there not listening to me when I tell you that my goal is 'to catch catfish'," it rocket reads, and you've got the pc's goal.

I can see some auditor – he's all set here for the next hundred hours, he's studied, you see, he's got this all taped, beautiful shape, and he says, "All right. Now we're going to start this intensive. Now, how has a goal been suppressed?"

"By your refusing to listen to me that my goal is 'to catch catfish'" – pssww!

And "To what?"

Terrible, isn't it? But also, look at the plight of the other fellow who has gone up – clear up to 2G5, and he still doesn't have the pc's goal, and he is getting old and bowed, and it looks like it's a professional activity.

Well, by that time – by that time, let us hope, and let him hope, that I have by that time invented 2G6. That's the only answer I can give you! Anyway, you see, those are the old goals finding methods all brought forward – all brought forward from the simplest to the late.

Now, all of these have worked. And there are certain sins that accumulate to each one, and that is failure to administer, and the other is failure to null what you've listed. That's always cruel.

Now, this can be taught and this can be done. And as a matter of fact you're looking at a preview of the schedule you will be on next week, because we intend, now, by our plot-out and so forth, to find the goal of the person in the X Unit. And not let them out of the X Unit.
until he does have his goal, and to bung him over into the Y Unit at the earliest, after his goal has been found.

So this is – becomes very important. You're going to get a rearrangement of – of schedule based against the reality of exactly what you're doing. It doesn't change or discredit any of your checksheets, and it doesn't cost you any lost ground. The... "In these lectures, is there anything you have been anxious about?"

Anyway – anyway, all – all – all good fun aside, there – there are the 2Gs, and we'll be doing those things in the X Unit. And in the Y Unit you'll be studying your – your 3M and getting ready to run it. You should realize that it is one thing to find the goal, it is quite something else to run one. And running a goal has become a hazardous profession. It's not – it's not that it is difficult to do; it's that auditors list so enthusiastically, they slide over the top of RIs and they bypass items on their lists, and they do various things like this; and it makes it more complicated than it should be. It is really very mechanical. It is the auditor making it complicated that is giving us trouble at the present time, and we can get around that, too.

But the point – the point is here that we mean to find the person's goal in the X Unit, and run it in the Z Unit. And it immediately and directly breaks down the course into Routine 2 and Routine 3, doesn't it? Well, you say, "Well, what happened to V Unit?" Oh, well – well – well, that's expiring. That's expiring as of Monday morning. It will be a thing of the past because too many people have been relaxing I am told, and flunking themselves down to the V Unit so they get some auditing. The V Unit ran itself up an enviable record of finding goals, and so forth -- and that's supposed to be done in the X Unit now, so there we are.

A student first coming in, is not going to be given even a grace period now, he's just going to go straight onto rudiments and Havingness. As soon as he's got his rudiments and Havingness – that's rudiments, Havingness and See Checking. Soon as he's got this down so he looks good, he moves straight and directly up to the X Unit – we start working with his goals, he finishes up his checksheet. As soon as he's got his goal and his checksheets are finished, he goes into the Y Unit, he studies in the Y Unit – nothing but study in the Y Unit – gets all ready to go into the Z Unit and run goals.

That's the way I'm streamlining the situation. And it'll work out a lot better for you.

We're going for blood on this. We want goals, we want Clears, and there's no time to goof around on it. So I'm arranging the schedule just to that degree to make sure that it moves on forward.

Now, you see, you don't think you ever cause anything, you see, and I've had my ear to the grindstone – I think it was my ear – and I heard some of you complaining about lack of checkouts or complaining about this and complaining about that, and you complained yourself into a brand-new schedule, so it's all your fault. It's all your fault, and I haven't anything to do with it. But I'm running a goal at the present moment, my fifth – and the goal is "to be responsible," so you will – you'll forgive me – you'll forgive me if I'm slightly aberrated on the subject at this particular moment. It's all your fault. Okay?

All right. Well, that's all we have, and I hope you can put this – this Routine 2 information to very good effect, and I hope where you're going that you can teach HPAs and
HCAs how to find these things, and you'll notice that they stack right up with each additional step following in behind the next so there's no waste of motion on it. Finding goals has been researched over a period now of two or three years, and I think you'll find it's pretty good.

All right. Well, thank you very much. Thank you very much, and good night.
CASE REPAIR

A lecture given on 26 March 1963

How are you doing? How are you doing?

*Audience: Fine.*

That's much better. That's much better. Got to get a little live response around here someplace.

Now, the reason this lecture is late today has nothing to do with me, so don't blame me. As you know, I'm running the goal "to be responsible," and so I'm not responsible for very much here, don't you see? And you're – you're all responsible. So why did you make the lecture late?

I have a very, very good announcement to make. The 26th of March AD 13, the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course is on this date entering the – or has completed the hundred – hundredth week of the course. This is the hundredth week of the course. You wouldn't think we could last that long, huh? I mean, the Instructors, and myself and so forth. That shows that we have tremendous survival capacity, tremendous survival capacity.

Now, during that time there have been 192 students enrolled, 130 students have been and gone, and there are 62 students on course at present. Interesting, huh? Now, this is a nice anniversary, and in this anniversary I expect to make some Clears in order to celebrate it. And that means you! Hear? You got that? All right. Get Clear this week. Okay. All right.

Now, we're doing pretty much okay. And it's a fitting note to begin this lecture, a fitting note, to give you a lecture on case repair. Case repair.

Now, worry is the occupational hazard of the auditor doing Routine 2 and Routine 3. It's so much so that there is even a worry rule. And to paraphrase the rule, if the pc is doing okay, don't worry, and if the pc isn't doing okay, worry. In other words, don't worry – to give you corollaries – don't worry yourself and the pc and start worrying about things and diving around on things unless there's some reason to do so. If the pc looks bad and feels bad and so forth, well, that's the time to start worrying. And the other extreme is don't neglect to straighten up a pc who isn't doing all right. Don't just keep plowing madly on, finding more items, hoping for the best, pc ARC broke, flu, upset in general, and all this sort of thing. Don't just keep going on and on and on doing new things, new things, new things. No, get back, take a look at it, and find out what's wrong, because there's always something very specific that is wrong. The worry rules.

You'd be amazed – you'd be amazed how upset some auditors can get. How marvelously upset they can get over a pc who's doing just fine. And you'll be equally amazed at the complete wooden-Indian, God-help-us-all, press-on, press-on, press-on of some auditors whose pc is all curled up in a ball, has turned completely black and the lists aren't running and
they're not even in the same goal anymore, and so on, and they aren't even able to get the pc on the E-Meter because he can't curl his hands up. And here this auditor is, trying to find new, new items and so on and never repair anything. *Thayh!* It's quite interesting.

I want to interject a comment there, because I may forget it when I give you another lecture on goals. Is – Mary Sue made this, and I'd like to interject it. There are two other types of auditors. They're the type of auditors on the routine 2Gs. There's the type of auditor who sets down the pc's goal given him. You see, the pc said, "Oh, I've got a goal, I've got a goal, I've got a goal," and so forth, and the auditor just sits it – puts it down over here and moves it aside and never does anything else with it. He doesn't know why he's doing 2G. And there's the other auditor who never does 2G1, but only sits there and does 2G2. You get the idea? The pc keeps giving him goals, so he keeps doing 2G2, and he gives goals, 2G2, and so forth, and there it is. Marvelous, isn't it? Never does any 2G1.

Well, there's a happy medium. There's a happy medium. When the pc gives you a rocket reading goal you check it out, and when the pc gives you goals and so forth, why, just put them down. And if the pc gets too trying on the subject, he's just nothing but trying to give you goals, trying to give you goals, and there doesn't happen to be anything rocket reading there or anything, and you haven't completed your 2G1, why, just say, "Well, you know, in the first half hour of this session, why, I'm going to check out the goals that you have given me, and in the remainder of the session we're going to do just 2G1. If you think of a goal, of course, why, we can put it down, but it won't be checked out."

In other words, there's ways to handle this situation. Mary Sue authored that observation. It was a direct observation, not a cynical comment. The other – the other thing here is that an auditor very often doesn't quite know why he is doing 2G1. And goes through all the eighteen buttons twice in two hours of auditing and he's done 2G1. That's pretty marvelous, you know?

I don't think I could get the Suppress button flat on a preclear in under one session. That's kind of a different look.

Well, of course, that's a prejudiced look. It's prejudiced and so forth. My pcs are usually in-session. Well, anyhow... That's a – that's a snide comment, isn't it? No, it's just when – when you can't get the pc to answer the question, the pc isn't giving you anything factual and so forth and giving you a big brush-off on 2G1 and that sort of thing, and saying, "Well, oh well, yes, I've suppressed a lot of purposes. I'm suppressing your purpose right now of trying to run 2G1. All right."

And the auditor says, "Oh, okay, I don't get any read on that, that's fine. And all right, have you invalidated – how have you invalidated a purpose?"

"Well, I guess I just invalidated your purpose now, for trying to run 2G1"

"All right. That's clean, that's clean."

That has nothing to do with why you run 2G1. As a matter of fact, a pc who operates that way is the one who has to have the most 2G1. Why? Because their overts come right into the session against the purposes of the auditor who is simply trying to run a process which will deliver the goal into his hands.
All right. So in goals finding – in goals finding, we begin the activity of creating a case folder, creating a case background as we audit this person, we create a line – or goals plot, and we get our Auditor's Report Forms, and all of that sort of thing, and that goes forward. And this is all germane. This is all germane to case repair, but case repair doesn't get crucial until the person has had that goal run.

Now, normally, simply finding a wrong goal on a pc – it's "so what?" If nobody does anything with the goal, perfectly all right to have found the wrong goal. Who cares? If nobody does anything with the goal. And the repair of it's very easy, if nothing has been done with the goal, repair is very simple. All you've got to do is prepcheck it. Or even if something's been done with it, just give it a Prepcheck and that straightens it out.

And most case repair however does begin in the finding-the-goal area because sometimes the pc has had found on him a goal that wasn't ready to be found. It doesn't rocket read or do very nice things, you know. And somebody's forced it off on him, and the bank they're – the GPM they're running has nothing whatsoever to do with the goal that has been found and so forth. Well, then you have to case repair it back to finding a goal, when this kind of thing exists.

So the 2Gs do come into case repair. They do come into case repair. Because you could take somebody who found a wrong goal and his R/S and RR disappeared and that sort of thing, and they've run down a bank and they can't seem to find a goal and that sort of thing... Well, the thing to do is just to recognize that the case has been run off the rails most gorgeously, and that the proper action is to straighten it up from a goals point of view.

If however you did have a goal, it did fire and you did get a blowdown on it and so on, and you've merely run more items and strays out of another bank and so forth, you of course still are engaged in 2G1, but you tend not to look on it as that. You look on it as part of 3M. The action which you should undertake when a case has had one goal run and it has disappeared or something has happened with it, the actions which should be undertaken are all resident in the 2Gs. They're actually not 3M actions.

Well, what do you do? You have to list goals against items, and you have to list goals, you have to null old lists, and sometimes, sometimes you have to run 2G1 on the person because their goal was so faint in the first place, because 2G1 had not been run, you see. And therefore it was the wrong goal or something like that. You have to prepcheck an old goal that you can't make any sense out of. So case repair can begin in the action of Routine 2G. In other words, if you had a line plot in front of you and you didn't even have the goal for that line plot... I saw one the other day. You didn't think this will exist. This goal actually did not compare to the line plot. The goal was "to experience" and the line plot on it had something on this order: It had "people who do what I tell them," I think. That was the dominating theme of the line plot. And here was – here was this goal "to experience."

What did it have to do with the plot? Well, either – maybe one or two of those items did belong to the goal "to experience," but then they had strayed off into some other GPM through reversing – you know, they reverse oppose something, and flipped over. They did a skip, and they went over into this other GPM. When they got over into this other GPM, they just kept on finding items, finding items, finding items, and the pc kept trying to say faintly –
or maybe they omitted the "how does the goal compare to it" step because the pc usually says, "Well, of course it compares to it; it's the reverse of it." And the auditor finally says, "Well, the step is not necessary."

And he's got a goal "to be a ballet dancer," see, and they run across an item "a steam locomotive." And the auditor is omitting "How does this – how does this goal – how is this goal related, or how is this item related to experience – to 'to experience'? How is this item related to it? Steam locomotive." Or "How is it related to the goal 'to be a ballet dancer.' Steam locomotive. Ballet dancer."

And the pc says, "Steam locomotive? Ballet dancer? Well, a steam locomotive couldn't do ballet, could it? I don't know. Don't know. I don't know how it relates to... Let's see, steam locomotive and ballet dancer. I don't know, maybe the... maybe... maybe the steam coming out of the funnel, maybe the steam coming out of the funnel, maybe... maybe it looks like a ballet costume. Yeah. Must be. I guess."

Well, the press-on type of auditor says, "All right. Well now, let's oppose it. Now, let's see, is it a terminal or an oppterm?" and so forth, "Who or what would oppose a steam locomotive?" Well, they're running this bank over here which is "to be powerful." See? And they get all these items for the bank "to be powerful," and they're sitting here with the goal "to be a ballet dancer." There's one item on the line plot, or two items or three items on the line plot that have to do with a ballet dancer, and all the rest of them have to do with "to be powerful," you see? "Hydroelectric plants." "Hydroelectric plants." "Tremendous, crushing force." "Powerful people." "People who smash you," and so forth, and the auditor's sitting there, you know – if he was doing this step; if he didn't omit it – he'd say, "All right. Now, how would the item 'smashing people' compare to -relate to the goal 'to be a ballet dancer'?"

"Well," pc – "Well... I guess he makes a smashing impact on the audiences, I guess. Smashing impact on the audience."

And the auditor says, "Oh, all right, it does relate. Does relate. Good." Down it goes on the line plot. He's sitting here looking at the E-Meter one session. He notices his RR's have been kind of small, and all of a sudden he can't get an RR. There's no RR on any list, there's no RR here, there's – the needle is just sort of something, and the tone arm is up here at five and a quarter, and what's he done?

Well, he's run 3M in such a way as to make it necessary to repair the case with 2G. You get that?

Now, the goals check, 1963 Issue II says that the first action – this'll continue to be the first action in checking out a Clear – is, does the goal relate to the line plot? And that'll seem silly to a lot of you, but you're going to be disabused of it, man. You'll be out in some organization or Keokuk or someplace, an auditor is going to turn up with this line plot, and it's going to have "Hydroelectric power plants. Steam locomotives. Crushing, smashing force. Inexorable pressure. A poor little weak erk." And the goal of this is "to be a ballet dancer." It's just by inspection.

How do you repair this case? You find the goal of the items which you've got. Or if you've got a goal that fired and was inspected and seen to fire, you find the items that apply to
that goal. So, the items that apply to the goal, of course, is a 3M action. To find the goal for
the items you've got is in actual fact a 2G action. And you just go at it and just find the goal.

You've got a lot of items, and you just go ahead with your 2G actions and you find the
goal for them.

But basically, you should try to find items for a goal if the goal was a proper goal and
if it did fire. And you will greatly appreciate when you've doing this, having some Class IV
initial down in the corner of the auditor's report. Not a separate sheet floating around some-
place, but right on the auditor's report the day the goal was found, or a few days later when
they went and got it checked out, and right down there in the corner, it says, "Checked out,
RRed, so-and-so, so-and-so, signed – initial." And you say, "Oh." Or name. You
say, "Well, it's checked out by a Class IV Auditor." Therefore – therefore the action is to find
the items which belong to this goal. But if there was no checkout, and somebody said, "Oh, it
rocket read all right. The needle just went all over the place, you know? It rocket read. Yeah.
It rocket read when it was found; it went just like that."

You say, "Oh, brother, where are we at?" Well, I can tell you where you're at. You've
got a hatful of items that may or may not have validity; you have an auditor who didn't know
a rocket read; you've got a mess on your hands, and you will be very pleased at that time as
you look with some horror at this mess – you'll be very pleased to remember this primary da-
tum of all case repair. Now, this datum applies to running an old goal which has already been
listed out on 4 lines, 16 lines, 40 lines and 114 lines. It's been listed out till you can't get a tick
on it anymore, but it did produce at one time a free needle with all this listing.

This applies to somebody who had a wrongly worded source list, it applies to some-
body who suddenly cognited on what the first ite m was and made up his own line plot. We
had somebody here do that the other day, by the way. He didn't cognite on the first item; he
just made up the balance of his line plot. And he's pretty sick, too. That's all right.

These wild actions, you know – these wild actions are all of them – are all of them in-
capable of deranging the GPM. You say, "What?" You're handling a nearly indestructible
commodity called the GPM – or the GPMs. We should call the whole bank the Goals Prob-
lems – Goals Problem Masses and one GPM the Goals... a Goals Problem Mass. In other
words, "the" and "a" would be different and "masses" or "mass." In other words, call one sin-
gle GPM which consists of one goal and a packet of items – call that a GPM, and all of these
many goals, you see, each one with their system of items, and so forth, why, call that aggrega-
tion the GPMs. And I think we'll have a little bit easier time communicating.

Now, a GPM or the GPMs are almost completely impervious to improper 3M. Now,
you can just hang that up as a stable datum. The pc can be made pretty green, purple and pink.
The pc can be listed backwards and upside down. The pc can be made pretty sick and be
caved in most magnificently. Fine, fine job of press-on has been done on this pc, you see, he's
been pressed on up to the point of where he's practically in the hospital. And you say, "Oh,
my God, look at the extent of the damage."

Well, remember something, remember something: The human body is not the GPM
and the thetan isn't the GPM; what hasn't suffered any damage there of any kind whatsoever is
the GPM. And that is a good datum for you. Well, the pc hasn't been destroyed or anything
like that, he can still talk occasionally. If he's fed a quick brandy and then you listen, you
know, closely, he'll be able to say – he'll be able to say, "A cat." And you get another item for
your list, you know, and feed him another quick brandy, you know, and get two items a day
for four or five months, and you eventually get the new source list, you see, and he feels bet-
ter. Sarcastic.

If the pc feels bad, if the body feels bad, if it all is caved in, remember this is your sta-
ble datum. The GPM is impervious to anything but perfectly done 3M. That should make you
feel good. It doesn't make the pc feel good.

Oh, you can throw the pc into various parts of the GPM. Yes, you can get splinter
items. Yes, you can list things backwards and throw him into other banks. Yes, you can pro-
duce the full effect of being in a grouper. Yes, all these things can be done to the pc, and
they're not uncomfortable but they don't disturb the order of sequence or anything else of the
GPM. Isn't that remarkable.

You've run the whole goal out. There's a big blowdown. The goal doesn't even tick
anymore. And yet you're absolutely certain looking at this line plot that less than half of the
items on this line plot – which only has twenty items on it and none of the fundamental bot-
tom items – this whole line plot, only half of it refers to this goal. Where's the rest of the goal?

You say – well, here's the worry type at work, see. "But, my God, how can I find any
more items or run any more items? How can I possibly do any of this? Because look here,
look here, I mean, the goal hasn't got any further charge on it. Therefore, I can't find the rest
of the GPM because the goal hasn't got any charge..." Yes, you can go finding items as long
as there are items to be found, whether the goal responds to your read or not.

In fact, practically everything you're ever going to worry about is covered rather mag-
nificently, succinctly and so forth, that the GPMs or a GPM is impervious to anything but
absolutely correctly done – correctly done 3M. And that should hearten you. Because at any
stage of case repair, everything that's been done right with 3M will remain right, and every-
thing that's been done wrong can be remedied. And you'll find out that the correct is sitting
there. Isn't that interesting.?

Remember that now when you start doing case repair and it'll keep you from doing a
lot of silly weird things and keep you from worrying, that's for sure. Because, all right, this
character comes in, and he's got this, and you've got the goal. And the goal's apparently been
run out. And they've done a source list for every item. (Well, somebody will, sooner or later.)
Done a source list, and they found an item, and then they've done a source list and they found
an item, and they've done a source list and they found an item, and they've done a source list
and they found an item. Well, they've done it the hard way. They've done it the hard way. All
you need to do is find where it didn't work anymore. And at the point it didn't work anymore,
you're going to find that the GPM was totally impervious. And where did it stop working?. It
stopped working on the second source list.

And did they find any items after that? Yeah, they found some ticks, and they found
some rocket reads, and they opposed them and they did this and they did that and they found
some things, they found some things on the bank.
Well, don't disturb – ever disturb an existing line plot. You can haul items off of it and put it on some other line plot, but don't ever disturb an existing line plot. Anything that you've... been found on the pc has been found. There's another big stable datum in case repair.

So, they found a steam locomotive in this goal "to be a ballet dancer." All right. You can put a ring around it if you want to; it doesn't seem to belong. And sooner or later you're running this case and somebody's running the case and they say, 'Here's a goal 'to be powerful.' Ha-ha. I wonder if he got any items anywhere else in this case, and so forth. 'Steam locomotive.' Ha-ha."

Let me tell you something very peculiar that a steam locomotive has been found and exists on another line plot does not alter the GPM so far as 3M is concerned. And the GPM called "to be powerful" will be found to obey all the rules of 3M. And everything has to be done to it that has to be done to it. Isn't that interesting?

Let's say you found item 1, item 2, item 3, item 4, item 5. Let me say all these things have been found, and they already existed and so forth. When you do your – your goal oppose list for that GPM... And yes, you do two goal oppose lists for the GPM, which I'll talk about in a moment. When you do the goal oppose list for the goal "to be powerful," it'll land you right exactly where you're supposed to be if you've done it properly.

Yeah, but you say, 'Good God, in 2-12 they found a 'harelipped lightning bolt.' And they found 'weak as a catwhisker,' and they found all these vital items. All these vital items have been found, and there they are, and sure they belong in the line plot. And that undoubtedly upsets because that'd be the top terminal and that'd be the top oppterm. And, oh, life is too cruel here. Look all this stuff's been found, so therefore I'm going to pick it up in the middle of the bank."

No, you're not going to pick it up in the middle of the bank, you're going to pick it up in the right top oppterm or the right top term. Simple, huh? It is simple.

It doesn't matter what's been found. It doesn't matter how many skips have been gone into in the bank. It just doesn't matter. I'll give you some kind of an idea of this: I had a goal that we got into and ran about twenty items in, ran it clear – and didn't find the goal for it, and then became aware that there was a goal for it. And there was a bunch of randomness of one kind or another, and we found the goal to the next bank. And we finally came back and found the goal for this thing.

And ran it on down and finished it up, and so on, all was going along fine. Ha-ha! On the case repair – on the case repair on that particular goal, because no source list had been done on it and so on, and it'd landed in the wrong spots, we found nineteen items. The nineteen correct items. The nineteen correct items for that bank were found. Even though twenty items had already been found in the bank and it had appeared to run. Now, you got that? See? Why worry, man?

Look, you know that a thetan has been sitting around here for a couple of hundred trillion years. You realize that there have been psychiatrists all over the track? I mean, you probably didn't realize that it was a stupid universe, but it is. Been psychiatrists all over the track; they've been electric shocking people. Well, that certainly should have upset the GPMs,
shouldn't it have? Huh? You know, the idea of a cure is a hundred billion kilo-megavolts or something, you know?

And you've got all this blast pistol and glare fights, and this person was through World War I, and World War II, too. And in addition to that was standing in the middle of Hiroshima on that memorable day when the US collected a motivator.

What the – what the hell, you know? This is a pretty – this is a pretty bad thing here. And this pc – this pc is going to – going to respond properly? No, his bank will be scrambled. Been electric shocked, he's had... well, back about two hundred thousand years ago he had eighteen prefrontal lobotomies, four transorbital leukotomies and had to listen to a lecture by Kennedy. The guy was completely brainwashed, utterly, see.

All right. Now, what's this bird all about? What's this bird all about? That didn't upset the GPM; that's the stuff it's made of.

The one thing it can't stand... And I've got to give you a lecture someday on exactly how the GPM is formed, exactly why it is formed, exactly why it is always of that pattern, exactly why, exactly why, exactly why. It's the most remarkable story you ever saw. If you want to know exactly what it is, read Book One, and wherever it says "engram" in the explanation of why people have engrams, why, you just put in its appropriate place "item" or "GPM" and you've got the whole explanation. It's quite interesting.

But I'll give you – I'll give you a lecture on this sometime. There is a reason he postulates each goal. The only thing that I have ever been in error about – I said many times that he had no reason to postulate these goals. Well, in actual fact on very close examination, he each time had a reason to postulate the goal. And it was borne out from the goal he had just survived. And he carries that on over his postulation of his next goal.

But he doesn't just postulate them from nothing. That is the first goal of the bank, is postulated from nothing. Nothing else is.

All right. Now, this – this character has lived through all of these things, this character has actually been subjected to the socialist economic principles of Galbraith, he's read a book on economics by Lord Keynes, he's been educated in several different schools and places and at numerous times in his life he couldn't find the decelerator switch in time to keep the ship from plowing into a sun. He – in other words, he's had a ball.

This didn't upset his GPM. The only thing that can upset a GPM is just this, just this: is a perfect mechanical auditing – this doesn't mean mechanical auditing, but a perfectly mechanically arranged, exactly right approach with an E-Meter and so forth, and there goes the GPM, zzz.

It can't stand the precision which we give it because we know exactly how it hangs together. It actually hangs together more or less by violence or lack of it. So it's very accustomed to violence, and it's very accustomed to mistakes. And it's very accustomed to all kinds of things. But you... frankly it'd be nearly impossible – absolutes are unobtainable but it'd be nearly impossible to make a sufficient auditing goof to actually upset the GPM.
On the other hand, you could make the pc very unhappy so it'd make it hard for you to get him in an auditing chair. You might be sufficiently knuckleheaded – I doubt it. It'd take a lot of duress – you might be sufficiently knuckleheaded to knock off the mock-up, don't you see. You could affect the morale of the pc with regard to auditing, strenuously. You could affect the body – the body is more resilient than you would suppose. But in actual fact the handling of a GPM correctly handles it, and slightly incorrect handling doesn't handle it, and doesn't even derange it. I think that stands very much in your favor.

You start doing one wrong and you actually ... I don't know what the count of items you could find in the thing is concerned. It is just go... will go on and on and on and on and on. And some of those items will be right, but the bulk of those items needn't ever have been found. That's why you get the varying length. The varying length of a GPM has to do with how long the goal served the pc as a survival mechanism. Its success, in other words, as a survival mechanism. And that doesn't vary it very much.

The difference of line plots, however, gives an apparent difference in the number of items in the GPM, because it's how many extraneous items does the auditor find and put on the line plot, that – still in that GPM but really needn't have been found – that would have blown if you'd found the right item. So you can put extraneous items in a line plot.

You can also put strays in a line plot that are from some other goal. You don't recognize they're from some other goal and they go into the line plot, and it isn't till you're straightening them up afterwards, after they've done three or four and you're neating up line plots, and you all of a sudden, "Where the hell does steam locomotive come from?" you see? Thooh! There's a steam locomotive sitting right there staring us in the face, and it's an oppterm, and it's got "a drunk engineer" as its terminal. And you say, "Where did they come from? Where did that pair arrive from?"

You look around for a while, you may not even have the goal yet. But you'll eventually find the goal and eventually you will find "to be powerful," something like that, and you'll be all set.

So stop worrying about the damage an auditor can do to the GPM because it is still sitting there – if it's grossly misrun, it is still sitting there ready to be run right. And that's a wonderful datum. It's still sitting there ready to be run right.

All right, we found item 1, item 2, item 3, item 4, item 5, item 6, item 7, item 8. Now all of a sudden we couldn't find any more items and we got "a steam locomotive" sitting in the middle of the line plot. Well, where did that come from? Where did all this go from? And we go back and we find that this one is ticking and that is R/Sing and another one's ticking. And we say, "Wha – whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. What's going on?"

Well, your immediate conclusion is, is "Well, my God, we've messed up the GPM to such an extent that... And we can't find anything right. You know? Write off one pc." Pc'll feel like this, too. He'll be sure that he's now now'll be written off.

What's the truth of the matter? You go back and you look this over and you find something as flagrant as this: When they did the first source list for that GPM, they did it with a wrong wording, because the pc said he couldn't answer the right goal wording. Instead of
"Who or what would 'to be a ballet dancer' oppose?" Why, the auditor's Q-and-Aed, and he said, "...'being a ballet dancer' oppose." "Who or what would 'being a ballet dancer' oppose?"

This of course has opposed an item. Naturally there's an item in there called "being a ballet dancer."

And he's handled this now as a source list. Since it'll kind of act like this and can be overlisted — you see, any list can be overlisted. And he'll write it out, and eventually he'll get something that opposes it. And sure enough, he'll wind up with something opposing it.

But after he's opposed a couple of these RI lists he all of a sudden winds up with nothing and it's all backwards, or he's skipping the bank, and nothing is working right. He's done a wrong source list. What is your proper action? In all case repairs, no matter what state of running the GPM... See, you're not running a pc in the first place, you're running a GPM. The pc and you are cooperating in the running of a GPM. And at any stage of auditing on a GPM, you'll find the first wrong action behind you that can now be found — the first wrong action behind you that can now be found — and correct it, and do it right, the way it should be done. Well, we — you can just apply it and apply it and apply it and apply it. I mean, there it is. It goes back as early as the source list.

You found twenty-seven items in this GPM, and it's all been very difficult, and you've also found some strays and skips and have things backwards. It was all very, very difficult. And you eventually — why, you get very wise, and you go back and you look at your source list. This first goal oppose list, see. You look at this source list, and you look at that thing, and you say, "Oh, I don't know, I said, 'Who or what would "to be a ballet dancer" oppose?' And I — I listed it, but nothing's run right since. The first item that I found, which is 'elegant dancing' — obviously an oppterm — wound me up with a terminal 'to eat pork.' Deteriorated form of ballet dancing. Or is it?"

You don't even have to know that much about it. Go back and look at the mechanics of the source list. What's it look like? What's it look like? Well, along about that time, why, the auditor, let's say, has heard a lecture on don't overlist. Don't run the pc into the ground with listing. So he's done a perfectly valid — perfectly valid source list. Done a perfectly valid source list. Perfectly valid. It's eight pages. Eight pages of goal oppose, it's all answered properly and so forth. And there's even fifty items there on which no R/S or RR is marked — is marked.

Well, you realize — do you realize that if you went over any section of the list and found something else rock slamming or rocket reading, the list was incomplete. "Hey," you say, "but we've ruined it. We've ruined everybody. We've ruined everything." Now, in Routine 2 you can't make goofs like this. You can take some item off of a Routine 2 list and oppose it, and then you can't get anything else on the list to fire and it's all disarranged.

But 3M isn't like that. 3M is much more rugged. The actions of... in the GPM are much more rugged. He had an incomplete source list. Well, let's complete it. Let's complete it. All right. And at page thirty-nine, only then have we got an area of fifty items beyond the last RR or R/S, and no tone arm action. Page thirty-nine! Well, we skip back and we look at all the RRs, and they don't fire, and we find this mysterious thing has happened, that something
fired someplace on the list that we don't have anything null. So we eventually null the whole list, and there it is. And there it is, gorgeously. It's "ballet dancers." Quite obviously.

Fires like crazy. We oppose it properly. We keep opposing it, everything starts running off, bing-bing-bing-bing-bing. Goes right on down to the bottom of the bank and there we are, bang. Yeah, but you've already found seventeen items into this GPM. Obviously it was all disarranged, everything has gone to pot, hasn't it? No, it didn't disturb the GPM.

Let's say you found all the items to the bottom of the GPM and you even have the goal as an RI at the bottom. You've gone that far. And the thing is still all charged up and so forth, and you suddenly say, "Hey, do you know that we've never done a goal oppose list to start this GPM?" Do you know that you can now do a goal oppose list to start the GPM, and a goal oppose list to end the GPM? This is getting phenomenal, isn't it?

In other words, if a piece of it's missing, you can always put it there. You can always do the right action.

Now, your stable data for case repair – your stable data for case repair – is to take the auditor and put the fear of Ron in him. That's always the first action. First action. You say, "You realize – you realize Ron's nearly an OT now. And if he heard you doing things like this, ohhhf" You know that sort of thing, I mean, you know, put it in like that. You don't have to take responsibility for it, you see. As long as I don't hear about having to take responsibility for it, why, I will.

So your next – your next action after you've done that... You can also – you can also pick up one of the – one of the better looking girls around the organization or something like that, and tell the auditor that this girl – you'll arrange it so this girl will never again speak of him or to him, or something like that. You know, you can work up things by which he will realize that he should read his bulletins. And you get him to study up on his bulletins and read over his bulletins.

Now, if he's being too zzzzz about it all, you'd better have him read his bulletins. All right. Have him read bulletins, supplementary bulletins, anything else that he's got on the thing, and have him get this thing fairly straight.

Because he's got some data in crosswise. So don't just straighten up every blunder this auditor makes, straighten up the auditor. You got that? Straighten up the auditor and his blunder. Got that?

Now, right now there's some excuse. There's some excuse because you haven't got all the materials you could have. Data is still snuggling in. The job is getting easier and easier to do. There are little, short, quick cuts that are being found – that I'm finding that are not just shortcuts of doing 3M, but actually more accurate methods of doing 3M which cuts out extraneous material. And we're still left with our basic stable data on source lists, but we're not left with the stable data on RIs. For instance, it's nonsense to run a long RI list now. But that's a horse of a different hue, and I'll give you a bulletin on it. The point – the point I'm making here is the guy has got to know what has been found to be runnable. Now, you read the first three bulletins back in 1963, and it is now 1985, and he hasn't read any of the rest of them. That would be quite catastrophic, wouldn't it, trying to run 3M? So you straighten him out and
then straighten out what he's doing. There's your stable data. Because if you don't get him and coax him every time to review his material on the thing and go over this, and so on – if you don't coax him also to do that – then all your action will multiply on straightening out cases. In other words, he'll keep fouling up cases which gives you more and more wasted auditing, more and more wasted case repairs; more and more wasted this. You want to send him always back and refer him to a bulletin and insist he read it. You got that?

Your next action on a case repair, just looking it over, is handle the thing as though you were giving him a Clear test or something like that. The steps are given in there. Compare the goal to the line plot. Do they make sense? Does the line plot got anything to do with the goal? Read the goal. Put in your left-hand buttons on the thing. Get it to fire. See if it fires. See if it ticks. Later in the bank, of course, it won't fire anymore.

Then go over your line plot and read from the bottom to the top or from the top to the bottom. Read each item against the meter. Just read them against the meter. Well, let me tell you, if one of the items that should have come from a source list now RR... now rock slams, it's been opposed but now rock slams, brother, that is the most incomplete source list that anybody ever ...

Just the fact that the item off of the source list rock slams is enough to tell you that the source list was improperly handled. I mean, it's just one-two. See? It was opposed, and the charge did come off of it and the question didn't read anymore, see.

All right. That – a harmonic of that carries through the remainder of your – of your actions here on this plot. So here is your stable datum. Any item that reads, no matter how slightly – you got that, now – any item that reads, no matter how slightly, after itself being opposed, in actual truth came wrongly into being. It came off a wrongly done or handled list. That is just your stable datum. One, two, three, four, five, six. You see? That takes care of everything.

In other words, the list is wrong. "Oh, yes," you say, "what about these wrong way oppose?" Well, I'll get to that in a minute. If the thing rocket reads after having been opposed, beautifully, that still really is no guarantee of a wrong way oppose. That is a guarantee that the list on which it appeared – you know, the list just behind it on which it itself occurred – was wrong. Got that? Now, what you want is the earliest item on the line plot which now reads. You say, "With or without Tiger Drill?" I don't care which; doesn't enter into it. The thing has to be charged in order to have Invalidate read. You realize that?

You find the earliest in that sequence of auditing that ticks and look behind it, look at the list on which it appeared and do that list correctly.

There'll be something wrong with that list. It'll be overlisted or underlisted or listed wrong way up or down or something. There'll be something wrong with that list. That's the list you're looking for. That's the list. It isn't how long a list is, how short it is, how beautiful the handwriting on it is, none of these things enter, it is simply that list. That is the one you want. And don't let anybody disturb that stable datum. There's something wrong with that list.

All right. If you don't find something wrong with that list, you had better recheck earlier items found. Because you haven't found – you're not exploring the fundamental error. In
other words, there's a... if you can't find it off of that list immediately behind, then you look earlier for another one that ticks, because there's going to be something wrong with those. There's going to be something wrong with those. And as you go up the bank, if there's apparently no top on the goal or something like this, you know that the item just isn't on the list at all.

But in actual sober fact, in actual sober fact, you don't – there's no variations to this – you find the earliest one that was put on the plot – that was put on the plot, see, that's in chronological order of finding; not the earliest one or latest one in the bank or anything like that – get the earliest one that was put on the plot that ticks, and then correct the list from which it came.

You'll find inevitably and invariably and always that there is something wrong with that list. I don't care whether it was the source list, I don't care whether it was the first RI oppose, the second RI oppose, the third RI oppose, there's always something wrong with that list.

Now, what about these wrong way to oppose? Well, you worry more about wrong way to oppose than you should. It isn't true that it's something that you should neglect. That's not true. But a wrong-way oppose, most frequently has this phenomena connected with it: It throws you out of the GPM. It throws the pc right out of that GPM into another GPM, and you get what we will call a stray.

And this stray looks entirely different than the rest of the plot. So when you find a stray on a plot, then you trace back and locate which one was wrong-way opposed that gave you the stray. Where's the first stray on the plot? And that is the way you check your wrong-way opposes.

Now, normally you try to list an item wrong way to, the mass comes in on the pc and the needle tightens up, and a lot of undesirable things happen, and it's pretty obvious. Also, calling the item to the pc with the line question one way and the line question the other way usually winds him up with an idea of which one turns on the most mass. And you don't want that one. You want the reverse one.

One of them makes him feel easier, the other one, so on. Some pcs out of pride will direct you to the wrong item and the test is not very good. But in actual fact you yourself should know by inspection and your location in the bank whether it's a term or an oppterm. Have you got that? You ought to get good enough to just recognize it by significance. You, a trained auditor, recognizing that all GPMs follow the same pattern as the one in the March thirteenth bulletin – those lower items and so forth; they're all in that sequence and so forth – should recognize where you are. And if you've cut in, down deep into the bank with the wrong source list, or something like this and it starts all going unsatisfactory you will find the first source list item that you found and put on the plot is still reading. So it goes back to the first correction.

Now, what do you do with all these items you have on the plot? You leave them on the plot. You don't take them away from the pc, you say, "There is his items. There are your items. That's it," he's all happy about it, they're his items, fine. And you just proceed from the new correct item you find on the list that was incorrectly done. Just as though you had not
found any other items. And you'll find out that your plot just keeps on beautifully. And that's true for all stages of case, that's true for all cases, that's true for all GPMs. I don't know what more you can need as a repair datum. Quite remarkable.

You'll find in – I know this, that you'll find if an item R/Ses when you read it back on the line plot and you get an item that R/Ses – one of those RIs now R/Ses – that the chances are it came from the source list, and the source list was incomplete. And the source list was a total mess. And it was nulled backwards and upside down and a few other things like that. There's something wrong with the list the item that ticks comes from and the item that gives you a stray was a reverse-opposed.

These are stable data in case repair. And all case repair should include in it – if you yourself are supervising auditors – the case repair should include an admonition to the auditor to review his material. He's probably re... he's probably missing something. Try to teach him yourself a bit, tell him to reread his material, keep him pushed on at it, and all of a sudden light will dawn, bells will ring, sirens will go off, a steam engine will vanish out of his immediate vicinity.

Now, there's your action. Get him educated, repair the case, see. Now, if you yourself are doing it, and you're trying to repair a case, don't repair a case that doesn't need repair. That's worrying too much. Don't fail to repair a case that you yourself are auditing, don't fail to repair a case that needs repair. Don't just keep blundering on.

Now, you have the ARC break assessment, you have other things, and you will come to learn that every time you goof badly is when the pc has a small, slight ARC break, or a big roaring one and you fail to do an assessment off of the ARC break bulletin. You always thought you knew what was wrong, and it's very remarkable that you will find out that you didn't. You will spot what is wrong in the immediate vicinity of it, you'll say, "Yes, I picked up the wrong item. Yeah, I bypassed the fellow's goal, obviously."

No, no, I'm afraid that isn't what you did. You probably did something else. Like, you didn't complete the list, or you didn't do something else. And it'll show up. The judgment of the ARC break assessment is better than the auditor's. That's true of all auditors. That's true of me. True of all auditors. It's – the judgment of that is better than the auditor's judgment any day of the week.

It comes up, and it says you have a wrong GPM. Well, God, you know you're in the right GPM. The thing is all worked out. Here you've got this goal, and you've got these items and so forth. "Wrong GPM! Ha-ha-ha-ha! Nuts!" Here you have this goal "to be a ballet dancer" and you've got "smashing power," "steam locomotives." There they are, right there, and so forth. So you say, "Obviously there's no reason to do an assessment."

But I've seen some blunders made recently, all done by an auditor who assumed he knew what was wrong because it was so obvious in front of his face and then pressed on with that assumption. And then really went wrong.

Because he didn't pick out what was wrong. What was wrong was a missed withhold. All right, but it was of a slightly different character than he thought. He thought he had the wrong goal, or he bypassed a goal. No, he just bypassed a GPM, that was all. He thought that
he'd reverse listed something. No, he didn't reverse list something; he hasn't -- he's not picked the item off of a list three lists ago. It shows up something else.

The real rough ones are withheld from both the auditor and the pc. That's the real rough ones that really cause you trouble.

Well now, that's case repair. And I could give you 8,760 laws and you could memorize and spend the rest of your life memorizing them all. In actual fact there aren't this many rules and laws in case repair. There are just those rules and laws in case repair. And you could also do some other things with case repair. You could also run cases so that they always have to be repaired. But the real method of repairing a case is to run it by perfect 3M in the first place. It's my job to give you perfect 3M. And it's your job to see that it works for you, too.

You'll find out this indestructible thing, the GPM, will only surrender to exactly correct Routine 3M. It's the only thing in the universe that makes a dent in it. That safeguards you, because you can learn 3M, I can teach it to you. And on the other hand, if a case is run totally wrong, why, all you have to do is run it right. And the only thing you have to do with case repair is find out where it wasn't run right, and then you've got it taped. And take the earliest action of it that wasn't run right, correct it, and the case all straightens out.

3M looks very dramatic, you're liable to get very, very nervous, you're liable to develop ulcerosis glaucoma magna. But actually, you're probably worrying too much. You've probably got too many conditionals. There's all kinds of "Well, gee-whiz, you know, the pc kept blinking his eyes in the session, and I knew very well there must be an oppterm there of some kind or another." Yeah, the pc kept blinking his eyes in the session, yeah. Probably couldn't have done anything else. The auditor turning the sheets over for the listing kept hitting him in the face. I mean, you just worry too much. You understand? There's too many cockeyed significances. There's too much worry-worry-worry, think-think-think, figure-figure-figure.

Now, what you want to think is, "Are you doing exact Routine 3M?" It's my job to show you exactly what routine 3M is. And then you recognize when it isn't done. Because there's 7,865 ways per square inch of the pc's bank area that it can be done wrong. That's by actual calculation.

Okay, you couldn't imagine all the ways it could be done wrong. Man has been trying to do something to his reactive mind and his bank and make a dent upon his fellows for two hundred trillion years; you've got the pc sitting in front of you with an intact GPM. Isn't that marvelous? I consider it's absolutely wonderful. What's only more wonderful than that is we get the exact key to the lock and delicately and adroitly turn it in exactly the right place and open the door to freedom.

All right. Well, that's the way you repair one. I hope that it'll do you some good. I know that I've had quite a time working out its principles because there were so many things that could be wrong and weren't. And these were the principles that stood up. You will always have exceptions to it, and the exceptions will inevitably be the creation of somebody who didn't know 3M in the first place. Okay?

Thank you very much, and good night.
TV DEMO : SEC CHECKING
WITH COMMENTS BY LRH

An auditing demonstration given on 27 March 1963

Well, how are you today? How are you today?

We've got a demonstration today. We're going to be sec checking somebody, showing how you dig something up. Your attention is recommended to the fact that the auditor is not there to miss withholds on the pc. This is not a definition of an auditor.

What's the date, by the way? Twenty...

_Female voice: Twenty-seventh._

Twenty-seventh of March 1963.

And the art of Sec Checking is very, very well established. It's one of the finest arts that we have. But it is to a large degree an art. It is restimulating the material to be picked up. And then picking it up.

I think somebody here recently went through a – in one week of four hours of auditing – I think that was right, wasn't it – one week of four hours of auditing, went through the last two pages of the Joburg, a Form 6A and what else?

_Female voice: And a student Prepcheck._

And a student Prepcheck. Oh, boy! That's really remarkable. I don't know how he did that. In the first place, it isn't that we want to audit slowly, we want to audit thoroughly. And thorough audit is very much the point.

Now, one of the things which you will find, one of the things which you will find consistent and so forth is that a good auditor gets something done. He audits the pc in front of him. He gets something done. And it's _not_ getting _through_ the Prepcheck; it's getting _through_ to the pc.

Withholds restimulate. They are actually not there. They have to be keyed in. And I think you will see some of that happening now.

Now, let me see if we're ready downstairs here. Yes, we're all ready downstairs, and we're about to see some Sec Checking. Okay? There we are.
Auditor: Hmm? Is that right?

PC: Nearly. This will do.

Aud: Okay, Leslie. Well, what we're going to do in this session is that I've got here the uh – Joburg, the last two pages of the Joburg...

PC: Hm.

Aud: ...which I understand has been flattened on you over the – in the pavilion.

PC: Well, we got something alive on it.

Aud: You still got something alive.

PC: Something alive.

Aud: All right. So what I'm going to do, I'm going to check down this list, to see what's reading or not, and then if we get through that, then I've got some more questions I'm going to put to you, to clean those up as well.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Okay. If I can get some of these questions alive, that's good for both of us, all right?

PC: All right.

Aud: Good. All right, now, that's fine, thank you. Just give the cans a squeeze. Thank you. Let them go. All right. Just once more and let them go – right. Thank you. All right now, I'm not going to put in Model Session here, if we do need it however, I will, but I'm not going to put Model Session in. Is that all right with you?

PC: Yes, it's all right.

Aud: Okay. Now, is there anything you want to tell before we start, at all?

PC: No, except that we were having trouble cleaning up something this morning and I felt a bit sort of shaken since. I was quite sure this morning I didn't have a missed withhold that they think I had.

Aud: Okay. All right. Now, anything else?

PC: No.

Aud: Good. All right, now how about this room? Is it all right to audit in this room?

PC: Yes, it's all right.

Aud: All right. Very good. Now, is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Okay. Start of session! Session started for you?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: To clean up anything that's been missed.

Aud: Good. All right, any other goals for this session?

PC: Just to do my best.

Aud: Good. All right, is there anything else?

PC: I think that'll – that'll be all right.

Aud: That'll be all right, very good. All right. Good. All right, now we're going into – straight into the questions here, and the first question I'm going to ask
you is: Do you know any communists personally? All right. That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me what does this question mean?

PC: Well, it means, do I know anybody who I know is a communist.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And I think it means in this life.

Aud: All right, thank you. All right, well now, here's the question. Do you know any communist personally?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. Did – a good look at that?

PC: Well, if I – if I do, I don't know that they are.

Aud: Hm-hm.

PC: I mean, I might know somebody who is a communist unknown to me, but not known to me.

Aud: All right, thank you. Has anybody told you – think who might be a communist or anything, do you know?

PC: Well, I just thought of one preclear who gave us a bit of trouble about a year ago, but I don't think he was a communist.

Aud: All right.

PC: I just thought of him then.

Aud: Okay. Is there anybody else?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. I'll check this question on the meter now.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: Do you know any communist personally? All right. You possibly have an answer there, do you?

PC: No, no – I just felt nervous and wondering if it would read or not.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right. Okay, I'm going to check that question.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: We had an equivocal read there.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: Do you know any communist personally? There is a read here.

PC: The only thing I get there is something which has come up in processing before.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: It's some – came up on this question, some past lives stuff, that's very confused and I'm not sure about it. But that's all I get.

Aud: All right.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: What actually do you get here?

PC: I usually think of Lenin and...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...sometimes Karl Marx.

Aud: Yeah.

PC: ... and I used to get the idea that I had had something to do with starting communism.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And it gave me a horrible scare ...

Aud: All right.
PC: ... and I backed off that one.
Aud: Okay. Now, I'll ask you the question, do you know any communist personally?
PC: No.
Aud: All right. I'll check it on the meter. Do you know any communist personally? All right, do you agree that's clean?
PC: Hmm.
Aud: Okay, thank you. All right, now, the next question I'm going to ask you is: Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology? That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me, what does that mean to you?
PC: Um, have I ever damaged it or hurt it in any way, or...
Aud: Yes...
PC: ...um – injured – it could mean have I prevented it from advancing, like I really feel it shouldn't advance, by...
Aud: Hm-hmm.
PC: ...by not doing things, too.
Aud: All right. Okay. And on the question "On Dianetics," what's this mean to you?
PC: Well, I haven't had very much to do with Dianetics except for...
Aud: Hm-hmm.
PC: ... trying to sell the book to a few people.
Aud: Right.
PC: Hmm.
Aud: And Scientology?
PC: That means just the general science all over the world?
Aud: All right, okay. Now, how long have you been in Dianetics or – and/or Scientology?
PC: '59.
Aud: Since 1959?
PC: Hm.
Aud: All right. Okay, well, have you been working in an organization or something?
PC: No, with Eddie, in the franchise center.
Aud: Hmm.
PC: Uh – I did – did a little bit of auditing in Melbourne.
Aud: All right. Okay, well, now, I'm going to give you this question. All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?
PC: Well, the thing I thought of there, straight away, was uh – the preclear I had in Melbourne ...
Aud: Hm-hmm.
PC: ... auditing her.
Aud: Yes.
PC: I was – I had to leave Melbourne and go back to New Zealand and I hadn't completed her intensive. She still had missed withholds at that time.
Aud: All right.
PC: It wasn't a break of agreement there, but the fact was that I felt that I could have done a better job auditing her than I did do.
Aud: All right. What did you actually do there?
PC: Well, I left Melbourne while she still had missed withhold.
Aud: All right. Okay. Any other doingness there?

PC: I didn't use my own judgment...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in the sessions.

Aud: Very good. Anything else there?

PC: No, I don't think so. I think that's all.

Aud: All right, okay. I'll give you the question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: Yes, by being slow with dissemination.

Aud: All right. Now, when was that?

PC: Thing I thought of there was once – uh – we were going to put an advertisement in the paper for a course in something and I slowed Eddie down in doing it in some...

LRH: You notice that rock slam – that rock slam there that she's turning on over this question. You notice that it's early and late. That is quite common.

PC: ...very banky sort of way, and...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... oh, no, we won't do it just yet, you know, sort of – I said something like that, and we actually put it off.

Aud: Yes, all right. Okay. Now, I didn't quite hear what Ron said then and I wondered if he could repeat it.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right.

LRH: I said it was just early and late, that rock slam, and that she does have a rock slam there on this subject – but it doesn't get instant when they do that on a Sec Check. You can expect it to turn up and turn off, and she's really shadow boxing with something. That's all I said.

Aud: Thank you.

LRH: You bet!

Aud: All right, now. I'm sorry, I didn't get – quite get the last of your communication there.

PC: I've forgotten what I...

Aud: All right, okay. I'll tell you what I'll do, I'm going to give you this question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: I didn't get any definite answer there, nothing that ...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... I've definitely done.

Aud: All right. Um – what – were you looking at there?

PC: Well, what I was looking at before was uh – slowing Eddie down in getting an advertisement put in the paper advertising testing, that might have been.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Sort of a back-off of confronting new people.

Aud: All right. Okay.

PC: And I – and I was successful in doing it. I realized it was an overt.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right. Anything else you did around that time?

PC: No, I didn't get anything there at that time.
Aud: All right. Well, let's have another look. [PC laughs] All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: I feel as if I have, but I don't get anything there.

Aud: All right. Well, what are you looking at there? Something there.

PC: Just – just a feeling of grief.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right.

PC: The – the thing is that I feel that I've done wrong, and – and – to do with Scientology and Dianetics, is in – in not making myself get a bit of necessity level on it and start things.

Aud: All right.

PC: That's the thing I feel.

Aud: Okay, when didn't you – when didn't you do this thing?

PC: Oh, I haven't done that all the time. Ever since I came into Scientology, all the time, it's been constant really. I – I do a little bit, now and then.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And when I do, I usually do – well, a good enough job to know that I ought to do a bit more, you see?

Aud: All right. Give me an example here. What's that?

PC: Well, that was 1960, before we started practicing Scientology.

Aud: Hm-hmm. Yes?

PC: And feeling we ought to start. I think it was 1960, I'm not quite sure of my dates.

Aud: Yes. All right.

PC: But at that particular time we were having a bit of confusion, Ed and I, and Ed was a bit down, and I had the feeling that I ought to do something.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Sort of get cracking, you know, quite strong, and I just didn't do it. But I – I knew I should have done it a certain time, and then I sort of forget about it.

Aud: Yes, well what was it you didn't do here, at that time?

PC: I'm getting a bit mixed up.

Aud: Yes, well...

PC: I – I didn't run a PE Course.

Aud: All right, okay.

LRH: That's a pumping needle, by the way, you see there, class, that's a pumping needle.

Aud: All right. Now. What was at – at that time, what was it you actually did?

LRH: It can also be caused by somebody having their cans against their clothing while breathing.

Aud: There.

PC: It would be – the thing I did would be, say, just go out to the pictures or something like that and do a...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ..just do lazy sort of things instead of doing something worthwhile.

Aud: Yes, very good. Very good. Can you give us a specific time when you did this. An incident?

PC: Gee, I've got this shut off.

Aud: All right. Okay. Some time when you went to the pictures.

PC: I just get the idea of – of going in the truck, you know, just being –
having my body in the truck, moving toward the picture theater some time, but I couldn't tell you exactly when it was, it must...

Aud: Yeah.

PC: ...have happened dozens of times.

Aud: All right, now you're telling me that you got this feeling you – what was it you were doing? What was this general thing you were telling me here?

PC: Doing things like being irresponsible, going to the pictures, instead of getting here.

Aud: All right, have you got one time when you went to the pictures?

PC: Well, the – the time I've got when I – I had this urge to do something was ...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...coming home from the pictures. I've got that time.

Aud: All right, what happened there? What was it you did?

PC: Oh, I think I'm starting to see a bit of daylight.

Aud: All right, very good.

PC: There's more to this, this – this – I was processing Eddie at the time...

Aud: Right.

PC: ...and he was getting upset as a – as a preclear.

Aud: Yes.

PC: I think that was what it was.

Aud: Hmm.

PC: And – um – this is before missed withholds, you know.

LRH: See that needle go clean?

PC: ...and uh – the cause would be in giving – giving bad auditing and no results, because he was confused and didn't want to – didn't want to start until he was sort of more sure.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And I had this urge to do something, real strong this time, and I probably made him feel guilty about it, but the fact was I had done an overt before that.

Aud: Yes.

PC: Because if I had done good auditing he would have felt all right.

Aud: All right. So what – where was this overt to here then?

PC: I don't know which overt you want.

Aud: The actual overt you got in mind when you said you'd done some bad auditing on him.

LRH: See, this is ...

PC: I don't have it there, except that I – just a general idea of – of a bit of confusion near his processing.

LRH: See that needle dirty up again the moment that she started talking about this bad auditing.

PC: And...

LRH: Moving on down toward what she really did.

PC: Once I blew of from him in the session.

Aud: I beg your pardon?

PC: Once I blew from him in the session...
Aud: I see, yes.

PC: ...probably around about that time.


PC: Uh...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: The – the one – I've got one there now.

Aud: Good.

PC: I've done it after this, too. I – I did this a – a few times.

Aud: All right.

PC: Uh – first one would be – uh – I was trying to get his case going and I'd be running a process – "What part of that scene you are looking at can you be responsible for?" or something like that

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...and he got upset in the session, you see, and I'm trying to get this process going and I got angry because he was angry and I blamed him, you see?

Aud: Right.

PC: It just went – and I think I said, "You can go to hell," and I just left. And I realized when I got to the door – I was in a real rage...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... what I'd done, and I came back.

Aud: Yes.

PC: I don't even remember if I ended that session or not. But I did go back.

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, is there anything else you did to that – in that session?

PC: Oh. Break the Auditor's Code.

Aud: All right. Anything else? Anything else there?

PC: I – I didn't get anything. There must be, but I sort of ran up against a blank wall.

Aud: All right. Well now tell me, when was the first time you blew sessions on this preclear? That's it.

PC: There was twice, very close together and I don't know whether the one I'm telling you about is the first one. I think it is the first one.

Aud: Well, what was the other one here, then?

PC: The other one was – uh – one – early one morning.

Aud: All right.

PC: Quite close to that time, probably within two months.

Aud: All right. Now, what happened on that occasion? Hm-hmm? You have got something there.

PC: Not – not anything yet.

Aud: And what happened in that session? The other session where you blew? It's there. It's there.

PC: Oh, yes.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Uh – he – he got upset about my auditing.

Aud: All right. Okay.

PC: And I just – I just didn't confront that.
Aud: Hm-hmm.
PC: So I blew.

Aud: All right, and what had you done then in here?

LRH: Notice the auditor properly called that a motivator, see? "He got upset and I blew," so now we got to get the overt, see?

Aud: There it is.
PC: I didn't want to audit him.

Aud: All right. Now, the – when – when was that? That.

PC: I – this was all the same time. It was the – the one... it directed me to another one, there were two close together

Aud: All right.
PC: ...and this is the one morning before I went off to – to school.

Aud: Right, fair enough. Now, what had you done in this session? There. There. There you are.

PC: I get the feeling I haven't got it yet.

Aud: Okay, just have a look there, something you did. There you are. There.

PC: Oh, I thought I started the session late.

Aud: All right, okay. Well, is that what you did?

PC: I'm not sure, but that's what I've got, that's what came up...

Aud: All right.
PC: ...just then, when you said "that."

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, is there anything else in that session that you did? Something there.


Aud: Oh, all right.
PC: I don't remember what.

Aud: Okay. Let's have a look at this. What – what was said in this session that led to this? Something there.

PC: Uh – all I got there was the idea of Ed saying to me I wasn't doing something right, and I can't even remember what I was doing or what it was I wasn't doing right.

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, what was before that, was it, that you weren't – that you'd done in this session? Before he said that to you? ... You've got something here.

PC: Not seeing anything yet.
Aud: Hm-hmm. Let's have a look. Was it an auditing flub?

PC: Well, it would be an auditing flub.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right.
PC: Would be an auditing flub.

Aud: Well, what was the auditing flub?
PC: Not understanding the preclear.

Aud: All right. Okay. What didn't you understand there?

PC: I'm getting a bit of – bit of it back.

Aud: Hm-hmm, good.

PC: Um – I didn't listen fully and – and acknowledge his difficulty.
Aud: All right.

PC: There was some difficulty with processing...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...in Scientology, and his case. At that time he felt that he could help other people with Scientology but nobody had helped him, you see?

Aud: Right.

PC: And – uh – it used to come up a lot in sessions.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And now I think it's – feel that that would be what it was.

Aud: What would it be, actually, then?

PC: Well, I must have done something that he – made him feel awful, the preclear was feeling lousy anyway, that's for sure.

Aud: I didn't quite hear that.

PC: I must have done something to make him feel bad, because the preclear would have been feeling really bad in the session.

Aud: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: And – and got a failure...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...somehow or other, about auditing.

Aud: Yes. Now, was there something on this you didn't understand or something that you did in the session?

PC: Oh, I didn't understand it.

Aud: Oh. All right. Now, where – um – well, tell me this, which house was this a – did this session take place in?

PC: Oh, this was in – uh – uh – River Road, 574 River Road.

Aud: All right. Is it a big building? Small building?

PC: No, a medium-sized house.

Aud: All right. How many rooms in it?

PC: Oh, I don't know how many rooms – one, two, three, four, five.

Aud: All right.

PC: Five major rooms.

Aud: All right, now which room were you auditing in?

PC: We were in the front – the front lounge.

Aud: All right. Tell me, how's that room furnished in?

PC: Oh, I get that view all right!

Aud: All right.

PC: A carpeted floor and a settee and the sofas.

Aud: Hmm, yes. Very good. All right, have you got the picture of that, when you – when you had this session with him?

PC: Yeah. Yes.

Aud: All right.

PC: It's getting better.

Aud: Good. Anything – um – distinguishing – anything distinguishing about the preclear that day?

PC: Only being upset, I guess.

Aud: Yes, all right, well, his attire or his clothing?

PC: I seem to think he had on his green jersey, but that's what I think.
Aud: All right, very good. All right, now have a look at this session, see what it was you did ... It's kicking here ... All right. How you doing?

PC: Uh – all right.

Aud: Good.

PC: I'm sort of just looking, trying to find something.

Aud: Yes, all right. Well what – what process were you running? What sort of auditing were you giving him on this occasion?

PC: It would be what was out at that time, I think.

Aud: Well, what would be – what was it – what were you running in the session.

PC: Gee, it's hard to recall. Could have been Havingness and Confront.

Aud: All right.

PC: Or it could have been uh – uh – one of those routines.

Aud: Well, all right. Was it one of those routines?

PC: There was another one, another – another routine there and I'm trying to pick it up, what it would be.

Aud: Hm-hhm.

PC: Hmm. I'm not sure.

Aud: All right, now what – what were you doing at the moment when he – when you started to get – when he started to get ARC broken then?

PC: Running a process, I'd be running a process when it happened.

Aud: All right. Okay. And what were his words to you?

PC: I'm not sure whether this is right or not, but...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...I get the idea...

Aud: Yes...

PC: ... of him saying, "I don't think this is doing me any good."

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, what was it – what would it be that wasn't doing him any good then? What process were you running at that time?

PC: Christ! I don't know.

Aud: All right, how's this doing – going?

PC: It's a bit hard to get – get what it is.

Aud: All right. Well now, tell me, this wasn't the first time you'd audited this PC?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. Now, were there some earlier sessions when you'd audited this PC?

PC: Yes.

Aud: All right, now, in any of those earlier sessions that you got something that you'd done wrong in them?

PC: Plenty of things. I hadn't blown in those earlier sessions, but...

Aud: Pardon?

PC: ...I hadn't blown...

Aud: No, all right, okay.

PC: ...in those earlier sessions, but plenty of things.

Aud: All right. Now, was there an earlier session you can recall here, with this PC?
PC: Well, it – it might be the first or second session I gave him.

Aud: All right, now how's that session seem to you? What did you do in that one?

PC: We were running uh – overts and withholds.

Aud: Good. All right, yes. Now, what – uh – what did you do in that session?

PC: Well, I'd be running "What have you done to me," "What have you withheld from me?" That would be what I'd be doing.

Aud: All right. Now, how did that session go?

PC: First session went all right.

Aud: Good. Your second session?

PC: Second session...

Aud: Yes?

PC: Ah yeah, the second session was when I started getting uh – uh – some trouble with the ARC...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in the session.

Aud: Very good. Now, what was it you did in that session?

LRH: There's an additive in that first session.

PC: All I can get in the second session was, uh...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: In the second session I gave him uh – we were – were at this time, we weren't married...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...and we were just going together, and I was a bit keener than Eddie was at that particular time.

Aud: All right.

PC: And in the second session, some of this started coming up as his withhold, you see...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...in that session. But I didn't do anything wrong in that session, I just acknowledged and went on. But I felt shaken up, but I might have done something before that.

Aud: All right, very good. Well, what about the first session then, that you ran? Yes? [pc laughs] Hm-hmm, yes?

PC: I've looked at this before, and...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...the first session I ever gave him, the only overt I could – I can think there, is quite a – quite a good-sized one, really ...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...and it would be – would be teaming up – I sort of suggested that we audit each other...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...and the – the teaming up there was sort of for Scientology, but the – my main goal uh ...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... was second dynamic goal, I sort of – sort of fell for him, you see. And I was really...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...after him...

Aud: All right.
PC: ... in a cunning sort of way. So the auditing would be as a means for that, really, underneath.

Aud: All right. Now, was there anything in your auditing, along these lines? Second dynamic lines at all?

PC: No, not at that point, I don't think, no.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: I was only running overt-withhold on me.

Aud: All right.

PC: Oh, well, I get his overts off on me, and he won't fly!

Aud: Pardon?

PC: I get his overts off on me and his withholds, and he won't fly.

Aud: All right. Okay. Is that it?

PC: Oh, yes, well, that's part of it.

Aud: All right, now, is there anything else in that session?

PC: No, I don't see anything else there.

Aud: All right. Well now, how about this pc now? And the subsequent ARC breaks? Still something there.

PC: He didn't really start ARC breaking...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...him... himself, until that's – probably about three or four sessions, and maybe even a week later.

Aud: All right.

PC: I think it would be within a week, really.

Aud: Okay. Now, after the first session, what about the second session? Is there anything you did in that session? Yeah?

PC: I don't get anything I did, I was just looking at the session...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...just – just looking at it there.

Aud: All right. Now, was that – how – what was the purpose of running that session?

PC: The purpose would be to clean up the overts and withholds, get the – get it clean.

Aud: Yes. Very good. All right, now any other purpose as far as you were concerned?

PC: No, no, the – actually the other one I told you about, I didn't consciously fully realize it about that at the time, but...

Aud: Hm-hm.

PC: ...I could see it afterwards...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...that it was there. But it wasn't – uh – I had it nicely suppressed.

LRH: [talking to auditor]

Aud: Um. Uh-huh. Uh-huh. All right. Okay, well now, why did you come into Scientology then? What was the original idea of coming into Scientology?

PC: Uh – the original idea of coming into Scientology.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: I had read a little bit about it in a book.

Aud: Yeah, hm-hmm.
PC: And got a bit interested...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...and I then heard a bit about it from my father, just a little bit.

Aud: Right.

PC: And then I saw – I was very bored and dissatisfied with my job...

Aud: Right.

PC: ...and so I wrote to the Christchurch Scientology people to find out if they had a course. And that's – that's...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...primarily – I think that was the first reason why I came in.

Aud: Yes, all right. And you wrote for the course, then what did you do?

PC: Pardon?

Aud: You wrote for details of the course...

PC: Yeah.

Aud: ...then what did you do?

PC: I went to the PE Course!

Aud: Right, yes. All right.

PC: And Eddie was running it. That's where I first met him.

Aud: Oh, I see.

PC: That's where I got my eye on him.

Aud: Pardon?

PC: I said that's where I got my eye on him.

Aud: All right.

PC: Sounds awful, doesn't it?

Aud: Okay. Thank you. Now, what – uh – then – was there any purpose then of continuing on?

PC: No, no, I don't think I had any strong second dynamic feelings until probably partly through the week, I sort of thought "Oh, he's nice," something like that.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And I thought, gee, you know, nice boys like that in Scientology...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...you see. But first of all I really was sure at that time that Scientology was something.

Aud: Good, all right.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: So what was your – what happened after the PE Course, what was the next move?

PC: I – I went on to a co-audit...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in Christchurch. And did the extension course.

Aud: Okay. Now, why'd you go on that co-audit? Yes?

PC: I went on that co-audit with the – with the reason – I don't want to own up to this one.

Aud: All right. Yes?

PC: Because I thought he might audit me.

Aud: All right, okay. All right. Now, any more on that?

PC: No, he didn't.

Aud: All right. Okay. So that was the original purpose there, was it.
PC: It would be part...
Aud: All right.
PC: ...would be partly, not wholly.
Aud: All right, okay. All right. I'm going to check this original question again now, all right?
PC: Hm-hmm.
Aud: Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?
PC: I feel a lot better about it, but I don't really see one.
LRH: Yeah, nice and clean, isn't it, huh? Nice and clean.
Aud: All right. I didn't quite hear what you said here.
PC: I – I feel a lot better about it.
Aud: Hmm, right.
PC: But I don't know if there's anything there or not.
Aud: Well, we got a nice clean needle here now, all right?
PC: Yeah.
Aud: Okay.
PC: Yeah.
Aud: All right.
LRH: You can close it off.
Aud: All right, now, uh – it's a nice point to finish up...
PC: Hm.
Aud: ...on the session, so if it's all right with you I'm just going to finish the body of the session now.
PC: Yes, that's all right.
Aud: All right. Anything you want to say before I do uh – finish the body of the session?
PC: Well, I've had a little look for this before...
Aud: Hmm.
PC: ...since missed withholds came out, with Ed, but I haven't had a good a look at the whole sort of picture like this before.
Aud: All right. Okay.
PC: Yeah.
Aud: All right. Well then, have you made any part of your goals for this session?
PC: Hmm.
Aud: Which was to clear up anything that has been missed, and to do your very best.
PC: Hmm.
Aud: All right.
PC: Yeah.
Aud: How'd you make out in those?
PC: I feel good about that.
Aud: All right. And on this one "to do my best"?
PC: Yes.
Aud: All right. Now, are there any other gains you've made in this session you'd care to mention?
PC: I didn't feel too worried about the audience.
Aud: All right. Very good. All right, anything else?
PC: Only – only a comment.
Aud: On goals and gains I was
asking you if...

**PC:** Yeah, yeah.

**Aud:** You want to make a comment? Do so.

**PC:** Oh, just – just a comment that it was so much easier to get – get to it when – when we went earlier.

**Aud:** Hm-hmm.

**PC:** I got – couldn't get that later one at all.

**Aud:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** Yeah.

**Aud:** All right. Okay. Now, I'll just check your havingness, all right?

**PC:** Hmm.

**Aud:** Just – uh – good. Now, give the cans a squeeze, would you? Let them go. All right, now, your havingness is down. What is your Havingness Process?

**PC:** "Touch that" or "feel that," I think they work.

**Aud:** All right, okay. Put the cans down, then, would you? All right, I'm going to run "touch that," okay? Touch that table. Good, all right. Touch that cord. Good. Touch the top button of your jacket. Very good. Touch your right cuff. Good. All right, touch your nose. Fine. Touch your hair. Very good.


All right, pick up the cans. Okay. All right, now, good. Now, give the cans a squeeze. Okay. Let them go. All right. And once more. All right. Well, we're almost back to where we started there and I'm going to leave it at that. How do you feel about that?

**PC:** I feel all right.

**Aud:** All right, very good. Now, is there anything you care to – uh – end of Havingness Process. All right, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?

**PC:** No, just thank you.

**Aud:** All right. Is it all right with you if end the session now?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Okay, here it is: End of session! Session ended for you?

**PC:** Yes.

**Aud:** Very good. All right, tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

**PC:** You're no longer auditing me.

**Aud:** Good. All right, thank you.

**PC:** Okay.

Well, there you have an example of Sec Checking, actually, with a first cousin to the withhold system. Pressing it back to the earliest time, picking up the earliest charge and carrying it on forward.
I want to call to your attention, very distinctly and very definitely, that there is a wealth of difference between Sec Checking and getting mid ruds in or some other type of activity.

Now, you get the mid ruds in, something like that, or clean up something, it is simply for the perfunctory, the perfunctory purpose of getting a session going, getting things out of the road, momentarily, so that you can carry on with what you're doing.

In Sec Checking, you are doing auditing with this type of action. You're doing auditing with it. In doing a Prepcheck, such as on purposes, you are doing auditing. That's different, don't you see? You're doing auditing of the pc's case with the process. In other words, with Sec Check questions and with Prepchecking – doesn't include Prepchecking a goal or something like that – but in Prepchecking – by which I mean you're trying to find times when well, you're trying to find out how certain purposes have been suppressed and that sort of thing – you are actually doing the auditing with the Prepcheck. You understand?

So on, however, goals running or 3M or some other process, you are simply using the mid ruds; you're simply using the mid ruds to brush the pc off of it – so they won't get in your road, do you understand?

Now, you can either audit with these things – as you just saw a demonstration of – you can either audit with these things or you can just set a pc up so they can be audited. Do you see that? In other words, there's two distinctly different uses to such things as a Sec Check question or a Prepcheck question, do you understand? They are two distinctly different uses.

The one use is to get auditing **done** with it. And of course, that's hammer and tongs. That's get the earliest one on the chain. That's this, that's that, that's the other thing, you see. Steering the pc's attention, finding out if there is anything. Restimulating the pc, if you please, to find out if there's anything that can be picked up and then going ahead and picking it up.

And then on the other side – on the other side – we have their use, very permissive, just lightly brush off, "In this session has anything been suppressed?" "In this session has anything been suppressed?" Pc says no, you say, "All right, I'll check it on the meter: In this session has anything been suppressed? That doesn't read on the meter." And away we go. You understand?

Now, that same question, that same question, used on the subject of purposes might go very well this way: "How has a purpose been suppressed?" The pc says, "Oh, I don't get anything on that." Oh, no! We're doing a Prepcheck, you see, we're using this thing to get auditing done. So we have to say "Well, what do purposes mean to you?" "What are purposes all about?" "What's suppression?" "Did you ever have any purposes, like that? Do you suppose there... any purpose was ever suppressed? Anybody's purpose was ever suppressed?" Anything like that.

Pc says, "Oh, I see what you mean. Yes, well, I've badly suppressed my father's purposes, and so forth." Well, of course, you realize by the limits of the question you can't just have "What purpose was suppressed?" That's a bad process. You have to say – it's like "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with." Spin the pc. So you have to say, "All right. Now, how did you suppress that purpose?" And all of a sudden, why, the pc is
giving you answers. You don't have to keep badgering the pc – that isn't the point, you can just keep giving the question, as long as the pc gives you answers.

Your tone arm sitting there, as you've had tone arm motion and so forth, and the pc all of a sudden puts on the brakes and he says, "That's all!" Well, all you've run into is something the pc is unwilling to tell you. So you just have to go ahead and find out if this is the case. It's – pc has something there that he doesn't want to tell you.

There's a difference here, in other words. When you use Sec Checking and Prepchecking for the purpose of auditing, you are pressing the question home to the pc. You are making sure that the pc understands that question. You're making sure that the pc knows this question applies to his life. And you're trying to pick up the earliest incident that is available and carrying it on forward. You've walked the pc down a chain, and so forth. You get auditing done, in other words, with this question.

But, over here, on the other side, just rudiments and Havingness. All right, well, we just do a light brush-off, with the rudiments, we make sure they don't read on the meter, we run some Havingness on the pc – pc comes up smiling. We don't badger the pc at all. Do you see that is a difference? Two entirely different modes of auditing. The mode of auditing done in W is very different than the mode of auditing done in Z. You have to learn both modes of auditing. You need both of them.

How are you going to pull somebody's missed withholds, to set him up so they aren't going to explode in your face all the time while you're trying to do 3M? Well, you'll have to take up the whole question with him, you have to restimulate these things, in other words. You have to discuss these things with him. Sec Checks, of course, are very good to do this with.

Now, your concept and understanding of this is invited. You haven't – you actually can't be called an auditor unless you can see check and press it home. You understand? And you actually can't be called an auditor if you don't know this other method of just a light brush-off and dash on. You understand? Because you're trying to get your Routine 2, Routine 3 processes done these days, don't you see? Well, you're not trying to press anything home.

But let's take the borderline process, which is your 2G1. And that pc just goes on answering, answering, answering smoothly. But if the pc isn't answering, you have to know how to press that question home and get it answered. So it's at 2G1 that you have the great divide between these two things. It's a part of each, you understand?

Now, where a pc is having difficulty and a rough needle and a lot of things are very poor about the situation, where all these things are going on – pc is uncomfortable, and so forth, about life – you can straighten them out with a Sec Check. And your procedure would be more or less the way you saw it.

But as I press home to you, it is an art. It is an art. It's not a – it's not a one-two-three – four-shift, one-two-three-four-shift, one – you have to audit the pc in front of you. Pc's saying, "Rah, I don't rah, rah, rah, gahr and I've never done anything to Dianetics and Scientology, except, of course, I'm pretty critical of the way you're auditing me and I'm pretty critical of the organization," and so on. Well, realize that there must be an overt beneath the criticism,
that's one of the stable data of Sec Checking. It's up to you to find that chain of overts. And it's up to you to get the bottom chain of overts. It's up to you to release those overts. You notice this girl went down to female Clear read on this. Well, one of the things that happens on Sec Checking is that a high tone arm gets cancelled out. And you get them coming down on it, if you do good Sec Checking.

So it's quite an activity all by itself. And it's a distinctly different activity than that carried on in Routine 3 and finding goals and that sort of thing. Do you see that?

Now, you have to learn both kinds of auditing and learn when to use each. And I hope that you've got some idea of that now.

There's one remark I'd like to make technically, rather than post it on the board, and that is that 2G1 is not run on the needle. Sec Checking is run on the needle. 2G1 is right part of its old ancient grandfather – and I'll give you more talks about it – was Routine 2 Prehav levels. And that is all run on the tone arm. And you run it up to a high tone arm, more or less stuck, and then shift to your next level. And it's all done on the tone arm. It is not done on the needle. No part! Nothing! And no part of the auditing commands are run on the needle in 2G1. Do you understand that? Only the tone arm. And you have to be able to persuade the pc to answer it a few more times. As long as there's tone arm motion going on, you have answers.

Now, there's 2GPH, which is the original Routine 2 Process, which is by Prehav level, applied to purposes. And you will be learning that one, too.

But I'm just calling that to your attention because those early 2Gs are all tone arm. All tone arm. Not needle. Sec Checking, rudiments, Havingness is all needle, not tone arm. You got the idea? They're quite distinctly different. Not only different processes – they use different parts of the E-Meter.

All right. Well, I'm very pleased with that demonstration and I think we ought to give Reg and Leslie a big hand.

Thank you. Thank you very much, and good night.
The GPM

A lecture given on 28 March 1963

How are you today? This is the 28th of March, AD 13. I don't have any messages here saying any of you people have gone Clear or anything like that here today. I guess you must be all slowing down, huh?

Well, it's getting towards the end of the week. Spring's here. That's it – spring. You're suffering from spring fever.

We have a new arrangement here today. We've got a – I got a board here I can draw you some pictures on and it's about time, because if you can't get it verbally you can always get it through pictures, huh? 7

All right. Now, let's see. Want to talk to you today about the GPM – the GPM. The composition of the GPM – or the GPMs – and the composition of any single GPM actually marvelously enough can be found in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health in the description of how an engram is formed. And we're right back to basics. Every time we've had anything that was true and anything that was very useful and usable to us, it is traced back, oddly enough, to the dynamic principle of existence is to survive. That is the primary take-off point, to survive.

And of course, the oddity of that problem is, how can a thetan be so fixated on the effort to survive when actually he can't do anything else. And that is his basic problem. His basic problem is he can't do anything else and therefore he works at it.

Truthfully, some thetan worries about will he get through or will he make it. He worries about that in processing. Well, I've been wrapped around a few telegraph poles myself in processing, pioneering the way, as you very often are. Pioneers fall into ice crevasses and that sort of thing. I've had my share of ice crevasses.

But the basic problem here is that you haven't got any other place to go. That's something for you to remember. That's something to keep in mind.

Some pc says, "I don't know whether I should be processed or not. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha." Huh! That's silly. That's a silly thing. "Whether I should be processed or not."

Well, you see, he in actual fact hasn't got any choice in the matter. He's definitely in trouble. He may tell you he isn't, but he is. And he's trying very hard to survive.

There one time after I wrote the first book I thought there was a dichotomy here. And I thought that it was succumb was the opposite to survive. And it isn't. There isn't any. The trap of this universe is you can't quit.

---
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Now, we've had – we've had a student who arrived over here and he isn't a student, really and he's been playing footsies with the idea that maybe he shouldn't go on course. He thinks maybe he ought to quit. Did you ever try to quit? Let me tell you something. You can't. It's not possible to quit. You'll always rise up again and try again because there isn't anything else you can do.

Now, if you digest that basic datum, "How can a man quit?" – you go back on the track and what do you find? You find he's still trying to fight the Battle of Antietam or something. He's still trying to fight this battle. He has not been able to quit.

You go back a hundred thousand years and he's still trying to play the game of knighthood was in flower. Only right now he's still trying to play this game. He wants to be a gentleman or he wants to treat the ladies nicely or something of that sort. What's this impulse stem from? He's still trying. Well, this game's been over for ages.

In fact the first game of this nature I know is about a hundred trillion years ago. And there's another sort of knighthood-in-flower game earlier on the track than that even. And he hasn't ever quit. Oh, become degraded, become miserable, become bogged down; but he never quit. He can't! Even though he says, "Well, I quit. Well, that's it."

Well, let's take a businessman. And the government officials are all over the shop and all day and all night, every day and so forth, and the tax people and the licensing board and the food surveyors and the this and that-a's, and he's always mixed up in some way or another, and he just can't get the help to go on. And after a while, why, he says, "Well, the hell with it, I'll quit." Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Let him try, let him try.

You know you always can pick up such a person a few months later, and you can ask him whether or not they should have quit. Well, you see, they've had to work twice as hard, because all the papers that had to be filed have now got to be refiled and so forth. And a bankruptcy or something like this is the most overworked activity you can possibly engage in. People come around and they say, "Well, how about this tin of sardines that you didn't sign a receipt for in 1952?" He says, "1952, tin of sardines. Were we even in the sardine business back then?"

"Oh, well, yes. Yes, yes, yes, yes. Well, you'll have to figure that out," and so forth. He can't quit.

You take a box fighter. He has been in there shifting around in the ring and he's gotten himself well up toward the championship, and so on. And then one fine day, why, he loses a fight, so he says, "I'll quit, I'll quit." Only he hasn't got any finance with which to quit. And here he is fooling around trying to quit and he has a few minor fights so he can have enough money to quit, you know. And he has a few other fights so that he can have enough money to quit. Eventually, here he is a sparring partner, you see, for five dollars to go three minutes, or something like that. And he hasn't been able to quit there and eventually there he is walking around in the street with the birds going tweet, tweet, tweet on every side of him, still trying to quit the fight game.

These fellows who quit the war are all very interesting to me. They quit the war. They stopped fighting the war. They stopped, and by God they're still in the war.
Every place a thetan has ever been, he is still trying to be, or trying not to be. But as far as an absolute succumb, this he cannot obtain. And his basic problem on the track is that he can't quit. I say that very advisedly, he is not permitted to quit.

I remember one time pulling a gag on the stellar organization. There's an organization they used to have. You know, they used to have ships on the sea before they had missiles. You probably wouldn't remember that; it's a long time ago. And they had these ships and they went around and shot at each other, that sort of thing. Interesting game. And I finally worked out how to be left alone. I decided I was tired. And day after day, why, I just laid down on the job. I was on a base and I didn't care anything about it, and so forth. And – why, I really got reamed out, I was supposed to be in there every morning and read that bulletin board and that sort of thing. I found out about as close as you can come to quitting and I said... This commander – I mean, he had gold lace and all sorts of things – and he says to me, he says, "You're supposed to be here every morning. You're supposed to read that bulletin board. You're supposed to go out here and muster oh-oh-ah-rruoww, you know, rocks and shoals, perils of the sea."

And I looked at him and I said, "Oh, Commander, it's been a long war."

"Oh," he says, "you can't talk like that. You can't talk like that. Oh, come on now. Well, we can find an easy billet for you and so forth, and be a good boy and so forth, and you can't just quit, you know." And God, after that, why, anything I wanted on the base they let me have because they thought I was about to quit. So all life actually conspires to keep people in there pitching.

Now, a thetan exteriorizes out of some mangled body that has unfortunately got in the road of some scientific achievement and he gets out of the skull and he looks around and he says, "I've quit." Well, he may have quit, but what are you and I doing as auditors finding this guy still exteriorizing, and still trying to quit. I don't care whether – if it was a hundred trillion years ago or otherwise; we find the engram of him doing that. Isn't that interesting?.

Now, engrams – engrams are there to provide methods of survival – methods of survival. There's a long discussion of this in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. He's long since found out that he can't quit so he adapts methods of survival. And these methods of survival are quite interesting. He learns lessons which he instantaneously applies. The one thing he finds out is that life permits him no time to confront. If he were given unlimited time to confront, he could then work out any situation he is likely to encounter. Do you see that? You know that with a reality? If you just had time to confront everything in your environment you would then be able to get yourself enough familiarity with it, in order to handle it.

Well, the one thing which this universe and life omits in the platter of goodies they give you – the one thing they omit – is enough time to confront. That's the main thing – enough time to confront. That's the whole crux of the situation.

Lacking enough time to confront you have to develop instantaneous reaction. Gradually the individual becomes convinced that he no longer has time to confront, so therefore he builds a house which will instantaneously react on given stimuli.
Here's the way this works. Fish swims into an area which has a yellow sand floor and gets bitten. So he just solves the whole problem of being bitten – he hopes, since he can't solve the problem; he didn't have an opportunity to confront it, and he just never seems to get around to having enough time to confront being bitten – that every time he gets over a yellow sand floor he goes away. That is his solution to the problem. Yellow sand floors are dangerous so you don't stay around them, you leave. So he has this engram and he keeps this engram up so that if he doesn't leave over yellow sand floor, if he doesn't leave, he experiences the pain of being bitten. So when he experiences this pain he is reminded that he had better leave, so he gets out of there.

You see that mechanism. That's an engramic mechanism. Then he develops a crazy jerry-rig-built house whereby when he sees a certain stimuli he then replies with a certain response. And you've got a stimulus-response mechanism which is built in in the form of engrams.

Father speaks loudly: drop food on floor. Well, it's a good answer. It sure shut the old man up. He stopped talking about that, didn't he? Huh? So there's a whole little series of pictures here that go along with this and they operate as a stimulus-response basis. It's all survival mechanism. It may not look that way, but it is.

Remember all the data of the service facsimile? The service facsimile was one the fellow used to get out of trouble. This is how he operated. Well, it was very useful, very useful. By observing a certain stimuli he recognizes danger may be present. Lacking the time to adequately confront that danger, he is now placed in a situation by the engram of reacting in some way or feeling the pain of former accidents.

In other words, he sees the stimuli and he gets the response. And he either executes the response or he forces himself instantaneously to execute the response by inflicting upon himself pain – pain, unconsciousness, something like this. There's always... these things are infinite in the number of ways they can be worked out. This is all discussed in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.

Well now, what's this got to do with the GPMs, or a GPM? Well, we're dealing with the engram on a very easily recognized and recognizable level. But the engram is hardly a lock on to an item in the GPM. Every single item in a GPM is to some degree active and the RIs are compulsively active and they all have the same purpose. When confronted by a certain situation, the thing to do in order to survive is the terminal RI. When confronted by the oppterm RI one then assumes the terminal RI. This is survival. One knows what to do.

When confronted with too many loud voices one becomes... or when confronted by a hostile audience, one becomes a cabaret singer. That's the dictates of the RIs.

Well, what about this goal? Well, a thetan was going along minding his own business and he finally found out he couldn't trust himself. That is always the common denominator of the formulation of any pattern such as a GPM, an engram or anything else. The lesson he learns is that he cannot trust himself. He did not have enough time to confront, so therefore he could not properly react. That's elementary. He found out that his efforts in some direction became nullified through an incompetence in himself.
Well now, it's slightly more gruesome than this. That's his first determination before he enters these things. But before he enters that, there's a slightly earlier one. And that is he gets the idea of possession and protection. This is compounded later by using things to create an effect with. But early on he is simply trying to protect what he has. And he protects what he has and eventually he has areas as a thetan, you know, like King of the Wood, talked about in Frazer's *Golden Bough*, so on. He plays this game of King of the Wood and he's protecting the wood, don't you see? And somebody comes along and decides to cut down the wood and he protects the wood.

He's playing a game there of havingness, and havingness is an integral portion of this. And then he finds out he can't trust himself to protect the woods, so he fixes up an automatic mechanism. When confronted with an axman, he becomes a storm, something like that. Opperm, axman; terminal, storm. All right. That's a solution to the situation and he'll put it into effect. He knows that he won't have enough time to confront the situation and analyze it. He's lost trust in himself as an analytical mechanism. He has made mistakes is what he has done, so then he no longer can quite be himself. In other words, he can only continue to be himself as long as he had a reliance upon his own judgment and upon his ability to protect things which he considered his.

Those are the mechanisms on which he is operating. And when he finds out that he cannot trust himself, he has made a mistake. He then, as a being, himself, a thetan, tends to degrade and tends to become some other thing. And these, then, are repeated over and over with – that is to say, his disasters are repeated over and over with consecutive removals.

Here you have the individual himself, right here. Now, here he is. And as himself he is being perfectly happy here, he's – so on – got a nice halo and so on. He's just a happy thetan and he's not bothering anybody particularly – so on. Somebody comes along and they say to him, "That halo looks silly."

And he says, "Well, it's worn by all the very best saints," and so forth.

And they say, "It's still silly."

And he says, "Well," he says, "I'm – I'm – got a perfect right. I have a perfect right to wear this halo." And he gets mixed up in a glare fight of some kind or another and so on. And instead of being himself, here, totally capable of having a halo or not-halo, he becomes fixedly – he becomes fixedly an identity: a thetan with a halo confronted by a critic. So a critic; here appears a critic. When confronted by a critic he becomes a thetan with a halo.

Now, he's had some wins this way, don't you see? He's had some wins this way. He finally manages to spread the word around that thetans with halos are actually – are actually the chosen of the big thetan. And the critics are actually daring the wrath of the big thetan if they criticize thetans with halos. He's had to then adopt a secondary thing over here which is an imagined force or an imagined power.

But, he's now an identity. That's an item. He's no longer, actually... feels safe as just himself. See, he's protecting the havingness of the halo and he is (quote) "a thetan with a halo" (unquote).
Well, that'd be some kind of a way backtrack sort of a glare fight area thing and we wouldn't have any GPMs yet. But he finds out through many encounters of this character, he finds out that, eventually, that he had better have a purpose in life. And that is about the first identity that he assumes that he never really gets rid of. And the common denominator of all thetans who have ceased to trust themselves is a thetan with a purpose. It is easier to survive with a purpose, he thinks, and he's got this all worked out, but he's always a thetan with a purpose. Therefore he never becomes himself. He never becomes himself. He's always a thetan with a purpose.

What is this purpose? Well, it's any postulated action which he feels will get him out of the trouble he's been in. That is his purpose. And one of these purposes is characterized just that way. It's a postulated purpose which will get him out of the trouble which he has been in.

Now, I covered that briefly. I said here he was, and one day he mocked up a halo and somebody — somebody criticized it and so forth. Well, eventually, eventually, he will have a goal "to be godly." He's now a thetan, not only with a halo, but he'll have a purpose.

Of course, this is way back. Later on he gets this idea of having a purpose, and he'd better have a purpose or else. That's the thing, to have a purpose or else. So he says — about the time he adopts God here — he says "to be holy" or "to be a holy person" or something of that sort.

Well, "to be holy," this is perfectly all right. There's nothing wrong with this, but in the process of "to be holy" he starts out as a thetan with a purpose. There he is, he's a thetan with a purpose. All right. That's fine.

Now, what's his next action? Is to assert the purpose. He's doing this all for survival, don't you see? He's already learned the lesson that he can't trust himself. He's already learned the lesson that he had better protect things and he's already learned the lesson that the real way to survive is to have a purpose. So here he is, thetan with a purpose.

Now let's take our next progressive action here and he isn't a thetan who has a purpose, he's a thetan who is a purpose. Now, this we just have as the stated purpose. This'll just be the purpose here "to be holy."

But this, by the way, will be an all-dominating thing, and he'll call this "the goal to be holy." Now, this becomes the thing, you see. That's becoming more — more important than he is. And now let's take it one more stage — one more stage here — and we've got a purpose and then we also have him as somebody. "Somebody with the goal to be holy" or "somebody who wanted to be holy," something like this, and we get the first three stages of evolution of a goal.

First it's just the goal. You see, it — all by itself, it's just the stated postulate. And then the postulate gets a little more massy and becomes, "the goal to..." And then — gets a little more massy, "somebody with the goal to...," you see. And that succeeds in every case. There is no variation from this.

Now, he goes further than that. And as he goes up the line here, he eventually finds himself in a very fine state of affairs. Let's take it the way you find it.
Here's a purpose and over here some kind of a provocation and here is the goal, stated as the goal – purpose, you know; "the goal to..." That has some kind of an opposition. And then over here, here is, "somebody with the goal to..." and more opposition. And then, so on, and then so on, and then here he is, his terminal lines, don't you see. Well, a lot of these things – but when we look this over we find out that he is down here, he's down here, and that's just the stated purpose. And then it becomes "the goal to..." and then "somebody with the goal to..." And now look, if this is holy, this will be "a holy person," see? The purpose is now getting more and more massive, don't you see? It's interiorizing more and more.

In other words, the more he conflicts with these things over here – these opposition terminals which are the difficulties he finds in life – the more he conflicts with these things, why, the more massive he himself becomes and then of course conflicts with something else and then the more massive he becomes, and then he conflicts with something else and the more massive he becomes. He conflicts with something else, don't you see? And then to assert that he becomes more massive like this, and there he goes, you see. Rather fascinating the way this thing winds itself up along the line.

In other words, he's asserting this same thing based on the fact that he can't trust himself, based on the fact that he wants to protect or defend something or to survive in general, and based also on the fact that he can't quit.

Now, he gets up the line here and... well, "a holy person," you see. And now he's liable to go into some postulate character like this. He's "being holy." You see? He can't quite be a "holy person," but he's "being holy."

Well, that's fine, that's fine. Now, what's our – what's our evolution up here at the top, as we get into the top of this thing? Here he is "being holy," and what he's confronting here, what he's confronting, you see, is "critics" was the first one, you see. And then "critical people" was the next one. And when we get up here, why, we'd say "sneering, overwhelming people." And then over here, see, this is "being holy" – in sequence to the other one that we just had – this is "being holy." And over here are "critical church people."

Oooh, what's this? Well, his purpose is beginning to cross over here, don't you see. Is – he's getting a cross-over purpose. So he's – now he's got, "critical church people," you see. Waah, what's this? Golly, he's now fighting, "critical church people," so what you resist you tend to become. And he gets up here and he's got here a new identity which is a crusader. Well, that's not quite a holy man, you know, that's somebody who fights.

And over here – over here he's got, "religious bishops who excommunicate," or "excommunicators" or something of the sort. And now as we go on up he finally gets to these top terminals and here you have him being "a critical thetan." That's "a critical thetan," see, and then over here what do we find? We find "holy people." You see the evolution of what he did there, see. And here we have "a critical thetan."

Now, what have we got? What are we looking at? We're looking at the bottom-to-the-top proposition. We're looking at a situation here where the individual is being called on to defend mass. He postulates himself new identities in order to do this. He can't trust himself, so he has to postulate these new identities to keep it going. And of course he starts in fighting
critics and he gradually mingles his identity until the whole thing crosses over and changes over.

Well, what do you know? This is still a survival situation, just as the bottom of the thing was a survival situation.

How did you handle a critic? That was his problem. And he solved it by becoming a holy person and he winds up here fighting holy people.

Now, there is the course of existence as far as he's concerned. To some degree he becomes these, too, don't you see? So he's less and less his goal, and more and more the enemy becomes his goal.

Now, you ask, in running off goals you say, "All right" – here's opponent – "What would be the goal of holy people?" See? And he'd say "to be holy." Bang. and you'd get the thetan's goal. You ask, "What would be the goal of a critical thetan?" He'd say "to be critical." And it won't check out because that's actually the goal of the opponent throughout.

Now, this is very interesting. These things contain... I haven't drawn the complete number of items which are actually to be found in one of these GPMs, whatever it is, twenty, thirty, forty. And it all takes... how long it takes them to graduate, you see. And here he goes right up to the top.

Now, when he gets here he's got a new problem, he's got a new problem. He no longer considers this a survival activity. This he doesn't like. It's a violation of his own purposes. So he has to do something new, and this becomes extremely important to him.

Here's the bottom of one of these – here's the same two that you just saw. Here's "holy people," right here, and here's "a critical thetan." This game is worn out. This game is worn out. The old game, you see, that's gone. That's gone. He's not got anything more to do with this.

How do you get out of a spot like that? How do you get out of a spot of being "a critical thetan?" Well, you do it by postulating – you go into a sort of a blank area and you say, "I'm completely lost now. I haven't got a goal. It's all gone." Get into this blank area – you've still got, however, over here, "holy people."

How do you handle these dogs? Not as a "critical thetan," that's all unsuccessful and he feels pretty degraded. No, he's got to postulate a new goal. A new goal has got to be postulated here which handles these "holy people."

How are you going to postulate this goal? Well, you just up and postulate it. But you see postulating and insisting upon is quite interesting. You don't just sit off – you've got – probably got an idea of a thetan sitting off in space, in the blackness of space saying, "Oh, I think I will postulate a goal. Yes, 'to be a good boy.' Yes, that's what I'll do. All right. Now, that's postulated."

No, man, that isn't the way that goal is postulated. That goal is postulated something on this order, see: He says, "It's gone. I just feel like the devil, you know. And everything's gone to pieces here. And these confounded 'holy people.' God! What are you going to do about them? There's only one thing that would work, I'm sure, only one thing that would
work, only one thing that would work. *Haarrrrrrrrrrrrr!* To be a devil. *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.* That would work. Yes, yes, yes. I think ... I think I'll try it out tentatively."

"Well, how are you today father? You probably don't recognize me. I'm a devil."

Oh, holy people say, "Eeek! God almighty."

"Oh," he says, "that's terrific." He says, "That'll handle them." So he says, "To be a devil. All right, that'll handle it. *To be a devil. To be a devil. To be a devil.* I'm going to be a devil. *I'm going to be a devil, a devil. Now, you got that now? You hear me now? Me, you know. Listen! I'm going to be a devil, a devil, a devil. *Rrrrr-rrrr. I'm going to be a devil.* I've got to concentrate on that, you see. *To be a devil, that's the thing to be. Brrrrrr.*"

Finally – finally, "That's pretty good, you know, that's pretty good, and it handles this. There, it handled it." And he finds he's now the enemy of "good people."

He's got a new enemy. He handled these "holy people" but now all the "good people" in the community turn on him as a man and they say, "Oh, oh. *He's a devil. Ho-ho-ho.*" And he recognizes these are good people so he begins to detest good people. So he dramatizes this one. And of course he has to become "the goal to be a devil" and he runs into "self-righteous people," and then of course he has to be much more – more mass involved in the thing. And he's got to say, "I am somebody who is a 'somebody with the goal to be a devil.' That's who I am. I'm somebody with a goal to be a devil, who else I am, that – that's me, somebody with the goal to be a devil. I mustn't forget that." And of course runs square into "inquisitors." And there we go again. And what does he finally wind up at the top of the next bank? (Just amputating this.) Winds up at the top of the next bank "devilish people – a good thetan."

You see how this goes? It's his effort to survive. You don't even have to mild it up to the point of saying, "the effort to have a game." You understand? It is frankly, very correct, that at the bottom of this bank it is a violent effort to survive. He's finished. He's absolutely finished at this point. He's a critical thetan. He hates himself. He is faced by holy people; he can't stand that. It's an intolerable pair, so he postulates himself a brand-new goal.

Now, how come thetans do this? How come they do this time after time after time with such great regularity? How do they do this? Why do they always do the same thing? Well, they are faced with exactly the same problems.

The problems are identical. You have the problems of this universe; you have the problems of formulation of MEST and mass, matter, energy, space and time; you have the thetan's effort to cope with this situation; you have a common denominator that he actually can't quit; you have a common denominator that he will wind up not being able to trust himself; you have the common denominator that he inevitably will try to protect some of this MEST and as a result he winds up with the identical solutions.

And it actually rattles off on a whole set of axioms. These axioms are unwritten at the moment, but they are a whole set of axioms like the MEST universe axioms. And they consist of now-I'm-supposed-to's or laws. And he actually forms his GPM by law. And that law is all
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agreed upon and... at any time that it's this and that. Actually they are very simple laws and they are based on the very elements which I gave you earlier in the lecture.

Now, that's how that GPM parades. To some degree, you see, each time, he becomes "holy people." To some degree he becomes here, "good people." To some degree he becomes, in each case, the opposition terminal. So when he's finally through – when he's finally through this mess and mass and potpourri – we have you, and actually have me. And when we start going on the backtrack, what do we run into? We run into the top of the bank (or we should), and we find the thetan in his most degraded form opposing an exalted opposition terminal. And then by opposition we go on down through and we finally come down to the bottom and in every case you find "somebody with the goal to be a devil." Some... you'll find "somebody with the goal to be a devil" or "somebody who wanted to be a devil." You'll find in every case an item down here which will be "the goal to be a devil." In every case you will find right here "to be a devil." That's inevitable.

Over here you get variation. This is variety at the bottom of the bank. You say, "Well, listing these things out, if the pc knew they were there he could simply put them on the list." Yes, pcs who know they are there put them on the list. But the trick is just this – if you're not overlisting madly – the one that belongs in the position will fire.

Let us say at this position of the bank we've got an item here, "a devilish fellow," see. This is this item here, that's "a devilish fellow." All right. And the pc says, "Well, let's get down to the bottom of this thing and get the show on the road and let's put 'to be a devil' on the list," see. Well, he'll also, of course, list "a devilish fellow," and he'll list two or three other things. And he'll also list "to be a devil." And it won't fire. What'll fire on your short list is "a devilish fellow."

All right. Very well and good. Our next action in here when we come down, the pc says, "Well, I – I – I know what this would be. I know what this would be, this is obviously 'somebody or something who wanted to be a devil.' That's obviously that." So he puts that and two or three other things on the list. And if he, at that same time put on "the goal to be a devil," and "to be a devil," on the same list, only the one in sequence will fire.

You're saved from this embarrassment. We don't care how he... well he knows the bottom of the bank. In fact, I'd prefer him to know that there are three down there at the bottom of the bank. When he puts them on the list, if he's way up here somewhere, "a devilish fellow," they just don't fire. You say, "Well, that's the goal. Of course that will fire." No, the goal won't fire as an RI when expressed as an RI with... if it's not in proper sequence.

In other words, it will come out by 3M\(^9\) correctly unless you are overlisting. But that's what occurs on the bottom of a bank. And there's a border between these two banks like that, and you actually go over the border of the banks. Well, it's – they're two different GPMs. They exist as great big black masses all in their own right, which is a compounded squeeze-together of all of these items I've been talking about. In other words, one goal, one black mass.

---
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Well, what happens – what happens if you have four or five goals all jammed together? No, they still come apart – one goal, one black mass; one item, one black mass; one... inside the goal but part of the black mass. In other words, every GPM is a black mass. And the GPMs, if they're apart or separate or stuck together or anything else, constitute what looks at first glance like a mass; but as the pc begins to run them his perception picks up, he begins to recognize one mass from another mass. Quite interesting.

Well, why are they so burned down? Why are they so black? Well, it's just that he's exhausted all the energy out of them, that's all. You'll find he'll still dramatize these things. They are apparently moving on forward into present time and always under formation. He's always in some stage or another of the GPM in its formation. He's always forming the top of it, but he also very often dramatizes that which has gone yesterday.

You see, he couldn't quit, so he's just as likely to use this goal of his, "to be holy," in some given circumstance. Well, he goes into a church and all of a sudden he's restimulated. He feels kind of weird and kind of sick, but he's restimulated. He goes into this church and at first he – well, let's say he starts to church as a career. And, oh, he gets along all right. He goes to church for a little while, he goes a lot – a lot of Sundays, a year or two, or something like that and one day he starts to feel kind of sick. He gets into the – sits down in the pew, and he starts to feel kind of sick. And he looks around and suddenly he realizes that that priest is pretty critical, pretty critical of him. Or maybe the priest did say a critical thing. And he's all set, you see.

And the next thing you know, why, he gets this horrible feeling that he had better do something devilish. Inexplicable. All of a sudden he does something devilish. In other words, he just picked up an old area in an old GPM – was restimulated momentarily – he lived through it, did its responses and so forth.

Why? Because it's the now-I'm-supposed-to. He's got a whole system of now-I'm-supposed-to's. And these now-I'm-supposed-to's routinely will give him the right answers and the right responses for any given condition instantaneously without further inspection on his part. He just knows what to do, man, and then he will survive. The only trouble is these things have never been very survival and formulated to match the times of Charlemagne, they don't go very well in the days of Khrushchev. They don't match anymore.

"I know what I'm supposed to do – a swordsman. Ha-ha. Golly, ain't nobody wielded a sword for a long time." He feels sort of out of place. He feels upset. He is faced with something and it says to him that he must be a swordsman, but, thhuh, he can't make it. He goes and reads books about sword collections. That's about as close as he can come to it. The more he reads, the more he's got to read. The more he reads the sicker he gets, but he's still got to read these books about sword collections. But he's in an interplay here of the universe around him and these things still have survival answers.

This girl is faced by a loud man and she knows what to be. She knows what to be – a cabaret singer. And she goes ahead and tries to be a cabaret singer and fails at it most gorgeously. Whereas the girl could probably be an opera singer with no difficulty at all. The one – see, opera singer, that isn't – wasn't going to be very upsetting. But a cabaret singer – oh-ho-ho-ho, that's the thing she's got to be and can't make.
You'll find people all the time trying to do things that they can't do, whereas they can
do something superior to them superiorly and won't do it. That's one of the puzzles of human
behavior. Well, those puzzles of human behavior are contained in this.

You can explain these things by engrams for the excellent reason that that which sticks
and has a command value in an engram is actually one of these GPM items underneath the
engram kicking in. And when you ran the engram you actually ran it off the top of the GPM
item and it didn't trouble the pc. Old repeater technique, or something like that will as likely
as not, as often as not, key the thing out and free it.

This is why processes have worked where they have worked, and also why they have-
n't worked where they haven't worked. Because these items here, the fellow has lived. He's
lived those things with ferocity. Those goals haven't just been, "Well, I now think I will put a
goal in 'to be a devil.' Yes, I think I will postulate that. All right, 'to be a devil.' That's postu-
lated." Ah, God no, man. He worked at the postulation of this goal day in and day out, week in
and week out, year in and year out. And he just got it so it would stick. Never, never again is
he going to be caught in any such situation as into be holy. Never. Never. "To be a devil.
That's the thing to be, to be a devil. Now, you hear me now; you hear me now. Now, listen –
to be a devil," and so on. This is to... in other words, he trains himself into the thing. And then
of course he inevitably gets its enemies and then he partakes of those enemies, and then he
partakes of those and those and those and finally this thing betrays him and he can no longer
have that goal or basic purpose.

A thetan has a basic purpose – a thetan has a basic purpose when a thetan can no
longer trust himself after trying to protect something in the physical universe. That gives him
a system of goals and out of that system of goals you give him the piled up system of items
which you get in a GPM.

When a GPM fails to survive anymore – I mean, to serve anymore as a survival
mechanism – when the GPM fails our next immediate action after that is to create a new goal
and to go the limit on it as long as it is useful. And is... when that one wears out and one is no
longer able to see anything in it but a totally degraded form, to achieve the next – to postulate
the next goal to solve the GPM that's just past. So we just have nothing but a solution to a
solution to a solution to a solution. In other words, the cures become the illness.

Now we go back and look over this situation, and we find out that the reason this fel-
low can't stand this universe, can't stand closed places, can't stand anything in a dress, can't
stand this and can't stand that and yet can't stay away from them is because of this goal "to be
holy." And the reason he can't do that, of course, is because he's got a goal "to be a devil."

I'm sorry, if anybody has these actual goals I'm sure they will be found. I'm not using
synthetic goals in this lecture. But there's the whole mechanism. There's the whole mechanism
of the GPM. There's why it exists. There's how it evolves, and so on. It is far simpler than you
would believe.

Now, when you realize – I said why they were black – when you realize that this item
here, the "goal to be a devil," may very well consist of lifetimes, each lifetime having a full
array of pictures, and that that has all been burned down and charred to nothing but cinder by
the hammer and pound of existence, you'll see why it's a black lump and you'll see why the
GPM is a black lump. Actually, the GPM is a lump of burned up residue, but its postulates are still there, the charge is still in it, and it still separates and it still squares away.

Now, as you recognize, an individual has gone through a great many very weird and terrible adventures on the course of postulating a goal and becoming the various items in the G... in a GPM. And you recognize also that he has been through GPM after GPM after GPM in order to get where he is today, and so on. And he's got a lot of overts, and he's got a lot of difficulties on the backtrack and he's having a lot of difficulties in present time – that it is not easy, it is not easy to find the goal, to find the top item, to go back on exactly the right number of items and to walk all the way through the GPM, to never skip, to never jump out into another GPM, to get down to the bottom of the GPM and list it out and find your next goal, and so forth. None of this, none of this could be considered to be easy. It isn't easy. But oddly enough, these GPMs are so much a carbon copy, one to the next, from pc to pc, they only vary in the significance of the goal and the significance of the items. They don't vary in the pattern of the goal.

You'll find the person's goal there and you'll find the – the item, "the goal to be a devil," or "the goal to catch catfish," or "the goal to be a tiger." "Somebody or something who wanted to be a tiger" – you'll find that there. You'll find out up here "a tigerish person" or "a devil" or something like that. And we go up the line and we get up to the top of the thing, we inevitably find in this column of terminals, we find "a saint," something like that. "A saintly person," something. It's totally reversed from the situation.

We find out that the similarity of items in this GPM here, well, let's say we have an item "people who care for nothing." Notings pile up more than anything else. We have "people who care for nothing" as an oppterm here. And down in "the goal to be good," "people who give up nothing" or something. And those two items are liable to collapse one on the other. And because they're liable to collapse one on the other the GPMs bang.

In other words, very similar items sometimes group. And you'll be auditing along minding your own business and all of a sudden the pc will go whoop, or whoop, or urp, and so on, and he'll have felt a couple of GPMs smashed together.

You'll have excited – through some wrong listing, or something of the sort – you'll have excited a similar item in another GPM and have collapsed it on.

Well, all this is avoided – the randomity is avoided – by being particularly careful to get the items that belong in sequence in sequence. And that is normally done by not overlisting on an RI oppose list and not underlisting on a source list. There's nothing much to it. You can even find on the last R... the goal as an RI oppose is a source list and you can even find the next goal on that if that last source list from here down into this bank is completed.

There's all kinds of mechanical arrangements here and we haven't even really begun to exhaust the number of possibilities that you could do to get a GPM. It very possibly is not necessary to do a goal oppose terminal to get this top GPM up here. You just say, "All right. Tell me an item, who or what would be the least likely to have the goal 'to be a devil'." And
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the guy says, "a saintly person." It RRs and you put it in as a beginning terminal line. I mean these things – these possibilities are great, but they are – are mostly assistive in recovery. If you do the goal right in the first place you don't run into these things.

And then there's the admonition that in actual fact you should make a Clear before you try to make an OT. You'll find auditors will go on at a fantastic rate of speed GPM after GPM and they never clean up the GPM they're in and they never look for these various items. They don't try to get the pc. They don't – they find something still ticking so they just list it further. They don't go back and patch it up. They don't try to find any of these bypassed items. They don't try to get these bottom items in the goal line. They don't try to neat this thing up before they go along. As a result you've got three or four or five GPMs alive and they frankly are maybe not as easy to patch up as it would have been if you had just patched up one and done it right in the first place. You haven't lost any time. You can patch these things up. You can take care of them.

The way to take care of them best, however, is to know the anatomy of the GPM. To know what you expect to find in the pc. Not go on expecting that every pc is different, that every pc is going to have a different pattern, that all of these things are going to be so difficult, and so on.

Well, I saw a GPM just today which – well, I won't try to quote the items out of it, but it's something like this, the goal "to be a lady," and the first oppterm, "a steam locomotive," and the first terminal, "astronomy." Well, come out of it. I mean, how does this relate? The auditor has banged off into three different GPMs. He's got a goal for something, but he hasn't got any terminals for anything. In other words, he's very dispersed on the thing.

No, if you know, you get experience as to what these are all about and you know what the thing should look like and you know whether you're right or not and you know how this thing should add up, you'll all of a sudden become aware of the fact you've skipped something – both by the pc's ARC break and behavior and so forth, and because you can't go on, and for other reasons; but also because you just know your stuff on the anatomy of a GPM.

The easiest way to run a GPM is know what you're running. I've given you the picture of the GPM, its basis, modus operandi and repetitive characteristics of the GPM. If you know these things quite well you won't have too much trouble clearing anybody.

How many GPMs are there? I don't know. You've sure been around long enough. I can hear you now on Marcab and on this place and in that age and that age. "All right. So that's failed. So I can no longer be a holy person, and so forth. I'm going to be a devil. Yes, to be a devil. Now, listen carefully, to be..." You know? You've been doing it for a long time.

I don't know how many GPMs you'll cook up in somebody. I'd say the more complicated the GPM first found sounds as a goal, the more GPMs there are in the bank. I think you'll find out that's a working rule. If the first one – the first goal you find of a person is "to be somebody who plays a pipe on various clouds and looks sad," I think you've got an awful lot of GPMs in the bank.

There's the other factor. The first GPM you encounter is sometimes truncated there, so you just have a new thetan, he looks like. His behavior will be very brash. Next one will be
truncated up here someplace and he'll be a conservative. He'll be backing up the conservative. And up here someplace it just happens to be where you find him in that GPM. And you get him up here at the top ranks of the thing, he will inevitably be a beatnik.

It's funny how coincidentally we have so many people who are just winding up their banks in this present society at this particular time. But remember we also have the new ones.

So that we have somebody cycling down the track. At some time we'll have the fellow being a great success. Well, he's in this part of the bank, the lower part. He'll be a rather conservative mediocre. He's in this part of the bank. And we'll have somebody very degraded. He'll be in this part of the bank. Actually his current conduct depends to a large extent on where he sits in his first GPM.

All right. Well, that's all the data I had for you on the subject. I hope it'll do you a lot of good. I know it's been very difficult to dig the stuff up and get it hinged together and make sense and get processes that make it work. But we're at this point and the information is there and it is stable and it's yours.

Thank you very much. Thank you. Good night.
Well, how are you today? Let's see if you're there. How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

All right.

All right, this is what? This is the 2nd of April, or the 3rd? Or the 5th? The 2nd of April AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have a lot of material here for you today.

But the first thing I'd like to show you is the prototype of the new listing meter. A listing meter. And been designing this, and Fowler and Allen have been throwing the nuts, bolts and electrodes together, and here we have the item. The item. Interesting, huh? There's a new listing meter here, huh?

Well, what's this all about? What's this all about? Well, I'll show you a better picture here on the other screen. There is a listing meter. Now, it goes this side down, as you list on the paper, it goes that side down, and you've got two panes of glass. Here, and here, and you've got your needle across here, and you've got two rows of dots. See the two rows of dots, there? See them? Now those, of course, are closest to the paper, and it actually fits at about that angle. And it's on a little s... little stick, here. See this little stick? And it tips like this. You can see it – see, it tips over here. The cans – the cans go on here, and they plug in over here to the side like that, and your wheel – your wheel, see – is back here. Back. See, the back side, and the tone arm reads are inside the dial there.

And so you get your needle action and your tone arm reads, and as you put it down here, you take a pencil, and you put your list underneath this glass. You see, this thing is hanging up like this and you actually rotate your tone arm over here, with your finger, and you go on and list, and of course as you look at your paper you are looking through the two glasses at the dial, don't you see? So as you list, if that needle twigs, ticks, rocket reads, rock slams or anything else, you of course see it without moving your eyeballs any off of what you are writing immediately below it. Don't you see that? See?

To show you the position – there's your paper, there's your pencil, and you look down through there and you see exactly what you're writing, so that you get something like this, don't you see. And you see that through there, and of course you can see your needle, your needle swings back and forth across that check mark. Pretty good, huh? That is the new listing meter. That is a prototype of this. And this does not replace the Mark V. This is a cheap meter. This is a very, very cheap meter, and it's skinned down, and it only has two sensitivities, and you skin this thing down to a very elementary meter design and elementary parts. And it doesn't cost very much money.
Now, the reason why it doesn't cost very much money is it's not good enough, you know, to put good close rudiments in or do sec checking or something like that. It's pretty good though, by the way. Only a Mark V will do something like that. But it's actually good enough for a co-audit to put in rudiments with. And you actually, because these things are cheap, you could have a lot of them for co-audit. You wouldn't want to buy a whole bunch of Mark Vs for a co-audit, they'd beat them up something terrible. No, what you want is a bunch of these listing meters. The price of this has not been released at this particular time, it's going into production as soon as I put in 12, 14 hours of auditing with the meter, and take any little refinements and so forth that need to be done, and there we go.

Now, this is all very interesting, but what does this do to the Mark V? Well, it doesn't do a thing to the Mark V. You need that for various things, and this is sufficiently cheap that you just put it in as part of your kit. You would also want a Mark V to audit with, man, particularly if you're security checking.

My idea was – a Mark V, you know, is quite expensive because the components in it are fixed to go forever and all that sort of thing. And that's the modern Mark V, it has really been groomed in that way. But this listing meter – so some co-audit member has an ARC break and busts one of them over somebody's head, well, you charge him the price of it or something like that, then. He isn't ARC broke. Mark V, you'd weep, man!

But you could buy – you see, you... they should have – if you're running a co-audit, you should have one of these listing meters for every team. That is, if you've got 30 people you need 15 listing meters if that's the way you're going to do it. And of course that's an awful outlay. So I've been laying it on here to get a real cheap meter that was beautifully designed, but basically one that would do a power of good as far as listing is concerned so that you wouldn't miss reads and wouldn't give yourself any agitation or anything like that.

Well, that's a – that's enough of the commercial here. The situation with regard to meters is pretty good. The US government, by the way, is sort of running up the white flag over in the States on that thing. That's confidential but I could tell you because I know you won't tell anybody. It'd be very shameful, you know, if the government had to quit. They apparently are.

Okay. Now today's lecture concerns the GPM and is consecutive to the last lecture which I gave you on the subject of the GPM. What do we mean by GPM? It is the Goals Problem Mass. Now you can call it – a GPM is a Goal Problem Mass. Sequitur. G, P, M – Goal, Problem, Mass. Pc postulates a goal, this gives him problems and he accumulates mass. And when he's accumulated so much mass and this thing has gone on and on and it's all worn out, and it's deteriorated in meaning, why, he postulates another goal and he gets another problem series, and he gets another mass.

Now, the whole thing was originally detected, by the fact that the only thing that would keep a pc from progressing in an auditing session was if he had a present time problem. I deduced from that, that there must be something very weird about problems. And I kept studying problems until I eventually had this drop out of the hamper. The whole existence of the GPM was deduced. It was deduced in its entirety, before anybody ever saw one. Which I
think is quite interesting, because it is a considerable triumph for research to have the thing actually exist.

Now nobody's trying to foist this thing off on you. If you don't have one – if you don't have one, why, you're pretty lucky. Also, you're not human. But anyhow, the GPM was a deduced mechanism, and it's on this basis which you find back in 1950 and forward – I don't think this definition existed till about 55. But it was postulate-counter-postulate. In other words, you cannot have a problem unless two people or two things have two opposing postulates or ideas. And then you get a problem.

A problem is of a dual nature. It has a duality, a problem does. And you have this expressed in the GPM as the terminal – which means the pc – and the oppterm – which means the enemy.

Now why are these things expressed? You very often will find a proper name. Actually, your name will undoubtedly rocket read in present time when you get to the top of your GPM. I had the rather horrifying experience, just last night, of having my own name rocket read like mad when we had approached it, and in actual fact suddenly greeted present time. I hadn't seen present time for some time, and it was terribly unfamiliar and so on, and I didn't like it very much. But the pc's present time would be the top of his forming GPM. That's his present time. Now actually, he slides up and down this to some slight degree. He becomes his last life, or this life, and he postulates his next life, sort of, and in postulating his next life, or one hoping, you know, what he's going to become or afraid of what he might become, he tends to have an element slightly into the future of the MEST universe present time.

So the GPM that comes right on up to present time, MEST universe, but may exceed it somewhat, or may not quite reach it, because the pc has his own present time as regulated by the Goal Problem Mass in which he is situated. The top of that would be his present time and anything back from the top of that would be his past.

Now, you get the oddity that a pc could be in his own past, and you'll find this is rather uniform and consistent. Now we've known this for years. The whole book Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health talks about engrams and somebody being stuck on the time track. Well, that's a pc in his own past. You see, that's a time track and that's his time track. And it's quite different than the MEST universe time track. It parallels it and it approximates it, but it doesn't answer up point for point with the MEST universe.

In other words, you can be a little bit ahead of present time in the MEST universe, you can be a little bit behind present time in the MEST universe with the top of the GPM, and then the pc isn't necessarily at the top of his own GPM. In other words, he got tired forming this thing, and for this half a lifetime or something like that he's skidded and he's using a slightly earlier item. Of course, he's still forming the GPM. But it's a sloppy thing.

I'll give you an idea here. Here's – here's MEST universe present time, you see. Now, the pc's GPM in which he is situated might be just a little bit forward of this present time because he wants to become a cowboy in his next life. That's not his goal, that's just an ambition stemming from the goal "to be active." And he says, "Well, this lifetime, that's too tough," and he doesn't want anything much to do with it, he's being a, bwahhh, something or other. He's up – he's up here. He said, "I'm going to be a cowboy, see, in my next life," and he hasn't be-
come a cowboy, but he... actually you'll find a little item up here, "cowboy." You got that? He's already forming the next item that will become a good sound terminal. And you will find it and it will run.

In other words, the pc – pc's GPM extends up with his hope and this rather tends to make somebody believe that the GPM was all formed 200 trillion years ago, and he's just living along this track. Well, that's irresponsibility to end all irresponsibility. I was looking at that the other night.

In other words, here he is in PT and he's John Doe. There he is as John Doe, and John Doe particularly – it's a goal "to be active" – and he particularly detests – because of the goal and so forth – active people. See, in other words, he was active down here. But now he's become more sedentary, and here's this oppterem, now, the goal has finally turned around on him, he's getting ready to leave this GPM. And John Doe, and he doesn't like active people.

So this one over here is an idea called "active people." Now this is how a thetan doesn't have to think. This is sloppy thinking to end all sloppy thinking. Brother, you've really taken the cake, the prize, the croix de guerre, all possible decorations for sloppy thinking. Because what you did was instead of having to analyze "Bill is an active person, Joe is an active person, August is an active person, and therefore antipathetic to me because I don't like my goal anymore, which is clear down here in the bottom of all this," we say, here – we just say "active people." And then that makes a group summary. That is the big think. That tells you that people who think in terms of "the people" – no individuals, "the people" – they're nuts, you know. They're nuts. Including Khrushchev.

I don't think I'd audit Khrushchev if he asked me to, because I think he'd be too nuts. He believes in a thing called "the people," which means he's dramatizing one of these things and it has nothing to do with people. This is the sloppy think, do you understand? The sloppy think. We don't want to have to think about Pete, we don't want to have to think about Gillham, we don't want to have to think about George, so we just think about "people," see, or "men."

You've seen girls like this. You've made a pass at some girl sometime or another – not any of you of course – but you made a pass at some girl or another, and she said, "All men are alike." Actually, this is taken up in Book One. It's quite interesting that we had it so pat. "All men are alike." And you say, "Huh!"

Actually, she's got something over here – "men." See? Now this doesn't – doesn't make it necessary – remember what I told you about confront in the last lecture? Well, this doesn't make it necessary to confront anything, don't you see, so that she can then just group classify anything that wears pants as men. And one of you girls comes up with a pedal pusher and you're just like all other men, you see. You're wearing pedal pushers or something like that, slacks, you know. Well, you wear pants, so you're a man. And she never looks to find out if you're a man or a woman, she says, "All men are alike and therefore you're brutal."

Now, somewhere around here we're going to have another one called "brutal people," see. We don't have to confront anything, we don't have to find out anything about people, we don't have to do anything else. If people are people, they're brutal people. You see the idea?
We don't have to differentiate at all. So this is why we get A=A=A as such a dominant character of the reactive mind, and this carries through forward to time. I have said advisedly that the thetan is on his own time track, just as time, but in actual fact the more he lives this thing, the more he group thinks. In other words, he – that means a different thing in advertising, it means – it means a number of high-paid executives sitting around getting no ideas, and that's group think. And that's not what I mean.

Classification. He thinks by classes. He doesn't think in terms of Bill or Pete or anything. So he thinks of time that way. So that all time becomes a time. And every time is instantaneous time so in actual fact as you run the fellow back he can't tell if it's yesterday or today or tomorrow or anything. He's got all time classified. Just as he has this whole item here, let us say, it is "all men are alike," see, and that's just "Men," you know, why, we've got another – other items which similarly group everything that has anything to do with the goal.

He just says, "Well, that's – belongs to a certain class of things, so therefore that's all that and I don't have to inspect that." And actually he's against it, because he is being this thing here which is against that class, so he is a class and he is against a class and there are no individuations and that carries through and forward to time.

So there is no individuated time in the GPM. It's quite interesting. It all seems like right now. You go back a hundred trillion years and you may have track with pictures on it which parallels this which is hanging outside the GPM and you say, "Oh, yeah, that was a hundred trillion years ago. It seems – well, it seems a long time ago." You're looking at this picture. The second you get into this thing called "ladies of the court," see, that's an item in the GPM. Here would be "ladies of the court," see. And here it is, actually, oh, back here ages ago, a hundred trillion years ago, see. And it seems like it's right here. Right here, right now. Right here, right now. "Ladies of the court" has no time differentiation. That's because there is no differentiation in these things.

In other words, these items are "men" versus "women," you see? And one item includes all men, and the other item will include all women. And a thetan just says, "Well, we don't have to think about this, the best thing to do is just to realize that bricklayers are bad people."

Well, anybody then could be classified who was bad people, would be a bricklayer. He thinks so, too. You know? He'll get a twinge. They're bad people, they must lay bricks, you know? It's true. But that's the non-think-characteristic because there's no confront connected with it. There's havingness without a confront. And you get a havingness without a confront, you get this type of classification. You understand?

So therefore, as you come up the bank, as you come up the bank, these items successively entered into, formed and so forth, are usually postulated from the past into the future like this, see. Here he is now, and here he goes into the future, and he thinks "I'd like to be a cowboy." See, "active people." So everything's going to become cowboys up here. But he hasn't entered that, so it's not really nicely heavily formed. There's not much mass on it yet because there's no livingness and no track connected with it.

But he's going to pass out of this period of present time and he's going to move into something that he's already figured out. He's begun to get the inkling here, you see, this – let
us say, this item in present time is "sedentary People" – he's begun to get the inkling that sedentary people are capable of holding you back. He's gotten this idea here, so he'll be something on the order of an "active person." He finds out he can't be quite a cowboy, so he's going to be an "active person facing people who hold you back." He's already had these two items up here slightly into the future. He's getting an inkling of them, but he hasn't lived through them yet. There's the way he figures out his bank, in other words.

And therefore you find this bank wildly and widely classified. It's all – it's all in classes. It's all in postulates or concepts. And this is why concept therapy was so effective when it was effective, if you'll remember 1952, something like that. By the way, the chiropractors down in Texas took it up – I think they've still got it. We abandoned it for the excellent reason that it apparently had some bug connected with it. Well, the bug connected with it is we were actually pulling the postulate out of one of these GPM items, without pulling or confronting the mass out of the item. And therefore Concept Processing – I recognized there was something a bit wrong with it, so I didn't push it anymore.

Now that's what happened. Now of course, you actually couldn't, even by concept therapy, disarrange this GPM very much, but you sure could key somebody in on the back of his own track. So there is no time identified, there is no mass identified in these things, that is to say he doesn't identify it as 1952 or something like that. What he identifies is 1952 is a hundred trillion years ago, you see. That's as far as his differentiation is capable of, he's got a total identification of two dates. He doesn't then confront and single out the identity of a single date.

I'm sorry for the use of the word "identify" and "identity" but English has moved over from differentiating a oneness into a total confusion of a oneness with all other onenesses. So you don't have a word which actually follows through on that.

Now, what's this all about here? This means that we've got a goal here, we've got a goal here "to be active." And the first thing up from that, he's simply now living the goal "to be active." So you have "the goal to be active," but it has certain enemies. And those are probably something like "inactive people" or "being inactive." And then he moves up here and he's become "somebody with the goal 'to be active'" and "somebody with the goal 'to be active'" of course opposes with "people who are inactive." So it's "people who are inactive" or something of that sort.

And then he gets up here a little bit higher and he's got "an active person" or "somebody who is active." And that opposes, of course, something banal like "somebody who is inactive." And then we go up here a little bit further and he gets – he's getting so he's fought these inactive people.

"That what you resist, ye become," to make a Biblical utterance out of it. Because it was never more true. Of course, all the time he has the goal "to be active" he's fighting inactive things. What's eventually going to happen to him? As he goes up the line on this terminal column he is going to become less and less and less active, and more and more prone to being very sedentary.

So you get up here at the top, you got something like "a person who hates activity" or "a person who can't move" or "a person who can't be active," is usually the type of terminol-
ogy it has, and of course what does it faces? It faces as an oppterm "active people." In other words it's a total reversal goes through this GPM.

This is always the case. Don't get fooled now and say, "Well, the case I'm auditing is different." That's just an excuse because you can't find his goal or something.

The case you're auditing, it does just that. He doesn't do anything else, otherwise he wouldn't be on this time track at this time, and he would be in some other universe or something of the sort. So that's what we're talking about, we're talking about these conceptual items. There is the pc's concept of his own identity based on his goal, and his own identity is at first his goal full-out, he is his goal, and then he becomes somebody that has the goal, and then he becomes somebody that represents the goal, and then he becomes somebody that isn't getting along very well with the goal, and then he becomes somebody who isn't very much in favor of this goal, and then he becomes somebody who is against the goal and then somebody who just can't perform the goal at all.

Now, on the oppterm side, the enemy becomes somebody who is highly antipathetic to this goal, becomes somebody who isn't so antipathetic to the goal, becomes somebody who isn't... is kind of neutral on the subject of the goal, and eventually somebody who is rather in favor of this goal, and then eventually is somebody who would have that goal and be active with that goal. And that's the evolution of the oppterm.

Now, the evolution of the terminal is the deterioration of the goal, the evolution of the oppterm is, of course, an improvement of the goal. He just goes from total wouldn't – oppterm wouldn't have the goal on a bet, to the oppterm is the goal. That's nothing to do with the fact that people change, but the person's idea who has these ideas change with regard to his opposition. And for every one of these pairs, you have a problem.

Now, you could even articulate what the problem is and fool around with it a lot, but you don't have to actually – you bleed the charge, the pc sees what it is. You've got, on the goal "to be active," you've got this person over here, let us say he's come up to a point of "somebody with the goal 'to be active'" and who does he face? He faces "people who are inactive." So he's classified.

Now, what's this conceptual thing? "People who are inactive." Well, this is... he just classifies everything, see. He just says, "Well, Joe, Bill, Pete, Mary, John, Oscar, government clerks, businessmen, people who sit down in chairs, loafers, bums, skid row, sailors don't move around on ships very much so they must be inactive," and so forth. And in other words, that whole thing is this item: "People who are inactive." Sweeping, isn't it? Sees one of these things, his hair goes up. He says, "Waahhh! Awful! Grrrr!" He doesn't know why. See, because he's not really articulating it analytically, he is simply talking about it.

He'll talk about the next one up, but not the one he's in. He's already forming the one that's up by forecasting his opinions. That which you resist you become, so as the person dramatizes his goal and postulates these opposing terminals, he of course gradually becomes the opposition, eventually becomes an inactive person. And there he is at the top of the bank as an inactive person.
Now what happens to him? Now what happens to him? Well, that's very interesting, you can always predict the goal, they run off completely, one, two, three, four. Here he is at the top of the bank. Let's say this is the top of the bank here. And here he is, "an inactive person" – this one over here. And these are "active people," over here. See, so he's opposing those. Now this is your bank band in here.

Now, this thetan with the goal "to be active" at the top of his terminal line is, of course, no longer capable of doing anything with this goal at all. He's got too many overt acts on the subject, you see. He's had too many oppterms and so on, so he has become the oppterm, so he's an inactive person. And over here you have active people.

All right. It's very easy to predict what he's going to do. Now a thetan, in actual fact, doesn't live the bank one, two, one, two. He's always himself, they're always themselves. What he does actually is become this one slightly. You get a continuous closure, and he becomes inactive people, and then he becomes the other one slightly. So he actually moves on a kind of a zig-zag up the line. He's always slightly into the oppterm and out, and then slightly into the next oppterm and out, and slightly into the next oppterm and out. You can see how he would do that, because he resists these things he becomes, and they monitor his own conduct.

So therefore you see very clearly here that an active person, he was an active person, he's become an inactive person. What's he going to do when he postulates his next goal? You've got "active people" over here. Now you'd say, well, maybe he should postulate his own goal back. No, no, you're going to get something slightly off. It's going to be something antipathetic about active people that he has learned in the wisdom of his long track experience.

So he's going to look at that and he's going to find life at this point utterly and completely intolerable. He's going to be degraded because of course he has of course denied his own postulate. Remember that many times said? He's denied himself. He's denied himself. But of course he is his own postulate to be active, and here he is being inactive, so he's denied himself, so he feels very degraded and he doesn't like this.

So not liking this, and having... wanting very little to do with this, he wants to get rid of that goal. He wants to get rid of that goal. And here he has the character, you see, of an inactive person. Faced with active people. So he solves the problem. He solves the problem. And he postulates a goal up here, right here, he postulates this goal and that goal is "to be quiet." You can predict what next goal he will – you can't say what it is, but you're going to get something weird going. When you try to finally figure out what the pc's next goal is, you're figuring it backwards, you see, from above down below. When you go back up the other way, you can see cleanly and clearly exactly what that pc's goal would be. The next goal he postulates, of course, is "to be quiet." Obvious. Second you see it. It's never anything like "to be a troubadour." Nuh-uh, uh-uh, uh-uh. Wouldn't have anything to do with "to be a tank driver." See, it wouldn't be anything to do – "to have a harem with 19 wives." You know, now that we've turned loose Routine 2 on goal finding, I think you're going to see some of these.

The most embarrassing goal that the pc comes up with, of course, ticks slightly. And some uneducated auditor who doesn't know very much sees that tick, doesn't realize that it's just embarrassment, the fellow giving up "to have a – to have a harem of 17 wives," you see,
something like this, you see. And he says that's the pc's goal, and you know those things never are.

Pc – you've got this bank, it – you're trying to find the upper bank or you're trying to find this bank – you've got this bank up here and you're trying to find the lower bank under it, well, it's not offering you much problem now, because we've got mechanisms which find the next goal, bang, without you having to do a thing. But he's never here "to be a singer." That goal isn't there, see. That goal would not be – wouldn't even be "to dance," you see, because here's what makes it up – these top terminal-oppterm. That top terminal-oppterm is what makes it up. That tells you what the next goal's going to be. And that's what the next goal's going to be. It's not going to be something else.

He postulates it all on his own. He thinks he's free and clear and he thinks he has been totally disassociated from any influence in having postulated this goal, as soon as you run back the bank you see why he's postulated every one of them. He'll tell you he postulated it free and clear, own free will, prime postulate, had nothing to do with anything, then you get back and you find out this goal "to be quiet" was immediately succeeded by the goal "to be active." They don't go plus and minus. They don't go plus and minus. You can't say a goal "to know the truth" would be followed by the goal "to know nothing." You can't say that that would be.

The goal "to know the truth" might be preceded by another type of goal. But it would be a goal that had to do with secrecy. I'll tell you such a goal: "to be a gambler." "To be a gambler." And, uuhhh eee oohhhh, he doesn't want anybody to know what he's doing. Only it might be a little more frightened than that – "to be secretive," how about that? Well, that's of course followed by a goal something like that "to tell people," or "to teach people," or something, don't you see. But there'll be a combination in between these. But sometimes it's more subtle than that. Sometimes it is simply – well, let's say this – "to be an executive." Well, that... rare that such goals occur, but it's "to be an executive." Then it's followed inexplicably with the goal "to be truthful." But when you see the two together you will understand. You will understand, because of course, as a manager, or as an executive, or as a government head or something like this, there are many things you can't tell people. And you eventually get to a point where you don't like people who are too broadcast in their opinions, so on. The US government now has practically thrown the press out of the Pentagon and everything, they – I think there'll be a camp eventually in Washington, as the government goes along its wild career. It'll be 30 or 40 miles out from the city and it'll be inhabited by newsmen, and that's as close as they're permitted to the Capitol. Nobody's permitted to give them news these days.

So you keep holding back news, don't you see, you keep holding back news, and you eventually get an oppterm, you see, which has to do with the exact reversal to hold back news, and even though you were an outflowing-type character to begin with, well, this will mount up. So you get an influence building through three or four GPMs, don't you see.

The guy was "to be outspoken," you see, and this is followed by "to be reserved," you see and so forth. And that will eventually deteriorate to the person – "to never say a word." Because you get the cumulative effect of these things. They're not "positive-negative." They're not "oppose-not oppose." That does not work out. It's just what the person postulated
originally and what he became on his experiential track, and then what he took on for randomness—these are all determinable from the exact goals that you find—and then that sequence lands him in another sequence which of course goes through the same deterioration and that lands him in another sequence. Each one of those sequences is a separate GPM with a goal at the head of each one of them.

These things are not intermixed. You can collapse one end of the GPM on the other, you can mix them up like dough, you can throw four GPMs together, you can think that one GPM goes ahead of the other GPM when it goes behind it, it eventually turns out. You can scramble the bank most gorgeously on a pc, but actually only by finding more goals than you have run. I don't mean there's any danger in finding goals. Ordinarily only one goal fires at a time, but I proved the other evening that two goals can fire at the same time.

What you're looking at here is the gradual deterioration of a thetan. You're looking at the dwindling spiral. What he postulates, he tries to become, but in becoming it accumulates overts on things that aren't what he postulates. Things are bad because he has postulated what's good. And then this of course results in a deterioration, a degradation where he's concerned, so he postulates a new goal, this selects... this preselects out for him his enemies, because an enemy is somebody who doesn't have that goal, and then he gets a deterioration up the line and eventually that goal passes out of his existence and control into the hands of the oppterm—it looks like in the bank. So he postulates a new goal and as he goes along, the whole consecutive pattern of a GPM takes on a rather consistent note.

You don't have somebody with a goal "to be a lady," also with the goal "to make heavenly voices." These would not be the same thing to a—it wouldn't be the parts of the same bank. Why? Well, "to be a lady," as it deteriorates, of course goes into other things. And it might possibly de... go up to a religious goal of some kind or another, we could expect that sort of thing to happen. But the truth of the matter is that if you've got a religious-type goal creeping in along the line, it's also whole-hog. I mean, it'll be common to all the GPMs. It'll be something about it: to be bad, to be good, to be devilish, to get around people, to trick people, to be honest, to make people be honest, to... this kind of thing. There's a consistency running all the way through the thing that has to do with regulating behavior. And you could probably get a common denominator of all goals—it's probably flavored by the first goal the pc ever postulated. But you don't have that goal and you won't have that goal for a long time.

So you will—the only thing you will notice is that they are—they're of a family. They're of a kind. The guy has a certain type of activity. Well, this gives you an experiential track for the pc. These—one on your 2, Routine 2Gs, you keep putting down goals that go out hard. You'll notice after a while that there is a consistency. You maybe got an Axiom 10 thetan on your hands, you see, and it's all on this subject, all on this subject, one after another. Axiom 10, Axiom 10.

Or they move up and down, maybe, the Axioms. But they're cousins, and bank to bank they're actually brothers or dichotomies or you can see that they're similar. And the various similarities here can be taken advantage of by the auditor. You have to study these things for a while, and you all of a sudden will say, "Yeah, what do you know." Well, I was just looking over a list, a goal oppose list, just a little while ago, and I didn't see the terminal or oppterm
The top oppterm, top terminal – I didn't see them on that goal oppose list. But the... I looked over an unnull list, which is most likely to achieve the goal, and there staring me in the face was the top oppterm. How do I know it's the top oppterm? Well, let's say the goal is "to eat jelly cakes." What's the top oppterm? "Eaters of jelly cakes," of course, I mean, you know – I mean it's very difficult to figure this out, see. Once you know.

The idiocy of all of this, however, is what has prevented man from understanding it or having anything to do with it. It's based on the solid mechanic of postulate-counter-postulate. Problem. Guy has a problem. And you get all the consequences of the overt-motivator sequence, the non-communication, the cut communications, the withdrawal – all of these various things – can't reach, can't withdraw, must reach, mustn't withdraw. All of these things are consequent to these masses. And they're in nice little packages all by themselves, and they go on up the line to the top.

Now the funny part of the top is that the pc will start exteriorizing from the masses when you get him close enough to present time. He can feel himself exteriorize from them, mass by mass. He all of a sudden recognizes that he isn't himself, his own name, and he recognizes that he isn't this future thing. He's liable to do a sort of a pop, an exteriorization pop. And even though you've run up to the top of the bank, in some way or another, when you've really got the top of the bank, you can expect the guy to sort of get an idea that he's going pop, exteriorizing. And he'll run something else down the line and he's going to go *uhhp* and exteriorize. And he'll start coming out of this thing.

Well, he's been in it for a long time. You run these banks on down to the bottom, find the next goal, run that on down to the bottom, find the next goal, run that on down to the bottom, find the next goal and run that on down to the bottom, find the next... that's all there is to clearing.

The individualists amongst us, however, have managed to vary the GPM only to this degree: the only variation I think you will find in GPMs is where they stop. I'll give you an idea of just that. Where do they stop? Where does a GPM stop? Well, let us say this is a full goal. Now, I'm not going to draw as many here as you would actually have in a goal, see. This is a full goal, and here's your bottom of the goal (that has an item here, too, by the way). And here's your top terminal-oppterm of the next goal, you got that? Here's the top terminal-oppterm of the next goal and of course that goes on down this way, and this goes this way, and here we've got this other bank.

Now the question is how far north in this thing does the pc go? Does he go this far? Is this all the items he's got? Or does he go this far? Does he go this far? All the way? Or, has he been very cute and postulated another goal up on top of this one, that only has that many in it? *Huh-hooohh.*

So we find this goal and we get this top oppterm and we run the thing down and we're running it all out and about this time, my God that thing has got a lot of mass and it's very difficult and it's having an awful time running it. But you go ahead and you run it out the bottom and you skip this and you try to find the next goal and it's all very difficult. You can find the next goal, but he's dragging an awful lot of mass with him and so forth. Finally you get
bright and you take this goal and try to find out what this goal is, and that may be much harder to find than the goal under it. And you try to find that goal up there.

Well, that's a horse of another hue. In other words, these conditions can exist. You can have a goal which – a Goals Problem Mass which has maybe four items in it, and then a full bank here – you can have a full bank, and of course if you've got a full bank, then you've just got nothing but full banks from here on. The number of these doesn't particularly – isn't particularly significant. This is your terminal column, this is your oppterm column.

All right, does the thetan's bank look like that? And are you here? Or are you here? Is that where you came in? Do you still have a piece of a goal up here? Well, the thing to do is to find the top of this goal with the goal you did find. Don't let go of the goal you found. You find the top here. And then come on down, and you can ask him on the meter, very cute, whether or not there's a goal above this one, and you'll get a tick if there is. And it's as simple as that.

And because you've got this one, and because you've got this one, you can actually give them questions that figure out what this goal is. Let's say this is the goal "to leave," why, naturally this oppterm here is "to leave." Well, now what's – "people who leave," and what's the next one? Well, I don't know. Possibly the next one is therefore, "to stay around," something like that. You're not quite sure what it's going to be, you can't predict it that it is what it is, but you can get various lists and predictions and guess at it and shoot at it and so forth.

You'll eventually get these two terminals, if you list upwards. You can go all the way through this bank and on repair you'll find yourself all of a sudden going backwards up into this bank. You can go both ways in a bank, which might be very interesting to you. And you can list one all the way to the bottom and then patch it up and find yourself listing the top and all of a sudden go wheeep, and you'll think you're going over here to some lower bank, but actually you're not, you're landing in that bank. You probably are landing in a lower bank, if you were inexpertly overlisting and that sort of thing, you're going elsewhere.

But you'll eventually find this little thing, and then up here, you'll find the pc's PT. Now here's what's particularly horrible: is in this zone of this little truncated bank, or in any part of the GPM which is present time, is formed that far, at the top of the top GPM you will find – you remember hidden standards and things like this – well, you'll find all of the pc's hidden standards, you will find all of his chronic somatics, you will find all of his worries and yaps lie in the few top buttons that are nearest to present time.

So, look at this horrible thing: You could come in here, run this whole bank, get its top oppterm, everything else, and you're going down this line, and the pc's dragging mass along, mass turns on easily, and he's saying, "Ohhh," and so on, "but when are you going to do something about this lumbosis? When are you going to do something about the lumbosis? The lumbosis, the lumbosis" – God, you've heard – never heard of anything but the lumbosis. After a while suspect what's going on. You haven't got his present time items or otherwise he wouldn't be talking to you about this, man.

The thing to do, you'll find one of these items ticking or something of the sort, is start going back up and see if you can locate just a little bit more close to present time.
Now the bank, as I say, might be in this state whereby there's just a little piece of a goal – it'd have a regular goal and everything – and then there's a whole GPM and then followed in sequence by the remaining GPMs, or it can be like this. This makes life much more interesting. Now here we have just your regular GPM, see, but it's truncated. Instead of a whole top going over a border to a little smidgen of a goal, you've got half a GPM. Now, you list "most likely," and it lands you, of course, in the bottom of the terminal column. Huh-huh. Toward the bottom of the terminal column. Because of course that's the most likely thing to make the goal. And so you say, "Well, let's list the least likely," and that's going to land you, of course, in the bottom of the oppterm column, and you don't want to be in the bottom. GPMs are always run from the top down. You get as high as you can go in them and run lower. Don't try to get as low as you can go and run higher. You can do it, but after you've tried it a few times you'll realize it's much harder to do than from top down.

But the horrible part of it is sometimes you have to start below the top and go lower, then do a patch up, realizing something is missing in here, find a bypassed item and start listing against it, and you'll find yourself going higher. And you'll go on up and find the top of the bank.

So it's not impossible. But recognize that the hidden standards, the PTPs, the chronic PTPs, the pc's chronic somatics, all of these various things he matters and yaps about and that are the realest to him, are contained in these items which are nearest to PT, and that it is very difficult to hit those dead-on if you have a half-formed bank. Why? There isn't any "most likely" to achieve the goal. There isn't any "least likely" to achieve the goal at the top of the bank.

Let's give you an example. It's the goal "to be excited." Well, of course, the least likely to succeed is "an unexcited person," and that probably is the bottom of the oppterm column for that goal, and the most likely to succeed is "an excited person" and that of course is the bottom of the terminal column. Oh, I think this is getting very interesting, because of course we are at the bottom of the goal, and we already know what's at the bottom of the goal, we've got "the goal to...," we've got "somebody or something with the goal to...," we've got the goal itself, we've got things at the bottom of the goal, and we could always go in at the bottom.

No, we want up on the top. So, on this goal "to be excited" – this goal "to be excited," we have "a lukewarm person" facing "lukewarm people." That's the pc's present time. Of course, it's halfway through. The overts have run him down to a point of where he's halfway away from the goal, and of course the oppterms have moved up to halfway to the goal, and you've got a middle ground here, and you've got lukewarm – "a lukewarm person" facing "lukewarm people," and it doesn't have anything to do with being excited at all. Do you see what you face there anatomically?

Well, trying to get that band, trying to get that half-formed GPM is much tougher than to get this one, because you can get this one, even though the pc's screaming and moaning that he still has mass, and he – not mass on the items, but he still feels bad, and he's still worried about Agnes, he's just worried about Agnes all the time and he just can't seem to get unworried about... Well, "Agnes" is a rocket-firing oppterm in his present time, and you just haven't
lead up to it yet. Of course he's worried about Agnes, he sees her every day. She's an oppterm in the flesh. You see – you see what?

He himself, he himself may be a terminal or an oppterm – he also may be an oppterm. So what – how do we find this? How do we find this? Well, that gives you problems. Of course there are many solutions to such a problem. I'm just giving you what – the problems that you face in looking at it.

So a GPM PT for the pc may be at any time of the forming of it. It could be the first two items. It could be the next six items. It could be the – it could be all the way to the top. It could be two over into the next bank. You know, I mean – where – what's his position? Because it's the same picture, just line up the GPMs of three or four goals one after the other, and then just cut in anywhere in the first one or two and that's where you'll pick up the pc. But of course you've got the special conditions of a partially formed goal. Partially formed GPM.

It all comes under the heading as not very complicated, just a partially formed GPM, and the top of that GPM is present time for the pc. That's what you've got to reach, and that's what you're listing for.

In trying to audit somebody, you're trying to get to PT and go down. That is what your mission is, is to get as close as you can to PT as a blind strike in, and then go down a bit, and then perhaps move it back up to PT by various mechanisms, and then clean it all out and get that little item that's dogged into the future, whatever that is. And then when you've got that all straight, then go for broke going down and you just – after that it's just a – it's just a sailing breeze, there's nothing to it, it's very simple. You can always go down.

The toughest part of the case is the beginning of the case, and that's where you're the most ignorant, and where your pc is the least educated, the most nervy, and the hardest to audit. Isn't it horrible the way life is? But that's why man has never cracked this thing. The hardest portion of it to crack was the beginning of it. And of course at the beginning, anybody trying to crack it has the least knowledge of it. And so it's operated simply as a big double-door shut-in-the-face mystery. It isn't actually much of a mystery.

It's... people are, and they become, and they can postulate, and they have an opinion about others, and that's all based on their pattern of goals. And they dramatize these things like crazy.

Now there are many special cases of actions, there's various things that can happen when you're auditing. It's not my purpose in this particular lecture to give you a whole bunch of things that can happen or not happen or anything. I'm just talking to you about anatomy, how the GPM is formed, where you find the pc when you first enter the GPM, and it is simply anatomy of the GPM. That is quite important to you. The more studying you do on this, the more experience you get on this the easier it is, in actual fact. The most worrisome time is when the auditor is the least skilled, and the toughest end of the case, of course, is when the pc's case has not been entered, because you don't know where you are in the case.

And those things are the most difficult ends of it, but if you can just get over that big hump – the big hump of your own lack of skill at the beginning and the pc's lack of knowingness about where he is or what he's doing – the tough end of the auditing is then overcome,
because when you've slid over those two barriers of the auditor's lack of skill and the pc's unknownness, you all of a sudden find yourself sitting on a high road. And it's very easy to go down that high road, clickety-clickety-click, poppety-poppety-pop. You learn more and more and more, you learn more and more about GPMs, you learn more and more about it and the pc is of course easier and easier to audit, and of course the next pc you get ahold of, there's not much of a hump, but you're able to go over that hump because you've gotten more experience. The next thing you know you do like I was doing a little while ago: I looked on a list to see if the pc's item was on the list before I nulled it. You know, that kind of an operation.

"Pc's item on this list? Uh – mmm, hmm, hmm. How far formed is this pc's GPM? Let's see, these are the lists he's listing. And how well formed are these GPMs? Well, his first GPM is – oh, it's not formed yet. It's only about halfway. Ah yeah, here's an old goal oppose list. So, it's about a half-formed GPM." How would you know that? Well you don't find any – you don't find anything that's likely top term, or oppterm or top terminal and so forth. And it's all sort of lukewarm. That's what you got. You'll get so that you're acquainted with it. And there's nothing like doing something with it to get acquainted with it, and you threw up your hands in horror and said, "Oh, my God, this thing is so complicated, and uhuhhhhh and the pc ARC breaks so terribly, and it's so dangerous if we audit him wrong" and that sort of thing.

Well, all these things are true. All these things are true. It is true that it takes a long time for a pc to be picked up off the pavement and get going, and it's not something you do in a half an hour, and it's true that you'll have bad times and that you will have times when he feels wonderful all day and the next day, God almighty, why the hell did he ever... He never really says why the hell did he ever enter Scientology or something like that, he always says what the hell did he ever postulate such a lousy goal for, you know.

This is the hazards of the business. You're at the tough end of the line. Learn anatomy. Learn what these things look like. Get it through your skull what these things are all about. And soon as you understand what these things are all about, then you understand what you're doing. And when you understand what you're doing, it falls apart. I would say that probably the toughest part as far as I'm concerned – as far as I personally am concerned – I should think that the toughest part of clearing is finding a goal, from my experience. The toughest part of it is not auditing items, or finding out where you are. It's tougher to find a goal. And look what we got – the ammunition we've got today to find goals. So in actual fact, if you can find a goal accurately on a pc, I do – I wouldn't quail at the rest of it at all.

Okay, there's anatomy of this here GPM, and I hope you get acquainted with it.

Thank you very much, and good night.
ANATOMY OF THE GPM

A lecture given on 4 April 1963

How are you today?

This is the fourth of April, AD 13, 1963. I've forgotten what Roman year it is, offhand. Haven't calculated it out lately. Nobody's using that calendar. But, Scientologically, it's the year of the win. That's for sure.

This is another talk today on the GPM – the anatomy of which I am getting to be quite an authority. And this is one of the more interesting pieces of bric-a-brac that a thetan can pack around. And you're making a steady acquaintance with it, which might serve you in some good stead.

I don't know if you've put together for yourself or tried to take a look at the significances of what you're trying to do or what you are doing in essence, or realize the antiquity of the project in which you're engaged. Man's been trying to do this for a very, very long time and has been successfully drowning himself in the process. And on the whole track you have been trying to do this for a very long time. It's quite interesting now that it is occurring and that something is happening.

And if you're having any trouble at all finding goals or finding the bank or finding items in the GPM, let me invite you to this interesting sidelight. Do you yourself have any idea of what you're tackling? Or are you just going through a bunch of confused motions? That's something you should ask yourself. You say, "Well, all this theory is all very well and good, but what I want to do is get down and audit."

Well, that's fine. But are you in the position of a radio repairman who doesn't know anything about the radio he is repairing? And if you are in that position, you're going to be very worried and very upset and very distressed and so forth.

It is essential to audit a pc today on the ramifications of goals and the GPM – it's essential to know what you are attacking. I know that sounds very banal, but in actual fact some of the mistakes you are making aren't banal, they're idiotic. It simply shows a lack of acquaintance with what you are trying to do.

You're trying to clear somebody, you're trying to clear a thetan. Very good. Why isn't he Clear? Well, he isn't Clear because he misguidedly or otherwise tried to protect or get rid of or acquire havingness. He had some misalignment on the subject of havingness. And then he decided to think, not confront. And his thinkingness is dominant so that he now finds it totally unnecessary to know what he is attacking – he merely classifies it all under a big group or class of thought – "All men are alike," "All woman are alike," "All women are evil," "All religion is bad," this sort of thing. So he gets a classification. So he knows now what is dan-
So you see that in auditing a GPM – I'm not saying you're doing this – but there is every tendency there to not confront. Why? You as the auditor have some tendency not to confront what you are doing – and certainly the pc has a fantastic... tendencies not to confront because he's running straight through "not to confront." That's why he has an item.

This item is "bad women." Great. Great. So he has an item "bad women." What does this essentially mean? This means his inability – fostered by himself and by reason of postulating a goal and so forth – to confront women has enormously been reduced. So now he is in a situation where he doesn't have to think about individual women, he just thinks about bad women. And there he is, he's got it all thought out now. He doesn't have to think any further. Somebody says, "Woman." He says, "Well, that's bad women. And what do you do to counter bad women? Well, you become a debaucher," (whatever a debaucher is, you see) "and that's the pattern of behavior you go through in handling women."

Somebody says, "Women: you become a debaucher." That's dead simple, see? You've got – you've got, in other words, a total packaged answer. There's the stimuli – women – so now we know the package response and we're all set.

It's almost as simple as, "car – mechanic." When you look at a car then you are a mechanic. You'd better be a mechanic if you look at a car. So the terminal is mechanic and the oppterm is car. If you're mad at cars, then the thing to do is become a mechanic. I don't know if you've had your car repaired lately but I think that's usually the pair that you'll find in most of the garages. If you're mad at cars you become a mechanic; then you can really wreck them.

Now, what's this amount to?

This means that you're auditing a pc whose confront is very poor on the subject that he is being asked to confront on. His confront is very poor.

Now, you as an auditor – Q-and-Aing with the pc and taking his directions and so forth – are taking the directions of somebody who can't confront on the subject he's being audited on. And although every now and then the pc is right – particularly when he cognites on the item or something like that- he's right, you know? Bang! That's it. Something like that.

Providing the meter says he's right, too, why, he's right.

But what – what in essence are you doing when you Q-and-A and fumble and...

Now, this pc may have a very fine confront on the subject of anything under the sun but what you're auditing him on. The very fact that it is his bank says that he has a no-confront on it. Well, fortunately, you the auditor don't have the same bank. So, therefore, you can confront on the subject that the pc can't confront on. This is fortuitous. But that is what you are there and that is what you are for – to keep the pc headed in the right direction.

Now, there isn't really any excuse for fumbling around on the subject of the GPM and goals because the data is now all known. That we've got the data, there it is. I mean, the GPM has certain anatomy, goals line up in that particular line and items are created in that particu-
lar way and, well, that's all there is to it. I mean, there it is. How do you list? You list in a cer-
tain way. And how do you find items? You find items in a certain way. And there are certain
rules which apply and so forth. And if you really know what a GPM is and really know what
the goal is and how it lines up and all this sort of thing, it's really a very easy job. It's nothing
to lose a night's sleep over. It's a very easy job. You know you're there or you don't know
you're there.

But to what degree are you taking advantage of the knowledge which we already
have? To what degree are you taking advantage of this knowledge?

Well, to a very slight degree, indeed. To a great extent you're still fumbling with "How
many do you list?" "What should the meter say?" and so forth. You have not surmounted to-
tally at this stage – you've not surmounted, probably, in its totality – all of the things which
you're handling or the complexity of these things. In other words, you're not handling them all
at once; you're still trying to get the tone arm centered so that you can null, you know. And as
a matter of fact, what are you nulling?

Well, others of you have this grasp. And you've already collided with the situation and
understand what you are going up against.

Now, the reason I'm stressing an understanding of this is what you're doing is terribly
simple. It is an idiot's simplicity because, of course, you're handling something an idiot put
together. I mean, a thetan becomes a complete idiot when he starts postulating goals and cut-
ting down his confront and doing a bunch of package thinking and all this sort of thing – get-
ting himself in the soup, turning on all kinds of somatics, having all sorts of trouble, running
into unsolvable problems and eventually denying his own goal and cutting his own throat and
saying, "Well, that's it," and so forth, "I've – I've postulated this goal 'to be a catfish,' and here
we are a few eons later and, oh, I hate catfish!" you see? And so, he's mixed up. He's the
original mixed up kid.

Now, despite the fact that the Freudians in their defeat at the hands of aberration and
such studies of the mind said that you had to be aberrated in order to get along at all – well,
that has no validity at all.

I've had some interesting experiences in that myself. I had an oppterm "conventional
music." Ha, that's very interesting in one of these banks had an oppterm "conventional mu-
sic." If the music was conventional, why, it had nothing to do with me. It had to be unconven-
tional music. Well, it didn't rule out music – but it certainly ruled out any ability to look at a
piece of music and get anything out of it. I had to remember it and go around sideways and
move down the corners of the thing. And, well, not just this item but just as general confront
picks up – well, I find out now I can listen to a piece of music and play the piece of music – I
don't even have to have the music. Conventional, it doesn't matter.

And the funny part of it is, auditing is improving my ability to play, more than practice
is improving it. Well, as far as I'm concerned, being well conversant with the fields of the arts
– writing and all that sort of thing – knowing the limitations and agonies of actual profes-
sional application in these fields – I know exactly what was blowing my brains out all along
the line. And they were aberrations. They were aberrations on the subject.
Well, I – there's no such item, but "long books." Supposing I'd had an item "long books." Well, good heavens what would I do? Every time I thought, "Oh, I've got to write a long book!" you know, I just would have quit. All kinds of somatics would have turned on. Would I have been able to write a long book? No!

Now, as far as being able to fight things and get mad and raise the devil in life and have a game and all that sort of thing – why, getting rid of the GPM in certain spheres doesn't seem to have interfered with that at all. I mean, I'm twice as mad as I used to be at certain things. Reading the paper this morning, I think the Kennedy administration won itself another medal.

But I begin to see what is aberrated conduct. Not according to some unconfronted standard. I begin to see what is actual aberrated conduct and am able to predict where that's going to land somebody. You see? And am very far from destroying the game – I find myself getting more and more involved in what's going on and in present time.

And the normal thing that is avoided by somebody who has an awful lot of items and so forth is present time. He's involved with games that don't exist. Well, did you ever try to play in a tennis court with no racket and no ball and no net and no partner? I think you'd look silly. You might be there in a tennis court, but there you are racing back and forth and fanning the air and so forth. And there's no interchange, there's no scoreboard, nothing. Well, that is a very good picture of what most people are involved in doing.

There's somebody sitting there and he goes like this a lot. [taps with his fingers on the table] See? He goes like this a lot. Nobody can quite understand why he goes like... Well, he's being a writer, you see? That's as close as he can come to it anymore, you know? He's still got an item. He should be going like this, but actually this is as close as he comes to it, see. Or maybe – maybe he's an old kettle drummer or something. We don't know. But he is playing some game that doesn't exist. And let me assure you, there's nothing that is less fun and there's nothing that looks more ridiculous than somebody who is playing a game which no longer exists.

Now, the fixed character of goals and the fixed character of items in the GPM give us an enormous number of games which a individual obsessively plays, which don't any longer exist. He has no reason to be playing these games. They aren't any fun and they make him feel awful and nobody else is playing these games. And he rather tends to draw out of contact with all of existence. Well, what's this – what am I talking about here, basically?

Well, I'm talking about the fact that he doesn't need this GPM. Which I think is rather plain.

But getting rid of it is a highly uncomfortable activity and very confusing to the pc – extremely confusing to the pc. He's in the middle of all sorts of items which give him all sorts of weird values. He's susceptible to ARC breaks that he himself doesn't understand what they are. He's going up against ideas and postulates that in a large part were quite germane in some other age and time, but no longer apply now. He understands them. He can understand them still and he knows what they do to him. But they don't look to him much like games. That's because the game is no longer extant. And he's a prisoner of his own postulates. And life, accordingly, is quite unnecessarily unhappy and miserable.
Life – life's bad enough without having some false misery and false nonsense added up onto it. You could probably cope with life all right if you didn't have all your old tin cans and chains and so forth that you were dragging along with you. You don't even have to be up to OT to cope with life, once you begin to see what it is all about and stop misemoting on certain subjects that have nothing to do with your life.

Well, be that as it may – this is no dissertation on aberration. This is just a dissertation on the subject of this GPM and these goals that an individual postulates. He postulates these goals and then he accumulates a certain set of items. And then he eventually turns against the very goal which he himself has postulated – finds that in... he is now in a deep state of degradation because he's denied himself completely – has to turn around and postulate another goal to get himself out of the mess. And then eventually it wears out and he is going up against, again, his own postulate. So he now has to postulate another goal. Oh, this goes on and on. And he's just getting unhappier and unhappier and he's less and less able and less and less powerful – and he is less and less capable of governing himself.

He is governed by a series of unseen, unknown voices, impulses, urges, pains that demand that he do certain things which might have been all right when knighthood was in flower or when he was a space patrolman but don't quite work out where he is at the present time – manager of a knitting factory. You see, it doesn't quite go. He's having a hard time – he's giving himself this hard time.

What we are trying for, in essence, is a self-governed individual. We've spoken a great deal about self-determinism and other-determinism, but unless an individual is capable of exercising his own true self-determinism he is then incapable of self-government. And so he will always be subjected to various tyrannical exterior forces. He is incapable of continuing on through life under his own steam. He has to be nursed along and all kinds of things.

Well, you see that regardless of the power this individual could generate – regardless of his ability to knock over radio towers and the domes off capitols and so forth as an Operating Thetan – regardless of all of this stuff, regardless of his ability to make wine turn into tea at two thousand yards at a spot glance. All that's very intriguing, but let's look at it within a framework which is far more comprehensible. This individual is a liability to all about him unless he himself is capable of self-government. That's interesting, isn't it?

Now, a control of his own environment does not necessarily mean a violation of the rights of everyone in that environment. But certainly on the fact that he operates on the greater good for the greater number of dynamics and he solves his problems on that basis – when he is capable of self-government he has crossed the biggest hurdle in the direction of a controlled or happy environment. He is looking all about him, as he lives, through his environment for enemies that victimize him.

Well, I think that's very interesting. Because standing right in the boots that he is standing in as he looks around that environment is his own worst enemy. Now, that isn't just an item – that is a fact. That is a fact. Buildings won't fall on his head anywhere near as hard as he himself is falling on his head. Life cannot do anything to him at all, actually. But he himself can accomplish his own destruction. And that is true of every human being alive. And
this is the kind of world we live in – where everywhere we look we see people bent on their own destruction.

I have this experience continually. People race along over some level plain toward some deep cavern or chasm – and they're going along madly in the direction of the lip of this cliff and they're about to fall into this chasm. And I say to them, "Hey, hey, hey, hey!" You know? "You go along that way about another fifteen, twenty feet, you know, and you go over!"

And the fellow says, "I guess I know what I'm doing!" Boom!

And you say, "What do you know!"

It happens rather continuously. I mean, there's hardly a week goes by but what across my desk isn't evidence of somebody who's going to go over the cliff!

I still as a matter of form say to them, "Hey, there's a cliff there." You know? And as a matter of form, sit back and listen to the dwindling scream.

It's almost – it's almost as if pointing out to them ways and means of self-destruction gives them the direction that they want to travel. Well, it's interesting living around such people.

Now, we in Scientology are a cut above that. The definition of a true Scientologist is – nothing very esoteric that one would want to use in the papers and so forth because only a Scientologist would understand this definition. And that is this: No matter how mad he gets, no matter how upset he gets, no matter what outrageous things he is doing, a true Scientologist knows back of it that he is doing it and has an inkling – he may not know exactly why, but he has an inkling – that it is because of something he has done that makes him do it. He never quite loses sight of his own causative hand in his own fate. "Well, here I am, mad as the devil at this car!" Well, he may go right on kicking the tires, you understand – he doesn't necessarily totally control himself on the subject – he may go right on kicking the tires and cursing out the car. But somewhere back here he says, "You know, I must have done an awful lot of lousy things to cars to be treating a car this way!" You know, he still has, he still has that little thing.

He may be fighting with his wife. Or she may be fighting with her husband. And mad as hops, you know, just "Trah-rahr-thrah! And wipe it out man!" You know? And at the same time, you know, kind of "Well, what have I done to him or her that is making me act this way?" That is never quite lost sight of. It may not be strong enough or powerful enough to monitor or control the conduct, but it is there.

A Scientologist is somebody who knows he is capable of understanding his motives. Not just the overt-motivator sequence – he's capable of understanding his motives. And you could put that down as the definition of what makes a Scientologist different than raw meat. A Scientologist knows that he is capable of understanding his motives. If he went just a little bit deeper and thought just a little bit harder about it and looked just a little bit harder, why, he would know why he was doing this thing. He knows that there is an explanation to what he is doing.
Well, now if a person who is calling himself a Scientologist really has never grasped that one fact – he's going to have an awful lot of trouble grasping what the GPM is all about.

Why?

Well, he doesn't think there is a cause.

Now, I – to my shame, we only have – we do have a student right now who really doesn't know that overt acts cause people to blow. He doesn't know this – he hasn't got this down. And he let somebody blow. Well, he's got a ways to travel.

Well, why doesn't he know that?

Well, that's because he himself doesn't quite have this one datum: He doesn't know that he himself is doing the things he's doing because of something he has done. He doesn't really believe that he is capable of understanding his own motives. You see? So not being totally cognizant of this one fact – not really thinking or believing that he is capable of understanding his own motives or handling himself or controlling his own motives or picking up his own overt or any of this sort of thing – then he doesn't think that the other fellow has caused his own difficulties. So, of course, he can't audit the GPM.

There's nothing more manifest in the world than the GPM as a confirmation of a person causing his own trouble. That's no reason to condemn him.

Scientologists don't do that. But it's also – there is – also there is no reason not to understand it. A fellow made a postulate – he said, "I'm going to square this all up. 'To be a pirate.' That's what I'm going to do – I'm going to be a pirate. To – being a pirate! That solves all of this – that just solves everything. I'm going to be a pirate. Yes, that solves all the trouble I've been having. I'm going to be a pirate!"

And a few trillennia later, he sees a pig going down the road with a ring in its snout. And he faints and has a heart attack. Everybody says, "Look at what the hot weather has done to him."

No! The hot weather – the hot weather might have assisted all this. But who did it to him? He did it to himself Way back down the track he said, to be a pirate. And, of course, pirates wear rings in their noses. There it is. Who did it? He did it.

Well now, you can't go around condemning this person for having done it to himself unless you are capable of establishing – for his reality and yours, too – what he did to himself and in such a way that it eradicates that causation in the past. Well, you don't have to blame him if you can eradicate it.

Well, all of these causations for his (quote) misfortunes (unquote) are initially and basically resident in the GPM. Now, those of yesteryear have actually far more force on him, than those of today. But because they exist in yesteryear and because today has in it all of the force contained from yesteryear till now – it seems to him that those items in which he exists here – that these items he exists with in present time... Draw a GPM here – and this is the PT situation. These items here in present time – oh, those items are terribly important. Maybe he's sitting in something that says, "Women – women who look like beatniks." You know? Maybe that's the oppterm, see. Now, he's going mad. He doesn't even know he's got this. He's
formed it up, but he's going mad on this subject. And his wife's a very neatly dressed girl and everything else and he's always calling her a beatnik and she never can figure it out and he never can figure it out. And here are these items here – a chronic present time problem – chronic present time problem, always, always, always, riding along with him, riding along with him.

He has another one. He has another one. He knows, you see, that the source of his ulcerous condition, you see, is because he eats too much harsh food. No, no. That's the somatic "all women are beatniks."

And what does he have to be?

He has to be a Turk in order to combat this in some aberrated way.

Well, there's his ulcers and there's his opposition. And he begins to think the whole environment is against him when in actual fact it's just "women are beatniks." He sees some uncombed hair – he gets ulcers. Bang, bang, just like that – one, two!

Well, this isn't actually causation. This is an effect. He's being the effect of these items. The fact you can run them out and discharge them is quite remarkable.

But way down here – let's take another bank, you see. These banks are lots of items long. Here's another bank, here's another bank, here's another bank, here's another bank, another bank, here's another bank. You get the idea? It goes on like this. Way back here somewhere, down below in this bank down here – he has a goal "to be a man." Naturally, this one creeps up through charge all the way up to the top here and causes women to be antipathetic to him.

Now, when you audit him, what are you looking for?

Well, actually, you're looking for one bank at a time. That's all you're looking for. That bank is monitored by the goal, the first goal, and that is the thing you are looking for. This bank has a goal. Now, this top bank may be complete or it may be incomplete. But it is only incomplete from the top down. It will be perfect in form right up to PT.

But where is the PT? Is the PT at where the goal is expiring or is it halfway through?

We don't know that. You would establish that.

But he's postulated a goal. Now, it is that goal which is available. And the first action is to find that goal.

Why is that the first action?

Because if you find too many of these items without finding that goal, you turn off the pc's R/S and RR, he cannot orient, you don't know what kind of items you are looking for – you shoot out of the bank and all kinds of wild, weird things happen. So let's put first things first: Let's find the goal. Let's find the goal for the first bank.

Now, we may be unlucky and find the goal for the second bank when we're looking for the goal for the first bank and actually run quite a bit of the second bank before we find out that a first bank exists. All right. You still have done nobody any damage. You'll start up and try to find the top of this thing and you'll run into another goal. All right. But that's a mis-
chance. In the bulk of the cases you operate with, you will find that goal, of that first bank. That's what you will find.

And having found that you will find his immediate explanation of what is wrong with him. He is causing a condition in life which pervades every part of life he is living – monitored, of course, by the fact that all this has gone before. But you're not interested in all this that's gone before – you are only interested in this first bank, the one closest to present time. Not the first one formed on the time track – that's so-o-o Lord knows how long ago. You're interested in the one that was formed just the other trillennia, just the other day. You want that goal.

All right. Now, having found that goal, you want the packages, the items – the pairs of items. These are always in two, in 3M. They are not in four as in the fringe areas that you get in 2-12. They're always in two. And they follow a certain pattern. And there they are – they're already there to be run. You have to find the goal in order to run them. And then having found the goal, what are you looking for?

You're looking for the highest oppterm in the bank.

Well, in a truncated GPM, one that is cut off at the top, the highest oppterm will not be very violently stated and it will be more difficult your first list. When you do this first list on other banks which are complete, you will be amazed at how easy it is. But because not all the items are formed at the top of the GPM yet, you may have some difficulty with this. But the bulk of the cases you won't have any difficulty with it.

Now, you're looking for certain items. And you find those items by following certain rules. You think, "Well, we had an awful lot of rules and we threw those away." No, we didn't. Just last night somebody in the Z Unit actually nulled a list that I think had seven RRs on it, each one of which fired during nulling. Well, we could have a real idiot's picnic out of this, you know. You mustn't have two firing at the same time on a list, but it's all right to have seven firing on the list. That's idiot. You want one firing on a list, you see. You've got certain rules. The second you find two are firing on a list, man, extend the list. Nobody's broken those rules down. Extend the list till you only got one firing on the list.

Now, I just saw another folder that horrified me. Twice running I have checked the list, twice running I have checked the list – unbeknownst to the auditor, I put the pc on the meter. Mean of me. But this auditor – this auditor had item, item, item, item, item, X, and then – this is the way the list looked. Well, of course, it had many items along...

Aw! Aw, please! For a year and a half I've been telling you – for a year and a half I've been telling you, "Goddamnit, don't do that!"

Why?

Because the list is not discharged!

What are all these stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, stroke, X. What is that?

The first thing it says to you is the list is insufficiently listed to take the charge of it off.
Nobody's changed any of the listing rules. You've been overlisting for the most part and skipping items. But please, stop that.

And then you know what I found? You know what I found?

I found that those marked R/S and those marked RR were still firing halfway.

Aw, what does this mean? That means that we had a dishonest auditor. A dishonest auditor.

And I just decided to come down on this with a thud. And I have.

Do you know what an X means? Do you know what an X means?

It doesn't mean this didn't R/S. It doesn't mean this didn't RR. It means this does not produce any reaction of any kind on the meter. And when you put an X down in front or behind an item, I want you to have said and be true to your statement: "This does not produce a reaction on the needle." That is what X means – this produces no reaction on the needle.

Well, you say, "That's impossible. I mean, you go down these lists and and they do produce reactions on the needle."

Oh, wake up, for Christ's sakes. I've only been trying to teach you this for a year and a half! The list is not complete! It's charged!

"Oh," you say, "we're liable to overlist."

Let me tell you something: The bypassed item is more likely to occur early on the list than late on the list.

If you're going to pick an item that will bypass an item, you understand, it's liable to occur earlier up here. More likely to occur. It doesn't always – sometimes it's the first item on the list and it bypasses no items. Let's say it's this one – this fourth one down here from the top – let's say it's this one, huh? All right, what about that one? It's "a gee-whizzer" – "a gee-whizzer." Ah, but "a gee-whizzer" isn't due to come up for another three items. It's part of the bank but it isn't due to come up for three items. What we want is "a what-notter." And "a what-notter" – my God, "a what-notter" is clear down here. That's "a what-notter." In other words, the next item we want is "a what-notter." And if you list to this one – the second item, "a gee-whizzer," and then take a fully charged list and null it – you'll get some kind of idiot's performance like this, by the way – you've never listed it down to where the next item on the list occurred.

Why?

Well, look-a-here now, let's look at our definitions. Why is this? And excuse me for swearing because I just – if I could just teach you the ethics of the situation – they include never giving the pc an item unless it fires – see, the item's got to fire – and never putting an X down so long as a goal or an item even goes tsk! no matter how slightly. You understand?

It can have a faint roughing of the needle as you call it. You'll find that quite common in goals – you couldn't get it to tick for the life of you. And if you examined it at 128 sensitivity, you'd find as you said it there's a slight, tiny roughness of the needle. Well, you can't get it as a read – it won't read and nothing else will read.
But we're talking about something that goes tick, man. You know? Tick! Tick! And you'd put an X down across something like that? Ooooh, you've just told a lie! That is a lie—and a very vicious one! Because it says that this list here was improperly listed and improperly nulled. And it is covered up by the fact that an X is put there.

This X is put there? Oh-ho! Why? Why did we put an X there? In the first place, why would we try and out, you know—in, in, in, in, in, X? What are you doing nulling a list like that? I mean, you know how a list nulls?

This is the way a list ought to look. There's nothing much to these lists. The list as you null should look something like this if you're going to null a whole list. That's the item.

Now, how do you get one like that? How do you get one like that?

Well, by listing it until it's null.

Oh, but what happens if you overlist it?

Well, the pc protests it. And then you have a dirty needle.

No, I'm afraid you have to know how to audit. There's no substitute for knowing how to audit.

The two things that go out and give you a dirty needle are Protest—now put this down well, because these are—these are I think—I don't think I ever stated these both consecutively and together: Protest and Decide. Protest and Decide are the buttons you have to get in every now and then—on a pc that's prone to have a dirty needle on everything and you can't null on. He's protesting. Fail to reveal, of course, gives you the dirtiest needle—that gives you the most twiggle-twiggle, but we're not interested so much in that. But it's Protest and Decide that foul up a list. The pc has decided that the item isn't on it. The pc has decided that there is no item on it. The pc has decided that the auditing question is wrong. The pc has decided something. And you'll continuously have a reaction. And the pc is protesting, you'll continuously have a reaction.

Well, what's this mean?

The Protest and Decide are all the buttons you need to get in, in actual fact, when you're nulling. You show the pc the list for anything he's done to it or something like this. And he eventually starts—if the pc is being overlisted, he'll protest and decide. You mostly don't have to get them in at all—just lean across and show the pc—you say, "Hey, hey, take a look at these things, you know? Have you done anything with—you had any thoughts on this list?" Not "Have you invalidated anything,"—that's getting in a button. "Have you had any thoughts on this list?"

The pc looks it over. "Oh, I thought that 'to be a cockroach,' I thought that was a very funny goal. Ah, ha!"

You say, "All right. Your needle is now clean again."

But do you know that no amount of rudiments or anything else—no amount of them—will clean up a list which is still charged. Learn that. Learn that.
And no amount of rudiments will clean up a list that has been listed... overlisted into
the ground, that the pc is going out of his head on. It'll just continue with a dirty needle.

In other words, there's two extremes – there's underlisting and there's overlisting. Don't do either one!

How long is a list?

Well, a list is long enough so that it nulls properly and has an item on it. That's how
long a list is.

Well, how can you tell if something is underlisted?

Well, if you have a bunch of dirty needles and zzzt and brrrp, and if the thing is an un-
clean needle, a very dirty needle as you go down the line – and if two items occur on the list –
in other words, you get two rocket reads or an R/S and a rock slam or two R/Ses on the list
and so forth – you know the list is not complete, so you have to continue it.

Well, what's an overlisted list?

Well, the pc is just kind of in apathy about it all and upset and sort of audited into the
ground, and it all is sort of tight and the mass is tight and the needle is tight, and the auditor's
just been a nut. That's all. The auditor had a complete list and didn't know when to stop.

Well, this asking the question for a test is all very well, but it is a rough rule of thumb.
You have to add five more after the thing cleaned up or you'll very often miss the item. The
item was about to go on but isn't on yet – but because it's about to go on it doesn't act as
charge on the needle – and, therefore, the question is freed of that burden and you'll find it'll
go on in the next few.

It's not a matter of judgment – it's a matter of pure mechanics. An overlisted or an un-
derlisted list are equally difficult to null. You get a terrific protest going, you see, if you start
overlisting and you get a continuous dirty needle. It's as simple as that. I mean, these are mat-
ters of judgment. These are matters of observation.

What are you trying to do?

You're trying to find the next consecutive item. Or you're trying to find the pc's goal.
That's what you're trying to do.

And in order to do that, you have to pay attention to this other phenomena. The other
phenomena is that if you can't null a list, why you've either overlisted it like mad – at which
time the pc has already decided the item is on the list – which gives you a continuous read,
and the pc is protesting like mad because he says the item is on the list. And with both of
these things – with both of these things at play – you of course, can never null the thing.

In addition to that, overlisting has a tendency to suppress the actual item. And you've
just wasted an awful lot of time.

Now, you also can put more items on the list than you actually need. You might even
get the wrong one firing or something weird might happen on an overlist.
Well, an underlist is easily detectable because more than one item RRs or R/Ses – or everything on the list is live. You call these things and so forth. Well, if you call this item here and it gives you a little tick and a flash and so forth, well, don't put an X down there, man. Why? It's not out! You see, it isn't that it doesn't RR and therefore is out. Heh! No, no, it has a reaction on it and therefore is not out. And I don't care what you're looking for, the rules and laws of listing remain what they are. No, sir, you'll never have the item.

Now, let's go a little bit further. Let's go a little bit further and let's find out something about the GPM. Let's know something. You probably already do, but let's make sure you do. What are you doing when you've got a goal "to be a lady" getting an oppterm "steam locomotive" and a terminal "astronomy"? What are you doing? Why? Why do you even stop? I mean, why do you even – why do you even read anything back to the pc, man? You know it's wrong! Well, what are you doing? Where are you? You know? You're supposed to be the auditor.

"Is this your item? I've got something here that RRs." Sure you've got something that RRs – you've got something that RRs from fifteen banks away. And it RRs. Well, sure, anything that didn't belong to the goal.

Now, look-a-here. Look at this "most likely" list. You're going down this "most likely" list, going down the "most likely" list, going down the "most likely" list and so forth. And finally, why, you think, "Well, that's about it – that's the end of that." It's "to be a lady," you see. And you've got items like "chemistry sets," "cockeyed jazaboos," "porphyry and granite," "astronomy," "steam locomotives," and so forth. "Aaaaaaah list must be complete. I guess I'll null it. Ah-hah-ha, ooooh – there it goes – there's the one that rocket reads, 'a steam locomotive.' All right, that's the hottest thing in your bank, 'a steam locomotive.'" And then we oppose that and we oppose that and we don't have any RR left on the pc.

Well, why?

You aren't even operating in the bank, "to be a lady."

What item do you want?

Look, know your GPMs, man – know your GPMs. What item do you want? You're not going to evaluate for it and give it to the pc. But you're sure going to list till you get this kind of thing.

Now, look, the pc's confront is not very good. The pc's confront is too bad. And the pc is not going to recognize – the pc's not going to recognize his items until he's listed long enough to find his items. Let's take this "to be a lady," and we're getting items like "porphyry and granite," "crab tarts." This is as close as he can get to his goal. You see?

You've just got to list until you find something on there that – "women who are ladies," or something like this. Don't you see? You get what I mean?

"Oh," you say, "oh, well, this is pretty – looking pretty good now. 'Women who are ladies' and there it is." We start nulling this thing off and all of a sudden, why, "women who are ladies," pshew! Well, we know what the top oppterm is – we already know the script. If it's a goal "to be a lady," the top oppterm is going to have something to do with being a lady. And
the pc is now very much opposed to it. See that? "Being a lady," "ladylike actions," "women who are ladies."

It's only in this middle ground of a GPM – if you're looking at a line plot – it's only in the middle ground of the GPM that it departs at all. And then it'll have something that's quite germane. It'll have something like "to be a lady," "niceness," "mannerliness," something like that. That's... be your middle ground.

But the items that you're looking for, for top oppterm as you list this list down here – it's got to have something to do with a lady. And I don't mean something to do – women who are very beautiful and sweet. I mean, it's got to have "a lady" in it. You understand? A lady! Or ladies. You know? English – English words. "A" space "l-a-d-y" – that is part of the terminal, or "ladies," l-a-d-i-e-s, is part of it, or you haven't got anything. So what are you doing picking it up? What are you doing?

I mean, that's adding the auditor in there to a terrific degree. But on your "most likely" list you're getting everything under the sun, moon and stars but something which has the exact wording of the goal in it one way or the other? Well, what's your top terminal on "to be a lady?" It isn't actually "to be a tramp." It'll be "somebody who wants nothing to do with being a lady," or something like that, don't you see? "Somebody who can't be a lady" – that will be the top oppterm. I mean, it's so simple!

And somebody here recently on an audit had an item on a goal "a person with this goal." Ah, but look, that's never part of the bank. "Somebody with the goal 'to catch catfish.'" Yeah, oh, yeah, that's it. So the pc hadn't stated it. The pc hadn't stated it. Well, how do you get around this? Obviously, if you tried to null this list – you see, it mechanically confirms the significance of it – if you tried to null this list, most likely, and it didn't have anything on it – lady, a ladies, you know – if it didn't have stuff like this on it – it isn't going to be discharged. Why? Because you haven't got any of the GPM's items on the list – what's going to discharge it? See? It's as simple as that. It isn't going to discharge by some... because you're charming as an auditor. It's going to discharge because it's got something on it that belongs! Simple.

You know, I could probably steer a pc by lengths of lists straight through a GPM without a halt or an upset, on just how many are listed and – you know, and checking it up – how many RR, and that the list is nullable and not more than one fires. In other words, steer them through, totally blind, with no assistance of any kind from the significance of the item.

But I could also steer them through one with no RR – hardly a meter. How? Well, I know what a GPM looks like. Well, you... down there at the bottom you've got the goal just stated as a goal. That's simple. You've got a – at the top of the thing you've got the reverse side of the goal. You've got, "people who catch catfish" – that's become an enemy, something like that. Or "catfish catchers" – that'll be up the top of this thing. The oppterm is established therefore. And then the terminal, the top terminal that is up at the top will be "somebody who doesn't want anything to do with catching catfish," or some such statement as that. Down on the terminal side of the thing you've got the goal as an RI, "to catch catfish." The next item up from that is "the goal to catch catfish." The next item up from that is "somebody with the goal to catch catfish" or "somebody or something with the goal to catch catfish."
it'll be "somebody with a goal to catch catfish," and then above that "somebody or something with a goal to catch catfish." And then "a catfish catcher."

Well, we've taken care of now a great many items. The rest of those items will be germane. They will not have "catfish" in them or something like that, but they'll all be germane. You might even go so far afield as "people who don't like fish," or "people who won't eat," or "people who hate sports." You might -- you might even have something like that. Or you might have "unluckiness," you see. But you're getting pretty far afield.

The middle ground of a GPM is -- the bottom of the oppterm column, and the middle of the GPM is left to question. The rest of it is not left to question. It could be rephrased just exactly looking at the goal. You look at the goal, you could actually write those things -- I say you'd better not -- but you could actually write them in on the plot. That's what... you practically could write them in. There's a -- slightly different ways of stating them. A pc could even become aware of these things and the goal will discharge and everything will be fine.

But if you know what you're heading for and if you know what you're trying to get on your line plot and you know what you're trying to list, why, it assists you enormously not to make stupid mistakes. So follow it all mechanically, do it all mechanically, obey all the mechanical rules -- and to that add your good sense. "To be a lady" -- oppterm: "a steam locomotive" -- terminal: "astronomy." "Well, Ron, I... here's the GPM, I've got her line plot okay. I've got her line plot fine here."

"Where's the rest of the items?"

"Well, she didn't have any, as a matter of fact. That's the whole GPM."

You're going to see some of these. You're going to -- it's going to be your unpleasant duty to point out to an auditor that somewhere he has bypassed everything but the goal. He's fortunate. He still has the pc's goal -- it still rocket reads. But everything else has been bypassed. The GPM and all items in it.

Not only has he done this, but he has also gratuitously added the contents -- the odd and random contents -- of two or three other GPMs.

There's ways of checking this. If an item ticks, it came wrong way off a list. That is to say, you go back on the line plot and you check all the items on the line plot, you find something ticking -- the list it came off of was too complete or incomplete, one or the other. You've got to adjust that list, get another item -- throws you back into the GPM. It's actually not very hard to do.

You remind me of somebody who is sent out into the front yard to find a dozen white stones amongst the gravel. And the white stones are there. And you keep coming back with gray stones, pink stones and green stones and saying, "Look, there they are. The pc's sort of messed up, was sick all day yesterday, but here's this beautiful green stone: 'a steam locomotive.'" And heh-heh -- you're just not using your good sense.

You go out in the front yard, you're supposed to find a dozen white stones. All right. You even know they're white. You can pick them up, you could almost pick them out. You hardly have to audit the pc at all to put together his line plot. Of course, if he put the pc -- if he
put his own line plot together without the thing being run and discharged, he'd be one of the sickest pcs you ever had anything to do with. But that doesn't have anything to do with the fact that you know what should be there. And if you're not getting what should be there, boy, you're doing something wrong. Then the mechanical rules are out, too.

What you're doing is spectacular to such a degree that it has never been done on the track. This is just unknown information. Never been done. Twenty-five hundred years ago they banged a few guys out of their head. We did that the other day on the Long John television program to the benefit of the whole New York audience. I sent a cable over and I said, "Bang somebody out of his head."

Well, there was a professor sitting there who was saying, "Nyaa, nyaa, nyaa. Scientology..." and so forth. And Thomas's wife, according to a report I had – told him try not to be three feet back of his head. And, by God, there he was. Made very good radio.

I wonder how many other people in New York City tried not to be three feet back of their heads at that moment. I imagine there were a couple of taxicabs hit other taxicabs about that moment.

But actually that's as far as – besides some codes and morals and things like that – that's about as far as Buddhism went. You know what they told you to do in Buddhism after that? Although we're the inheritors of all the empire of Buddhism, in actual fact – we should not be blind to what the Buddhist did – he got overwhelmed by the GPM. Oh, you think so? You don't think he did, huh? Ha-ha-ha-ha. What do you think nirvana is? You've seen pictures of nirvana, haven't you? Populated, totally populated – big circular mass that you're supposed to go into and become one of all with everything.

He collided with the GPM, but he didn't know what it was. He thought it was heaven.

Well, we're way beyond that. What we're doing is so spectacular that it's totally out of – completely out of the range of believability that we have at... accomplished this thing. And yet we are – and are accomplishing it, we have accomplished it – there we are. Aha! But what happens now? Are you supposed to sit there in total reverence just because this is enough to overwhelm every thetan in this universe? Are you supposed to now sit there in a state of overwhelm?

I don't think you are. You know the score! You can become the master of this thing. Well, why not do so? You're on your – you're on the way out from this. You've won. What are you doing cowing before, kowtowing to and being a slave on the subject of the great, overpowering GPM? No, you've got it – you've got it made. Well, go ahead and audit it. Learn more of it. It's not formidable. All you have to do is an honest job of auditing today and a sensible job.

The GPM merely proceeds from a goal. You clean up the GPM for that goal. You find the next goal. We've even got easy ways to do that. And as soon as you've got the goal to the next GPM, then clean up with a Prepcheck the GPM you're working in. Go on and find the items of the next goal.

Oh, it's not easy on the pc. But as soon as you get the stunt, it's awful easy on the auditor. And the easier it is on the auditor and the more cleverly an auditor can do this and the
easier it is for an auditor to do this – the easier it is on the pc. You go on down the track at a high rate of speed.

This can be done. This is being done. We are being successful. It's time for you to wake up and take a look.

Despite the GPM, you now have permission to confront.

Thank you very much.

Good night.
TOP OF THE GPM

A lecture given on 16 April 1963

How are you, how are you?

Well, this is the what? The 16th of April AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, today I could talk to you about a lot of things. I could talk to you about quite a few things. Talk to you about goals. Talk to you about GPMs. Talk to you about the basics of auditing. But I'd rather talk to you at the moment on the subject of the GPM. I, frankly, have been somewhat holding you back from getting too enthusiastic going down the bank because you omit the tops of some of these goals and the results can be quite catastrophic. And believe it or not I didn't know what the top of a goal was exactly like, even after doing a dozen GPMs – I still couldn't guarantee what the pattern of the top of a GPM was.

Now, I finally managed to get this squared up.

Now, I've been restraining some of your enthusiasm for going down into a bank, and knocking a bank together out of any old thing and then going on and finding the next goal and then going on and finding the next goal and then going on and finding the next goal and running part of that bank and then going on and finding the next one.

This perhaps is forgivable from the standpoint of research. I myself have had to do it. That's no particular reason you should or your pc should.

Now, some of the banks that we get in here, and we've seen some actual banks of one kind or another, some of these banks are the most incredible hotchpotches, and potpourris which I think you have ever seen. They are absolutely incredible. In the whole bank there are nothing but a few locks and numerous pieces of other GPMs. This is quite interesting.

We just had one in here from California that was enough to fry your hair.

Now, this applies very much to goals finding. And you know, I wouldn't – I just wouldn't let a pc have the goal "to create," the goal "to do," "to be," "to have," "to be cause," "to cause," any such goal. I just wouldn't let the pc have it. It appeared on the list, I wouldn't touch it. I'd just go right over the top of it and go somewhere else. That sounds strange, doesn't it?

Well, let me tell you, after I'd had ten banks very thoroughly run, a lot of items still in them and so forth, the goal "to create" got onto a list, and the auditor started to drill the goal "to create" and the whole bank started to beef up. And listen, I'd had ten banks run – ten – and the goal "to create" appears somewhere at about bank fifteen.

Well, in other words, with that many banks run I still couldn't even stand to have the goal "to create" be drilled, you know; to be tiger drilled. Why?
Well, in actual fact these goals are quite ancient, and the earlier you get on the track, the more force and velocity there is in the energy and enthusiasm with which a thetan mocked these things up, and you get a recurrence of that when you go back too early on the track.

Well, let me tell you something: The goal "to create" is two hundred and sixteen trillion. That's the beginnings of it. And that goal is a multitrillion year goal. And you're going to take some pc that can't even sit still in an auditing chair and you're going to find this goal on him and you're going to run it. Ha-ha! I think – I don't know where the goal "to be" is, but I think it's before that.

Now, naturally the wickedest goal in the bank is the goal "to create." But you are going to take the goal "to be," the goal "to create," the goal "to cause," the goal "to be cause," and you are going to run this on somebody that... ha-ha-ha. No you're not. You're not going to make it. Why not? It's too early, too early. You could probably steer him through it one way or the other and you might come out the other end with a live pc; might be, if you were lucky and it's all straightened up.

But you get goals in here of one kind or another and... I'm just giving that business about the big goals on the pc's list. The pc's just being enthusiastic and ambitious. His goal is probably "not to breathe in mouse's nostrils," and you're going to run on him the goal "to create." Ha-ha, that's silly, you see. I mean, it's beyond the reality of the pc. Don't you see?

Now, a goal tends to present itself by it's context. Most of the goals found as the first goal found are designed to be found.

Let's take one. The goal "to know," of course, presents itself like that. Why? Because you want to know somebody's goal so he says "All right, it's the goal 'to know,'" you get the idea. It's a pretty early goal. Not unrunnable, but pretty early.

Let's take another example. Let's take the goal "not to be detected." Well, you say, "How does this present itself?" Well, because it's got "someone who wants to be detected," or something like that, in its top oppterms which the pc is dramatizing. So they give you this goal "not to be detected," because the pc wants to be detected.

The goal "to find," of course, is a natural. The goal "to know the truth" is another natural. These goals – do you understand what I'm saying to you – they tend to present themselves because of their significance.

Now, goals behave in significant ways, but the running of a goal has to do with significance only to the degree of getting the right items, not whether a pc cognites or not. We don't care whether he cognites. All we want to see is that meter rocket reading. And that's all we want to see. And the amount of recovery the pc will make is simply the number of banks and the amount of charge which we remove from the case.

The pc's confront goes up in direct ratio to the amount of charge removed from the case. And his confront does not go up – does not, definitely not go up – on the amount of confronting he does of the bank.

This is a – this is a peculiarity about the GPM. In other words, you couldn't familiarize somebody with the bank – it's entirely a proposition of charge. Well, this becomes (quote)
"quite important" to us. It tells us that the pc is going to be as able as we find GPMs and run them out; not as able as they are significant. Do you understand that?

We have two pcs. One is to have a goal "to be good," the other has a goal "to be a bad man." Well, all right, we run those out. We get an equal recovery as far as the actual status of the case and the ability of the case is concerned; which is comparable. In other words one GPM equals one – so many ergs of recovery. Don't you see?

Now the fact that one has a different experiential track than the other has nothing really to do with auditing. This fellow has an experiential track which has – never has anything to do with business. All down the track he has nothing to do with business. Well, of course, he's going to wind up with an experiential track which to some degree omits business, but at the same time has experience with business because it's a direct opposite. You spend half your time in a GPM doing the opposite to the goal. So the significance of the goal is not of very great importance.

Now, the significance of the goal, however, means something to the auditor. It means that a goal which is so worded is more likely to present itself than a goal that isn't so worded.

All right, let me give you an example. If a pc had the goal "to present this goal to the auditor," that is the goal which the pc would give to the auditor and the auditor would find on the pc. Well, in lesser degree this is true all the way down the line. So that mediocre goals, or quasi-quasi goals, are rather difficult to find because they don't dramatize their own presentation. Do you understand that? To that degree significance is important.

Now, significance is also important in wording up the GPM. That's very significant because the right items in a GPM are worded a certain way and wrong items aren't.

Now you get a GPM and somebody has allegedly had found on him, "to create." This is his first goal, see. Oh, ah, anybody see it read? I doubt it. If anybody saw it read, it read for a moment and the pc quietly expired, but they went ahead and found some items. Well now, they found the item "steam locomotive," "a lady," "astronomy," "pigties," and one we saw this morning had the marvelous thing of... the goal "to create" I think had in it, or some such goal – the goal had in it the name of the auditor. I know we had it... the auditor had the same name two hundred and sixteen trillion years ago. See, it's ridiculous.

In other words he didn't find any part of the goal "to create." They found the goal "to create," but didn't find any part of the goal "to create."

Now do you see what happens when you go too far backtrack with one of these goals? Well, it isn't enough to abandon some pc's goal that is rocket reading, just to say, "Well, that's too far backtrack." No, the thing to do is to have confidence that you can plow the pc through anything, providing it rocket reads. But plowing him through that much backtrack, well it just wouldn't happen, it just wouldn't happen, you'd never get him into it. You'd find a whole lot of lock items of one kind or another unless you piloted him very directly.

Now, I am not saying that you should abandon the pc's goal that is rocket reading because it is too early track. But I'm saying that the pc's goal, run, is going to give you a great deal of difficulty. Most of these whole statement goals which are brave and upstanding like "to confront," you know. That's a great goal. That's a nice goal. That's way back on the track,
and the goal you are looking for in actual fact is a lot more modern. A pc isn't as full of vine-gar in modern time. He's got reservations as to how much power he has. He'll have a goal something like "to get along all right," or "to get along," or a goal "to get out," or a goal "to quit," or a goal "not to quit unless I have to," you understand? Or a goal like "to make it somehow," "to not be sad." Ooh, you know, I mean these are interesting goals or there may be some minor goals the PC knows he can do, which is "to reforest Earth," or something. Or, no, that's pretty ...

The goal that I'm talking about is – the later it is on the track the more significance it is going to have.

That doesn't naturally hold true, because the escape goals, the not-confront goals – not the goal "to be free," that's probably pretty early – but the escape goal like "to never go to school," see, something like that. Such a goal as that is more likely to be in present time, and such a goal as "to confront," "to do," "to be," "to have," "to create," "to cause," "to be cause," goals of that character are very early track.

In other words the whole simple thought is backtrack, and the more complicated, non-confront forms are present time-ish. You got the idea? Present time could contain a goal such as "to be a man," you see? All right, that's a finite goal. On this PC the goal presents itself "to cause," and the auditor drills this goal "to cause," and can never get the thing to go out. It won't go out and it won't rocket read, and it won't do this and it won't do that. Well it can't be run, don't you see. But "to be a man," that can be run. That is runnable, and because it is runnable the individual is able to get through it.

All right, so much for that. Now the later a goal is on the track, the more the PC was likely to dramatize it. And the most important goal to the PC is the one which includes present time. And the top of that goal may not be there fully because it may not be fully developed. He may not have lived all the way through that goal yet, but nevertheless what top that goal has will be the hidden standard; will be the chronic present time problems of the PC. You see that?

That's as far as the whole track is concerned. In other words, the PC is much more likely to dramatize a recent goal than an ancient goal. You got that? All right. Now that looks at the whole GPMs. See? All of them.

Now, the later an item is in a GPM, the later an item is in a GPM, the more likely it is to be dramatized and the less reality the PC has on it. And that is also true of the whole track. The PC has less reality on a modern goal than an early goal. A PC has less reality on the top of a GPM than its middle.

Now you ask – now this has a great deal to do with running – you ask a PC, you say, "Oh, give me an item in your GPM," you see. It's "to decide," you see, it's "to decide," and he gives you "maybe." In other words, it's not "not decide," and it's not "to decide." He'll give you the crossover area.

PCs tend to give you the middle of the GPM, and left to their own devices more likely give you the middle of the track. They dramatize, however, the material latest in the GPM, and the material latest on the track.
Well now, that's – this is all data. This is actually vital data. It isn't the type of data which you think you can get along without because you can't.

Now, Mary Sue did the rather fantastic (I don't know how many auditing hours she put in over Easter), but she did the rather fantastic thing of running a fifty GPM bank in seven and a half hours, which is the average time of an RI every nine minutes, which includes all breaks, arguments, administration, upsets, everything. One every nine minutes. A seven-and-a-half-hour sprint which encompassed the whole of one GPM.

Now, I don't know the GPMs have less in it. They probably – some of them may have less items in it – in them – than this particular GPM. But there were at least fifty items in this GPM, and the reason there were at least fifty items in it is – I know we didn't miss many because missing one was something like being blasted out of the chair. The second you missed an item, why, the whole world sort of went *nyaah*, and the corners of the room went out of plumb, and got sick at my stomach, and so forth. This body did not like it at all.

Any one of these items in this GPM was the equivalent charge to a bank later on the track – than a whole GPM later on the track. This thing is a crusher. I'm speaking from experience. I'm speaking of the goal "to create," and we ran it out last night in a seven-and-a-half-hour sprint. Rather fantastic.

Why did I have to do this? Well, we actually took the goal "to be cause," "to cause," and the goal "to create," to get early enough on the track to get the plot and form of the GPM. Why? Well the later – the later items are terribly obscured, awfully nailed down, and awfully hard to get at. They do not reveal themselves easily, and we had run all the way back down, I think "to create" is about the fifteenth GPM I've run.

We haven't prepchecked these things. We haven't cleaned up all the items in them, but this one we did clean up well in order to get the pattern of the GPM.

Well, we've been struggling along in that direction, and I've been trying very hard to get it and suddenly it came to view why the top of the GPM is missing. And the top of the GPM is missing for this excellent reason: (I don't know if you can see this or not. The top items of the GPM, the first fourteen items – that is to say, the first twelve items down from the top of a GPM, I said fourteen because I know the next two), but the first twelve items are simply positive-negative.

In other words, we've got one here which is a noun, you see, and that's the noun. And over here we have "no" noun. Now, if a pc dramatizes – you see this is your – this is your oppterm, and this is your term. Now, if the pc dramatizes the top of the bank more easily than the bottom of the bank, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha – what happened to the top of the GPM? This gets very interesting. What happened to it? Well, "no noun" overlaid "noun." A top oppterm was "noun," you see. Let's say it was "to scream," you see. So this is "scream," or "screams." Now this would be "no screams." The top terminal is just "no screams." Simple as that.

Well, with these two collapsed on each other, every time the pc looks at "screams," he says, "No, it's not screams," you see. He says, you see, "Screams, well it's no screams," so there aren't any screams.
Now the next one is a – is the goal with an "-ing" form followed by a "no" same, see. So that's "screaming," and every time the pc would look at it, this top being collapsed, term and oppterm, the terminal of course is "no screaming." So every time he looks at "screaming," well he sees immediately then that there – it's no, you know, it's – there's no screaming. You see, it's not there. And that's true of the first twelve items of the top of a GPM. Every one of them is cancelled out by the fact that it's a direct negative.

You've got the top five oppterms, and they are all followed by negatives. And they go, the next one here goes "-ers," and it's "no -ers," and the next one is, horribly enough, "-ingness; -ingness," and this is "no -ingness," and then it is "-ishness," and then "no -ishness," and then finally, "-ivity," and I think – of course I haven't compared this to the top rungs as far as the upper goals are concerned – but I think there is a whole constant because this is in "das master plan" that you chumps laid down. I don't know what the hell is the matter with you people. What did you – what did you do that for? You know, that's silly.

Anyhow, here's this – here's this puzzle. The next one down from that on the oppterm side is "beings who 'goal'," or "people who 'goal'," depending on what part of the track you are on. You know, if you are on the early track there aren't any people. You might have been back there sometime, you might have noticed there are no people. And of course on this side, why of course it's "a being who never 'goals'," or later on the track, "someone who never 'goals'."

Well anyhow, what's all this positive-negative proposition? Well, it's just a gradient scale of how the goal increases. Now of course, these – I might have these, one or two of these turned around, but what you are looking at here is the, is the first real look at one of these GPM tops. And the idiocy here of course is this negative all on the terminal side. The first – I said five, that's not correct. One, two, three, four, five, six, the first six terminals from the top and the first six oppterms from the top exactly compare except the terminals have "no" in front of them, or "not."

Now you get a beingness form goal like "to be – to be slap happy," and you then get the "-ing," of course is "being slap happy." And this of course is "not being slap happy" over here. I'm talking about the second from the top, the top and then the next one to it. This "goal –ing" means of course "being slap happy," and the negative version is "not being slap happy."

Now some of you unfortunate people who have cooked up a goal which is "to skate on the Empire State embankment unless the police catch up with me," nevertheless have all these goal forms as far as I can find out, and how you squeeze all that into a single goal form I don't know.

But here's – here's the weird one about this thing. We've got "to be slaphappy," you see. Well how do you get it into an "-er" form? What are the "-ers?"

Well, oddly enough the bank wasn't laid in in English. I don't know if that ever occurred to you or not, but you haven't been speaking English very long. And what you are doing is approximating in English just thetan-thought concept which exists without semantics. So much for Hayakawa and Korzybski. Semantics isn't the end-all of everything, it's just what semantic sits on the thought concept, because a thetan can hold this thought concept. And of course these thought concepts are not expressed in English, and you get such a thing as "being
slaphappers," or some such thing, "being slaphappers." And you get "slaphappingness," "be-
ing slap happeningness." And you get "slap happyishness." And you get "slap happyivity." That
sounds like gobbledygook, but you're going to be the most amazed person in the world when
you find it start rocket reading on your pc. "Oh, ho," he says, "what's this, what's this, what's
this?" Well it's because he didn't live the bank in English. He didn't live it in any language,
and that you could get it into English at all is fabulous.

Now this "-ishness" is quite interesting. It's different than – well let's take, let's take
"create," see. We have "creating, creators, creatingness," that's all perfectly happy. And we
also have "creativity." Well this one in here, what's this "-ishness?" Well actually you have
"creatishness." It means the tendency, the tendency toward creatingness. And that all matches
up in English to the actual thought concepts that are in it, which I think is quite amusing.

But anyway there's the top of the GPM, and of course each one of those things has a
suitable negative. And "to skate on the Empire State Building so the police won't catch me,"
oh brother, you've got a job on your hands. How do you make that into a noun? Well it's not
"skating upon the top of the Empire State Building so the police won't catch me." It's probably
"skated" or it's probably, well, it will be something on the thing that says the nounal form of
skate, to skate, you see. And maybe that's a "skut." But whatever it is, you take "to bring all of
my money home to my mother." You see? This noun form becomes "brought all my money
home to my mother," see. Some such expression, but it is what it is and it will not be "pay-
check." You understand? See, it won't be a different word. It'll be "brought all of my money
home to my mother," you see. It'll be that sort of thing. It might even be, "brought-home-
money," you see. But whatever it is, it is what it is, and fits under that noun form.

Now, right across from it of course is "not it," you see. "No," "no brought money
home to my mother." Something of that sort, and that will express this concept.

Now of course it's very easy "bringing money home to my mother," and "not bringing
money home to my mother." "Bringers of money home to my mother," and "no bringers of
money home to my mother." "Bringiness of money home to my mother," "no bring-" or
"not," (no or not) "bringing home-" "bringiness home to my mother," "bringiness money
home to my mother," "bringiness money home to my mother," "not bringiness home...
money home to my mother," and "bringivity." And you say, "Oh, that isn't English." You're
right, you're right, you didn't lay these banks in in English.

I think it's quite amusing. And of course the joke is on the poor pc who has such a goal
as his first goal, and the poor auditor who finds the goal, knowing he had better find the goal,
not "to be," or something like this, but find the goal "to be a good, sweet, little fairy who
makes children happy."

Ha-ha! Well of course you just keep working on the verb form of it till it fits in. Now
it's got to rocket read, and the odd part of it is you'll find it does rocket read.

Now there is a school of thought of "What is Ron doing entering my bank this way?"
Well, I'd say you've got an awful – you've got an awful slow reaction if you have that school
of thought. But what have I been doing for thirteen years? That's just bum; you just noticed.
What do you think of somebody that just noticed he's being processed after thirteen years?
Anyhow, the thing is what it is. It isn't what I say it is. And you'll find out that your pc will stay very comfortable, will feel very good and everything is fine if you run the whole GPM with no nonsense about it, and you get the whole GPM. And the pc will feel very strange indeed if you don't run the whole GPM. And if you can catch a pc with a late goal and run the whole thing, or even if the goal – whatever the goal he gave you, catch the early goal and struggle with it if you have to – and you run the whole thing and you get it beginning with the top oppterm and go right on through without bypassing a single item, work it right on down to the bottom of the GPM, do your RI oppose list at the bottom of the GPM to get rid of that goal as an RI, do all that, prepcheck it up, you'll check it up – check its items, make sure nothing's ticking, just everything in it, prepcheck it up; you're going to feel marvelous, you're going to feel marvelous.

But if you leave the top there, find a bunch of items that belong to another bank and get the goal discharged somehow and get down to the bottom of it and try to prepcheck this muck that won't prepcheck. So then you go and find the next goal and do the same thing with it, and find the next goal and do the same thing with it, and find the same goal and do the same thing with it, and the next goal and do the same thing with it, you're going to have an awful uncomfortable pc.

Now your pc is going to be uncomfortable enough with a goal entered and a couple of bypassed items in it. How do you think your pc's going to feel with four or five or six or eight unfinished GPMs? Well he's going to feel pretty grim. Therefore it is very, very important for you to know the anatomy of a GPM, because let me let you in on something here. Do you know that nobody listing straight in a GPM, including me, has hit the top. They hit the middle beautifully, but they never hit the top. They never hit the top. They just never put it on the list. That's remarkable when you come to think about it. Well that's because it's too late on the track.

Now the things will fire if you present them to the pc. So you get a thing called "directive listing" which – in which you direct the pc's attention to what you want for what particular spot on the thing.

Now, this goes contrary to what we have done formerly, but it's not evaluative because you're not saying, "your item is," you say, "Give me the noun form of your goal." And the pc doesn't give it to you, he gives something else. Well keep taking down what he gives you. Keep telling him, "No, no, no, the noun form. What is the noun form of 'roaring'?")"

And the pc says, "Oh, roar."

"No, that's the verb form. Oh no, it's also the noun form isn't it? Roar. Yeah, well, I'll put that on the list: roar."

Okay, it rocket reads. That's it. You are away. Test the thing and so forth. And you say, "Now give me the negative form of that."

And he says, "negative roars." And you say, "No, no, no, no," and he said, "Well, not roaring."

"No, no, no, no, the negative form," you know, "like 'no roar'."
He says, "Well all right, if you want to put it that way, no roar."
You say, "That rocket reads."
He says, "It does! Well, what do you know about that."

You know they protest sometimes for a moment or two. "What are you doing entering my bank? How do you know what I've been doing all this time?" It's about time we found out what he's been doing all this time.

Anyhow, you steer him — steer him into your proper forms for these, and you'll find they will fire promptly and properly in sequence.

Now, in keeping with this, here is very good news. Early on the track where they are hardest to run there are no items in the bank, no items in the bank, none, which do not contain the goal as part of the wording. Got that? There are none.

So if this holds true on up the track and forward into present time, then you won't get any more goals whereby you have "to be a lady," oppterms "steam locomotive," terminal "astronomy." See? "To be a lady." Well, it's just "lady," or whatever it is. I don't know what "lady" is in its noun form. You'll have to figure that out some day. It's not gentlewoman.

And there it is, you say the thing sits there and then it goes down the line "imperfect being a lady," "active... active lady being." You get this kind of thing. It's got "be a lady," "be a lady," in one form or another. It's "people who are ladies." It's "someone," it's "someone who would never be a lady." You got the idea? It's "lady," "lady," "being a lady," "be a lady," "ladying," so forth. It's just "being a lady," "imperfect ladies," and so forth, and it doesn't even get down to "tarts." It's just the "hopelessness of being a lady" is a low oppterms, don't you see? It's just a "lady, lady, lady, lady, lady." You get, you get the pc's item and it doesn't have the goal expressed in it one way or the other. If the whole bank follows the basic pattern of the very early, big, beefy banks, why, then we'd say it appeared in each one.

Now, we can't guarantee this is the truth in all of the later banks because we might get a variation. But I have found this to be the case, that you can pick off lots of locks that will RR and apparently disappear when you actually have left sitting right there the key item.

Let's take — let's take the item of "being a tiger." All right, we've got this item, and it's got a lock on it, and it's "imitating large animals." And you get "imitating large animals," and by George it borrows the rocket read from "being a tiger" and rocket reads and you can oppose it, and then you promptly get lost and you don't know where you are going.

In other words this gives us a very, very set and patterned action on a GPM.

Now there's a little bit better news. There's a little bit more news about this, and it's good news, is the lower oppterms, the very low oppterms repeat the very high terminals. So that you again get no noun, and no nourcing, or no goaling, and so forth in two or three items down there along the line.

And the only thing that doesn't really contain the goal expressed in the item on a whole GPM is the last couple of oppterms, the early oppterms, and of course they savor of the earlier goal. And you probably will find in the last one or two oppterms that you get a different phraseology entirely. But that makes it awful easy to pilot one of these things. You can
ride one of these things right on down, and it's all done by the drill. You test them, you test the question and you find out if the item is still reading and you go ahead. You don't test for terminal or oppterm because it's pretty obvious if you're doing it this way. And you make sure that it RRs and you carry on.

And with this pattern I began to suspect something, and can now tell you as an abso-
lute lead-pipe cinch. Now look, this does not apply to a source list. A source list has to be tiger drilled. But if you have to tiger drill an item or put the big mid ruds in on an item to get it to fire, that is not the item you want. Now, that's revolutionary isn't it?

In the first place I haven't been putting in anything on items for a long time. But it suddenly occurred to me that you're all drilling items to get them to fire. You get it on a list and then you drill it to fire. If you've got to drill it to fire it's not it, because you can make almost any item on a list fire. How do you like that? You could tiger drill anything that RRed on listing and you could make it fire again, momentarily.

Well, you mustn't drill these items. There is where you are taking up all of your time. It's all in the senseless drill. I couldn't figure out what you were doing, but now I know what you were doing. You're drilling items, and you mustn't drill items, you just mustn't do it, because if it didn't fire, it isn't it.

Well now, let's take this goal here, "to scream." And you put down "scream." Well hell, that's out of the blue. The pc is saying, "Aw, scream, what's this, scream, what's this?" Noun form of the goal, so forth. You say it a couple of times, it'll RR. Oh, you might touch it up, take the suppress off, because they just suppressed it. Take the protest off because they just protested it. Something like that. You know it's there. Oh, it's forgivable. You've got to make it fire. But if you say, "All right, give me the negative form, who or what would oppose scream? Or screams? Who or what would oppose screams?" And the pc puts down everything under the sun, moon and stars, and you're going to have to tiger drill something to make it RR. Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, it's just "no screams." If you get, "no screams" on the list, bang that's going to fire. You're going to see it fire. You're going to say it, it fires. That's it, that's all there is to it, bang.

There is no "null the list and go on down and null the list and get on the mid ruds. All right let's get on some mid ruds (let's see, we can waste another ten hours of auditing). Let's get in the mid ruds on all of the items in the bank, and so forth, and see if we can get the mid ruds in on the pc. So we see the pc is biting his fingernails. Let's get the pc in on biting fingernails, mid ruds, biting fingernails. Ee-ee beinsstu-huh."

What the hell's the matter with you? You haven't got the item, that's why.

Now look, as you go down the bank this is going to serve you in very good stead, because it's a number one test. I'm not just making fun of you. You're a knucklehead, and I – but I love you anyhow.

If you can't get something to go on the list, pshhhew, which when read back goes psshhhhew, see, if you can't get that thing going pow, you haven't got the item. Most marvelous test in the world. You get the item without drilling. If you can get the item without drilling, it's the item.
Now this has its limitations because you can get other items without drilling. You are
down in the middle of the bank, the pc can give you fifteen dozen locks, all of which fire,
one of which belong there. You get the center item and however it fires.

But the pc does this trick. You list for a while, and the pc isn't satisfied with the final
result. You call it, it fires. Pc says, "Oh no, that couldn't be it. It turns on mass, and it does this
and that and the other thing." And you'll notice that – you don't depend on the pc's telling you
– your tone arm is up here at four and a half, and when you give him the item, and you read it
back to him, not when he finally accepts it, particularly, if it's the right item, you get a blow-
down. It comes right down, that tone arm. That tone arm doesn't come down, you go on listing
for a while. Only guide his listing, and get him to put the thing on the list straight. Soon as
you've got the thing on there straight, once more the thing will fire, but the old one won't fire.

Now, you learn to work around with this fact that they fire without TD and you will be
clearing people. But as long as you put in Tiger Drill buttons on items to get them to fire, as
long as you null lists to get them to fire, you're going to wind up with the wrong item.

Just because something fires when you call it does not make it the right item, but if
you have to tiger drill it to get it to fire it is pretty much of a cinch to be a wrong item.

Now, the only thing about this is, is once in a while, about one item in fifty, the pc has
been sitting there chewing on it one way or the other, and has been refusing it. Let's say well,
we found it in bank one, and it turns up again in bank three, and the pc has been chewing on it
in bank one. Well you suddenly remember we've had this item on several lists before and it's
always been refused, and we see it on this list again. Yes, it could be that it is suppressed
enough so that it won't fire. But don't be deluded. Don't, don't be deluded by this, because the
chances are even if you do get it to fire it's still wrong for the spot you're trying to put it in.

It's one of these things. That an item does fire, bang, when you read it back to the pc, it
is not a guarantee. That you have to tiger drill it to get it to fire it is practically a guarantee
that it is not the item.

And there's where all of your clearing time on 3M is going. There's where it's all go-
ing. You are just not getting the items on the list.

Well, the reasons why you weren't getting the items on the list of course have to do
with the fact you didn't have the top form of the GPM.

Now, on actual listing tests, and on a great many pcs, and a great deal of experience of
this with this, I can tell you that the pc's bank is too heavily charged at the beginning of the
case for the pc's confront to be capable of giving you the item. That's it. It... he's just too
charged up. There's nothing wrong with telling him what the item is or running a bunch of test
items in on him, you know. Is it "bringing the truth?" "bringing truth?" you know. Write them
down on the list. Ask him if you can put this one down on the list, and that one. We'll eventually
work out some where it doesn't upset the pc particularly, and you'll eventually get some-
thing to fire, and there it is.

Now, when you get away from the top, the pc's confront comes up because the bank
isn't as jammed in the middle. But you now know that you've got to have items with the goal
in them, expressed in them if all banks follow the track of the original banks on the track.
All of this is very interesting information. It is all quite usable in auditing. I have been actively slowing down your going into too many GPMs and jumping over and so forth, until I was sure that we had something that looked like the top of the GPM. This is another good try at this. This is not a guarantee that the goal "to be a self-appointed archangel in the Christian Science church" – which is very late on the track – this is not a guarantee that it will have all of these tops. But look, if you've got all these tops you can test for them, and if they don't fire, they don't fire.

And then in the next goal that you get down to, why, you've sure got all these tops again, and you can test those things out. My money is on the fact that they will continue to fire all the way down, because it's a gradient scale on the oppterm side, it's a gradient scale from the extreme accomplishment of the goal down to the nonexistence of the goal. And on the terminal side it comes from the nonexistence of the goal, increases down to the goal itself. And this looks to me like a very good rendition of this.

Now, there may be some other common points about this, and I'll be studying them and so forth. But knowing now what this dozen at the top here are if there are any more items or patterns around in there that might get missed it won't be very serious. So you can go ahead and plunge on with this.

I'm quite intrigued with the fact that the GPM is this pattern. I'm quite intrigued. And I was very intrigued to find out that in the goal "to create" that the pattern was very fixed, and that the pattern was extremely patterned. And that made me very suspicious, because when did a thetan learn how to do this if two hundred and sixteen trillion years ago he was obeying the perfect pattern?

Well, I'd say there were a few goals before this, and I expect sooner or later to run into the beginning of track with some such goal as "to know how to put a GPM together."

But anyway there is as far as we've gotten on this pattern.

Now, tests for the top terminal, for the top oppterm, rather, tests for the top oppterm have been very successful and we've made some good progress on that. The top oppterms we got we didn't get any higher on those we already had been testing than "bringers," or "people who – people who 'goal'," or something like that. But we did get the "e-r" form, which was still two from the top. We want the noun form, itself.

I don't mean to muddy you up on that because all this will be published and these things will be rewritten. Before I rewrite them, however, I'm going to check a lot of later banks and get the information exactly fitted together, and it will be released at that time.

But this is good enough to use, and I think that it's very interesting that we had one pc who came in to see me today and he had a goal, and he told me, he told me that he – that nothing was doing him any good. And he had a goal "to be good." And I said, "Well, it doesn't do you – it does you no good. Is that right?" And he said, "That's sure right." And I said, "Well, then it's no good, isn't it?" And he said, "Aw, that's so true." And all of a sudden he... I said, "Well, that's your top terminal isn't it?" And he said, "Yeah, I guess it is," and he stopped saying any more about it. Now that's a mean thing to do to you, but I thought it was just too good.
Of course somebody with a goal "to be successful" has got a top terminal – is "no success," and he's dramatizing it like crazy. So if you are beating your brains out as an auditor wondering what's the matter with this guy, well, it's just "no success," you see. And if the guy had a goal "to find," and you'd just be beating your brains out because you've got "no finds." And if you had a goal "to know," you'd probably have "no knowledge" up here, and the pc's going to hit that awful strong because that's him.

Only one other little datum I might give you is the goal fires much better with the pc in a terminal than an oppterm. Isn't that interesting? Then you get back on the track later. I think that's fascinating. The pc definitely comes up the terminal side, and definitely faces all the way the oppterm side, just going into it slightly.

Well, that's some more data on the GPM, and now that we've got it pretty well taped, and we've got it pretty well figured out so that you can get through it – actually you could get through it before without losing your skull – but now that you can get through it, now that you can get through it, those in the X Unit will find it's perfectly safe now to find your goals. Perfectly safe and so you've got till Friday because it's awful hard to run a GPM without the goal, and if you haven't got your goal by Friday well, we'll have to put you into the Y, and then put you into running GPMs without the goal. It ruins the case, you know, to do that, so don't put us up to that, don't make us guilty of that terrible overt. Go ahead and find the goals before Friday. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.
DIRECTIVE LISTING

A lecture given on 18 April 1963

How are you today?
Thank you. Well, this is the what?

*Male voice: The 18th.*

The 18th of April, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and I'm going to talk to you now about directive listing and R3M2. The situation is evolving very neatly on 3M. Situation is well in hand. And if you want to be interested in something, or if you want to have more worries than you have at the present time, just audit some 3M. This is a guaranteed – this is a guaranteed method of absorption and worry. You can have more heart failure auditing as the auditor, doing 3M than the pc ever dreams of.

Now, pcs are very anxious to go down the bank, very anxious to run the GPM, and they get very ARC broke and they hate to be stopped, and, all of this sort of thing. And the auditor on his part, why he's – he's in one of these mental states which is, well, it's pretty grim! It's pretty grim! I'm getting my licks in now, on running it. I know what of I speak!

Now I myself didn't get much reality on auditing Routine 3M by being audited on it. And one of the reasons for that is, is I have probably one of the most indestructible RRs that ever emerged! You can be thankful for that. I miss a few items, or a couple of GPMs even and nothing much happens. The only time my RR ever went off was when I'd found – been put through a bank and found twenty items, without having the goal for that bank, it appearing that the bank was part of another bank. And my RR went off and we found the goal for it, for those twenty items, and of course it went right back on again and there's been no further trouble.

So I don't have a reality, subjectively, on the delicacy of most pcs' RRs. And yet I have now auditing experience that, shows me very definitely that pcs' RRs are very delicate. And you miss... well it's this delicate: You miss a couple of items, you know, bypass a couple of items and you find all of a sudden the pc's RR is dwindling, getting smaller, and will suddenly disappear, and you can't find any items on this pc. And that's apparently fairly ordinary.

The experience is more than just my auditing experience; it's been happening in Z Unit rather consistently. I began to see what the auditor is up against there, in this situation, because there are only two things – now get this – there are only two things that can cause an RR to get smaller. That is successive item after successive item, an RR can get smaller, shorter. And that is a symptom of danger. And only two things cause it.

And the first of these is not having the goal for the GPM you are running. Well, now with the new directive listing, which we are using, this liability becomes much less. Because the items you are getting in directive listing are taken directly from the context of the goal.
And, this only leaves the possibility that the goal might be slightly misworded. Instead of "to be successful" we have a goal "to succeed," don't you see? I mean we could be that close in.

But if this were the case, the goal would have R/Sed a lot on being checked out. Beware of these goals that R/S a lot. They RR and then they R/S – that doesn't apply to a goal halfway through a bank, because a real goal halfway through a bank will R/S. But, when you're checking and finding goals, you'll find a goal that R/Ses. And they've got a lot of R/S turns on with an occasional rocket read, you can be absolutely certain that that goal is slightly misworded.

In other words, instead of, "to be a kingpin" you see, it's "to kingpin," give you an idea. Instead of, "to run a restaurant" it'd be "to be a restaurant," you get the application of it. In other words, there's something slightly wrong. Instead of "to be a cook" – "to be the cook," you see? And that much error, that much error in the wording of the goal will cause a goal on checkout to do a lot of R/S, and once... starts in by an RR or two, and then does an awful lot of R/S, and then goes blooey, and you can't get it to do anything else. Well, that kind of a goal by the way is very valuable – very valuable in Routine 2. You find a goal that does this, all you've got to do is tell the pc to give me some variations in the wording of this goal. And, if the pc starts out, it's "to be a cook," see, you've got this goal "to be a cook," and the pc starts out, "Well, to like food. To prepare food easily," well, all right, let him go on. But what you want is just a variation in the wording of the goal. Not a goal of similar context, you see, we don't want the similar concept, we want a varied wording.

Because it's something – we know that "to" and "cook" are probably right. But is it "to cook"? or "to be a cook"? or "to be the cook"? Which one is it? Now this gets us into directive listing on goals which is where we properly pick the thing up. Now when we have the goal that way, we mustn't suggest goals to the pc, because this upsets the pc like mad. But if we've got a goal, which is going bing-bing, and R/Sing, and it RRs every once in a while, and then it goes R/S, then we can't get any RRs out of it, we know what we've got our hands on. And about the only thing that's going to cure this, in the final analysis, is directive listing.

We tell the pc, "All right, give me some goals of a similar context." He says, "Well, to like food, to eat, to never have anything to do with animals, to run a farm, to be the director of price control in the government, to elect the president. To..." Well, look – look, this pc's confront on the subject of goals, and so forth, is about the same as it is in the bank, which means, terrible! See? It's because his confront is measurable directly proportional to the amount of charge you get off the case by running a bank, you see. And it's not directly proportional to the amount of confront that a pc does in a bank.

Now you can make a pc just confront lots of goals and do lots with goals. You can make a pc do all these things. But, the truth of the matter is, his confront comes up because you are in actual fact in the bank situation. You're in a dropped charge – it isn't the number of goals, it's the number of goals you discharge. In other words, by find... in finding goals, you must keep your tone arm action going.

If your tone arm action ceases, in the finding of goals, and you do list after list after that without finding one, then the pc's attention has hung up on a favorite goal. And you must
get rid of that favorite goal. It is either the goal, or if you've never been able to get it to do anything, and so forth, you must change the pc's position in the bank.

And you do that by saying, "What goal would you postulate after 'to catch catfish' had failed?" There is the wording which is used – "What goal would you postulate to catch... after 'to catch catfish,' had failed?" That's... you'd do this list, you see, and then null it the same as any other way and all of a sudden you'll find your tone arm motion has been restored.

Tone arm action ceases when you've gotten the pc's goal and gone across it or the pc has stuck on a favorite goal which is not due at this time to be run. It's his goal, it's somewhere in the track. But it can't be run. So you must move his attention. Well, the.. one of the ways to do this is directive listing. Directive listing is directive to the degree that you just say, "Tell me the goal after this other goal has failed," that directs his attention, don't you see?

Well, we can go a little bit further than this. And we've got this goal, "to be a cook" and it RRed, and then it R/Sed, and then it went out, and nobody's heard anything about it since. Well, one of the ways of handling that is to make the pc give us another wording for that goal. And we can do this quite directly. And the pc's given us this long concatenation which finally winds up "to elect the president," and it isn't anything to do with being the cook. You've got to bring his attention back, "No, give me some goals with the word 'cook' in them. Cook. Cook." And the pc says, "Oh, well, oh, why didn't you say so?" you know, and, "to be a cook, to be the cook, to cook, to have nothing to do with cooks, to never cook." Aha! That one RRed. And you say, "Thank you very much," and you tiger drill that one, and that's the goal.

That's quite interesting. But one of these near misses requires direction of the pc's attention to the right wording to make it run.

Well, now to get back to what I was talking about, the only thing that while you're running the GPM with Routine 3, that can cause an RR to shut off – there's only two things: Is to get a wrong item or bypass an item, or list one wrong way to. This is all under the heading of actually wrong item, because a bypassed item means you got the wrong item, because you didn't get it in sequence. And, the wrong way to, well, you called a terminal an oppterm. So that again is a wrong item – and, so on. So, it actually comes under the heading of, you've handled even a right item, so as to make it a wrong item, or you bypassed the right item. You've done something. Just in that immediate framework. Nothing further than that. And you'll find the pc's RR is getting narrower on the subsequent items, if you find them at all. In other words, bypassing an item, or getting a wrong item, or listing one wrong way to, you can then give the same phenomenon as would appear if you were running a wrong goal.

Now we are running the goal "to be a cook" – this would be a wrong goal. "To be a cook," and we get the top terminal, top oppterm, and so on, which would probably be "cooks" or something like this. And, we get "cook" or "cooked" or something like this. And it's "to be a cook." It doesn't look wrong, does it? And, then we'll get down to the next one, we get the – we have a little trouble getting the top terminal. All right, that's fine. And then we get the second oppterm from the top and oh, we get that all right. And then we get the second terminal from the top, and we suddenly begin to realize that this pc's RR is getting awfully small. Well, of course, we haven't got the right goal.
If we go on getting RRs, why, the RR will shut off. We go on getting RIs, the RR will shut off. The shut-off RR, then, is adequately telegraphed to the auditor. The auditor knows all about it. You see, it isn't true that different RIs have different lengths RRs. That's not true. They're basically all the same length. And if you got an inch and a quarter RR on the top optterm, you should get an inch and a quarter or even a little better on the top terminal and it should be an inch and a quarter on the second top optterm, and an inch and a quarter on the second top terminal. In other words, we should go on there, and if anything the RR should improve a little bit, and certainly it should improve on the goal.

Well now, if the reverse happens, if we get a shortening RR, we know that one of two things are wrong. We've either gotten a wrong item or we have got a wrong goal. Now, with directive listing it isn't likely that we are going to get a very wrong goal. That is rather ruled out.

One of the ways we would become aware of this is the pc keeps putting down, "steam locomotives," and we're trying to run this "to catch catfish." And, what's going on here? And we keep directing him into catching catfish, don't you see? And we want a "caught catfish," or whatever the top optterm is. And it just doesn't fire. And the top terminal is, "no caught catfish" or something of the sort, and that doesn't fire well. But we start getting other things firing, and, so forth. And we just can't seem to make it.

Now because auditors do have a lot of trouble making this, your first assumption is not that you have a wrong goal. But this is definitely a possibility. You can't get the items which would ordinarily belong to that goal into that GPM, and they don't fire; obviously, there must be something wrong with this goal. Of course, if you really want to ARC break a pc, start challenging a right goal; that's... sometimes even challenging a wrong one! This is one of the liabilities of the business.

And the other one, and much more likely, is that you've gotten the wrong top optterm, or the wrong or... and the wrong or the wrong top terminal, and the wrong, or even the right top optterm and the right top terminal, and the right second top optterm, and then you caught the next one and by accident listed it wrong way to or something, and – wow, I did that. And immediately on the third top optterm why, I didn't have any items. I didn't have any RR or anything. And I got a couple of little things on the list that RRed, but the RR from being about an inch long, was suddenly only about a quarter of an inch long. And then on the next – next item it didn't exist at all! Just nothing RRed. We had nothing but long falls.

Well, now there are those amongst us I am very sorry to say, who would say at this point, "Well, it's the pc's item and it doesn't really have to read anyway, so we'll just go on and find it." Yeah, you'd better blush! This – this is nonsense. Because the auditor has simply blinded himself to the fact that something is wrong and should be corrected.

So you know if you get a shortening or a vanished RR, there's one thing that is true: There's something is wrong! And, the something wrong is with the items or the goal. And the second one you take, and look at of course, is the goal. You try to correct the items first. Now, if you've run this thing, six, eight items down into the bank, and it's all running fine, and they're right according to the lineup, and so forth well, of course, it isn't a wrong goal. It couldn't be a wrong goal, or it wouldn't have gotten that far. You wouldn't have found those
items RRing. That's it – I mean, let's say, it's "to be a catfish" and "catfishishness," and so forth. Stuff like this is turning up in there. "Being a catfish," you know, RR, or "being catfish," RRed like mad. "The beingness of catfish," see, that kind of thing, you know.

This sort of thing all RRed. Well, you can't have a wrong goal there, don't you see? So it must have been that you omitted an item, or you got a wrong item, or you faked an RR, or you did something, and goofed. And the first thing to suspect is that your top oppterm and top terminal, since they're the most variable – now, from being the most fixed they've become the most variable – but your top oppterm or top terminal are wrong.

And the thing to do in that particular case, is go back and experiment with them, and see if something else fires in their place. And if that isn't the case, see if you haven't skipped a pair. You might have skipped a pair, don't you see. There might have been a terminal and an oppterm. Maybe the third oppterm and the third terminal, maybe you just skipped that pair. And somehow or other patched up so that they crossed in. And you got two bypassed items. Look for something like that. And, of course, the most obvious thing to look for is – you evidently – you will do this, sooner or later, because I just did it last night. Just carelessly list one backwards. Just like that. Even though it's staring you right in the face. All of a sudden the pc's wrapped around the telegraph pole, all ARC broke, and nothing going anyplace, RR diminishing, dwindling, everything going to pieces.

In other words, now that we're listing by pattern with directive listing, you're pretty safe in running Routine 3M. It's very safe. Now, running it without a discovered pattern, was not safe. Because the pc's confront is not up to it. And you'd just miss things all over the doggone place if you did that.

So there is only two things that can be wrong. And the most likely is that you've got a wrong item, subhead – you've bypassed an item. Subhead – you've, opposed one wrong way to or subhead – you've got... you just picked up the wrong item. That's your most likely. And then the other one is, of course, that you've got a wrong goal. But if of course the proper 3GM [3M] wordings according to the pattern you have, has been firing on the pc, the possibility of that goal being wrong is very faint – very faint. And you shouldn't rack the pc up with it. But you mustn't rule that out as a possibility.

Well, that's about the only thing can go wrong. Now, if you want to know whether or not every RI should RR, and "Isn't it all right just to kind of apathetically go across the ahhhhhh, the meter moved a little bit, and yeah, well it's supposed to be there, and so I'll just give it to the pc..." I know what you're up against. I had a tendency... I've had a tendency to do this, you know. It's obviously the right item. Turning on somatics but it won't RR.

Well, that leads straight to disaster. Because you're not going to get anyplace from that point there on. The thing you've got to do is stop right where you are, correct the thing that prevents the RR from occurring. And that will be something that went just before, just ahead of what you are doing.

Nope. If you run a straight pattern, and if you run that pattern right on down that RR will improve, it'll get better, it'll get sparkier and spunker, the goal will read better, and everything will go along beautifully. Soon as you miss one of those things, as soon as you miss,
your RR will get smaller, and, tend to disappear, you don't get rocket reading items on your list and so forth.

Well that's the liabilities of 3M. But if you'll see that, as a prevention of doing something wrong, you can get in a happier frame of mind. Don't curse at it! Apparently, on the bulk of the pcs you will be auditing, you know right away when something is wrong, because you lose your RR. Well, you take old ironsides, he didn't ever lose his RR, so this has never come up, see? He had twenty items and most of them wrong – twenty items into the bank, without the goal. And, my RR shut off. Well, that's kind of the way it is.

But RRs apparently aren't that strong. They're fairly delicate. Now let me give you another – another item here, on this same subject. A pc in running 3M, if you're running from the top down, if you haven't picked up the goal, "to cause," or something like that off the backtrack, and you're trying to run this on this poor pc; if you've got his present time goal, it's got pain in it! It hurts! Those items hurt! He's very delighted to have them, and get rid of the somatics, because he's had them for a long time. But it hurts! And every time you say that item to him you turn on somatics.

Let's say it's, "catching catfish," you see. And, you found this, and when he put it on the list, it fired, and when you called it back once, it fired, and so forth. You're going to run into this kind of a situation sometimes. You're going to call it again. "Catching catfish," you know, you didn't see the RR, it only went a full dial, and smoke came out the corner of the meter. And you call it again, and you want to make sure – you want to make sure, you want to be certain. You want to be certain. Whereas you don't have any certainty, you want to be certain about this, you see. So you call it again – so you call it again. So, you know – you know, perhaps the second time you call it, it's not going to be there as an RR. Third time it certainly isn't going to be there as an RR. And the fourth and fifth and sixth and seventh and eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth time you call it brother, it's not only not going to be there, the pc's going to hate your guts! Because every time you say it, you're blowing his head off! That's an interesting thing. You ever think about it, that the pc has something to do with the session.

I've tried to teach some of the people in W Unit this – that the pc has something to do with the auditing session. I'm having some success. Having some success. We're going to rig up something that when the pc dies a large bell rings, or something like this, so the auditor will be aware of something having happened. I'm sorry to be sarcastic. But I myself audit the pc in front of me. A little demonstration which we saw last night, I didn't see the pc in front of the auditor being audited. I saw the auditor going through the forms of auditing. And that I always frowned on.

The forms of auditing should be used. But, of course, the pc is there to be audited. You don't abandon the forms of auditing, you just get good enough, so that you can audit the pc in spite of the form of auditing, and because of the form of auditing, and you're going to be all right. And, by the way, you'll find it's much better to use that form of auditing. Of course, there was one student who got much better results, he was permitted to audit up in East Grinstead. He didn't like being there – at that time we were separating, doing some course separation. And, they had to stay around awhile after they were terminated. And this pc took... was
taken up to East Grinstead, and audited, and they got along much better, because the auditor was permitting the pc to eat stick candy all during the session. Well, the pc did much better, that's true. It's true, the pc did much better. That pc – no bad auditing came anywhere near the pc. The pc wasn't in-session, didn't get any auditing, and an auditor who would do that to a pc, or let a pc do that, would probably audit the pc very badly anyhow. Man, to keep the pc interested and sitting there, you have to feed him stick candy. I don't think that's the right way to go about it! Anyway – anyway, I'm in a vicious mood today!

The situation with regard to the discipline of auditing, is the pc in front of you feels. The pc in front of you has nerves. Now, of course you're clearing him, and eventually he won't have any nerves, or be connected with any, and he'll be just doing fine! But at the moment you're auditing him, could I call to your attention the fact that the pc has a sensibility as to what is going on. And, you take an item that is anyhow strong enough or big enough to aberrate 90 percent of his life, and you're going to say to him – you're going to say to him, "Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching catfish! I'm trying to see if that rocket reads! Catching catfish! I didn't see if it rocket reads or not – catching catfish! I – it's – I – you see, I – I have to confront you when I say it, you know, and I don't get a chance to look at the meter, so I'll – I'll look at the meter again. Catching cat... no I didn't see the meter again – uh... " so forth. And you say, "Well, that doesn't RR! " Well, the question is: Did it RR? Well yes, when you called it the first time, it RRed. And after that the pc – a lot of pcs will do this, it isn't just a few of them, they put on the brakes! They do a total suppress. And they say, "No! No! Get those goddamn catfish off of me!" See? And the auditor says, "I want to see if it reads. Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching cat... it isn't reading yet – catching catfish! Cat..." Oh, my God, he's got these knives going through the pc's chest, you see, and the pc is trying to hold this stuff up. So what happens? You don't get any read.

Now, after that nonsense, you could put in your mid rudus. By all means put in the big mid rudus, and preferably even an eighteen-button Prepcheck, that would be good and time-consuming, and you get this thing all put in, you see, and you finally get it all straightened up, and you say once more, "Catching catfish!" You get a rocket read, see. So then you say, "Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Cat..." And the pc says, "No! No! No! No! No!" He may not even be sitting there saying anything, you know. But internally that's the way he's going. "No!" You know? Because it's an oppterm. He's been fighting them all of his life!

So, you say, "Well, that doesn't rocket read. Well, probably have a wrong goal. Probably have the wrong GPMs. Probably have the wrong reactive mind! Probably have the wrong thetan! Possibly even have the wrong – probably even have the wrong auditor! Maybe we're in the wrong room!" See, you could trace it back like this. And what does it come from? Comes from the fact that you should understand in running 3M that items have \textit{kksssrmm} in them. They got \textit{skkkrrrr}! And the more you say them, and the more you chant them at a pc, and the less certain you are, and the more nonsense you go through, the less likely you are to keep a rocket read on.

You could say it this way: I'm studying the delicacy of RRs. And the delicacy of RRs are this: The pc listed it, you give the pc, "I'll give you the next rocket reading... next-to-the-last rocket reading item on the list," – the next-to-the-last, so the pc doesn't make a mistake. And you say, "Fishhooks! That doesn't rocket read." "That doesn't read," you would say.
"And now I will read you the last – the last rocket reading item on the list. Catching catfish! That rocket reads. That is your item. Now, would 'no catfish,' or 'no catching catfish,' or 'not catching catfish,'" whatever it was, "oppose catching catfish?" And the pc says, "Oh, yes, yes!" And you get your blowdown – Zzzzzrrrrrm! Sometimes you get your blowdown earlier.

And, then you say, "All right, thank you. How does that relate to the goal?" And the pc says, "Oh! It's an absolute negative of the goal. Catch... well, no, it makes the goal, but somehow or another I'm against it." Whatever it is. And you say, "Thank you very much!" Write it down on your auditor's report, write down your next question, "Who or what..."

"Now here is the question," you say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" And actually that's all the actions you take in 3M. See? You don't take other actions. No. You get it... your trouble occurs when you've gotten yourself all set, you say, "I'll read you the last rocket reading item on the list," or usually, now we have directive listing, "the only rocket reading item on the list," and, you say, "All right," the pc's put it down, pc all very bright, and you say, "Catching catfish!" And, it doesn't rocket read! Ooooooooh! And according to pattern that's what belongs there, oh-oh-oh-oh-oh!

Well, try to get some more items that measure onto it more closely. But watch it, man! If that's the item that really belonged there, you gonna stray somewhere! And it didn't show up till just now. So try to get the right item down. Do everything you can to get the right item down. And if you still can't get the right item down, recognize that you have got a wrong item ahead of you, usually, or you've done something silly with something just back of this! Don't try to take it out with the item "catching catfish." In other words, don't go at it on the basis I was just showing you.

"Catching catfish! I will read you now the only rocket reading item on the list: Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Cat – catching catfish... On this item, has anything been suppressed? On this item, is there anything you've been care – careless of? On this item, is there any foolproof? On this item, should we use Neverleak? On this item, za-bwa-bla-wrarahrarah, yap-yap-yap!" I mean, I'm telling you! There's no point in it, man! There's no point in it.

That's the right item. It's the only rocket reading item on the list, you completed your listing, you call it, you're going to get an RR. If you don't get an RR you're wrong. Doesn't do you any good to try to drill it, or pray to Allah, or throw coins out there in the wishing well, it won't do you a bit of good. It's a wrong item.

And something before that is wrong. It'll – either you didn't get the item on the list, or an item just ahead of this is wrong, and the first thing you consult of course, always, is the list you are working on right at the moment. And you try everything you can to make that work out. And if that doesn't work out, and you can't get a rocket reading item off that when called back to the pc, then it's an earlier item that is flubbed up. You've missed something, or you've done something there.

That's what you put your time in on. Is looking for what's wrong right here with the 3M. Not trying to get this thing to read. And you call it once. Don't you call it six, seven, eight, twelve, fifteen, eighty-two times.
Now, this brings us down, if we're going to be that sharp, this brings us down to directive listing. Now, what happens when the pc says, on the goal "to catch catfish" the pc says, "That's the '-ers form' – yes, on the plot there, that's the '-ers form.' So, therefore that's Er-catchers! Ha-ha! Yeah! That's – that's the item. Er-catchers! Uh-" so on. You gonna let him flounder around, burn up all your auditing time that way? No you're not! You say, "Yes, it's the -er form, that – that's right. Now just for fun, take a look at this..." and you make out what it is. In other words, you've got to know the item better than the pc. Because the pc is down in the middle of the bank. He can't confront it, because he's under all the duress of charge with relationship to this item. But you're not! And you can figure out what that item is.

Now, I'll give you a couple of lessons on this, on directive listing. Two things I've learned, is gobbledygook isn't right. I mean, he tries to give you some gobbledygook of some kind or another, just to comply with the form.

And they aren't words that make any sense whatsoever. They don't make sense. It doesn't matter if they're not English, but they don't make sense! Don't expect them to read! They might even read! But you're shortly going to run out of RR.

Let me give you – "It's the -er form." Well, the only thing you can seem to get there is a "catcheter." You don't know what it is, pc doesn't know what it is, nobody knows what it is, and for some mysterious reason it rocket reads. So you say, "Ha, well that's it." And you finally find out that it's just a plain "catfish catcher," see? And, you'll find out that it's – the item actually makes sense! The item makes sense! And you're going to see sooner or later people with directive listing trying to make gobbledygook work.

I had an – I had an example of this – I had an example of this. I had a couple of words on a line plot, when I was auditing, and they didn't make much sense, and I let them go by! They didn't make any sense to me and by George, we had a wrong item! And as soon as we got the thing straightened out and they did make sense, and so forth, they rocket read, and we went ahead beautifully.

The point I'm stressing here, is even though you have those forms, don't try to gobbledygook it. Because gobbledygook won't work. But sometimes it looks a little gobbledygooky, let's get the idea of "to be Catholic." Let's say that somebody had a goal like that. Got it down in the Vatican or somewhere, they got implanted, and "to be Catholic," you know. And you get down to the "/-ness" form of the goal. And you say, well that's obviously "the beingness of a Catholic." But by George, that doesn't work! And you finally find out that it's "Catholic-ness." Makes sense, doesn't it? Catholicness. It isn't an English word, but it's a perfectly decent concept. It's the "/-ness"-ness of being a Catholic. See? And Catholicness, you'll find out will fire right at that point, very nice.

So, trying to bend it around, or the pc trying to bend it around – "Cathness – uh – catholness, uh-uh-uh-uh-nesscath! Uh..." Isn't going to work! It just isn't going to work! Yet you'll see pcs try this. Well, you've got to be good enough as an auditor to look at that thing, and say, "Well, his goal is to be a Catholic, uh – what would it be? '/-ness' form of the goal, the beingness doesn't seem to operate here. It's Catholicness!" So you finally, after he gets, "cathness" and "nesscath" and "Nescafé," you finally say, well – you finally say or say even earlier than that, you say, "Let's try Catholicness."
"Catholicness!" he says! "Catholicness! Ha-ha! Didn't think of that! Ha!" Of course he never thought of it. That's why you're the auditor and he's the pc. Because he's right in the middle of the living lightning. And it's living lightning, man! And you can't think! You wait till you run a bank on somebody someday "to be stupid." You really want to have a picnic! Oh-ho-ho-ho! It's hard enough to think in some kind of a bank "to be bright!" But in one of these banks, "to be stupid," – it's gorgeous!

And what are you going to run into! What are you going to run into? You're going to run into gobbledygook! He's going to try to follow the form, but he can't make it integrate, and you've got to sit there as the auditor, and direct his attention to what he ought to put down there. Otherwise, what's going to happen? You're going to start running out of RR's, you're going to start bypassing items, the next thing you know something is wrong way to, and the next thing you know you may be over in some other bank. There's no telling what's going to happen!

Now look! The liabilities of a wrong item are so great – the liabilities of a bypassed item are so great – the liabilities of straying into another bank are so great, in terms of just the mechanics of auditing, trying to hold the pc in-session. In terms of the number of somatics and the amount of pressure that turns on, on the pc. The... in terms of ARC break and so forth, these things are actually so magnitudinous that you must do everything possible to prevent them. And that's what directive listing is for.

Now, you've got the bank. You've got the – you've got a bank pattern. Now, the bank pattern you've got at this particular stage, is not, perhaps, the perfect bank pattern. It's awful close to it – it's awful close to it, particularly in its upper and lower reaches. The upper, fourteen, or even the upper eighteen or twenty, and certainly the lower dozen – omitting the two lowest oppterms, which vary on every goal, that's very, very set. That's very, very patterned.

Now, how patterned the middle ground is, I can't actually guarantee. Nor can I guarantee that something hasn't been bypassed through that goal, because I don't particularly suffer from this sort of thing. But I tell you why, why that bank is issued. It's issued just for directive listing. Now, it's actually my fifteenth GPM. I think it's the fifteenth. It's some such number. And I was running out earlier GPMs and straightening them out very neatly, and I became aware of the fact that we had to know some data. And amongst the data that we had to know is did you get knocked off if only half of the bank was run, or that sort of thing. That's all in a guinea pig frame of mind. And also, I realized that we had to have the basic fundamentals of a bank. Well, the way to get the basic fundamentals of the bank was just to sit down and grind them out under every possible combination. And, I would say this sounds very heroic, and I could say, well, I gave my all for you, and so forth. I could go into it that way. As a matter of fact it was an auditor flub! The auditor started looking this over that far back on the track. And I complained. I said I'm in the middle of the living lightning, here, man! And we're going to establish the character of the bank back this far on the track? Haahaaaaahhh! Because we certainly should know the character of the bank. And the auditor went ahead and established – started running this bank. So, that bank is so bad, and so beefy, that of course you had to get the right pattern, or you would have got killed in the pc's chair by the amount of charge. So I didn't have much choice!
But anyway, I was going back on the track to see if we couldn't establish what the exact pattern was. And if you'll notice, there was a lot more to the GPM than there appeared earlier. And with the number of cases now I've seen run in the top hampers – nobody finds them! Just nobody finds them! And early on in the first few banks I ran I didn't find them.

So it's an unconfrontable situation. Because there's too much charge. And confront is in direct ratio to the – to the amount of charge taken off. And the pc can confront the more charge is taken off. So anyway, I went all the way back on the track, and there I was, and I got all the data, and stretched it out, and one of the reasons I'm very chary about putting it around is that's the most wicked thing – the bank – that there is. Which is of course "to create." Rrrrrr!

Of course, every one of its items that has a positive create form in it is busy creating. And they can create more mass and more answers and more this and more that so it's obvious that if you took it out of that bank, and that bank evaporated, why then of course you have a correct rendition of what the pattern is. Now much to my amazement, it holds true later on the track and it holds true on other pcs. Not because they're told so. The point here, in actual fact, is if the pc isn't run, guided very closely to this pattern, his RR goes off. So therefore the pattern has value. Now there will be other patterns, I'll pick them up, I'll straighten this one up, and absolutely shape it up, and there will be patterns for various types of goals. Don't you see? But you can extrapolate it from the just "to (verb)" form of goal. You can – you can figure out what it is, because it's all the same. And it's a perfect pattern. Now directive listing, then, has to do first with the accuracy of the pattern. Directive listing was not very successful when you didn't have a successful pattern. And when the auditor doesn't know what he's trying to do, you don't of course have very successful directive listing.

Now, an auditor who gives a pc a bunch of gobbledygook, "Nescaf" and other things like that, that's for the birds. But an auditor has to give some suggestions because the pc is just not likely to pick it up. Actually, the pc will go on listing and listing and listing and listing, and will practically list himself into the ground. Where as a matter of fact all he has to put on the list is one correct item, and bang! The charge is gone! That's it! Sometimes they have to list a few more to get the edge of it off.

But the point I'm making here is that directive listing is kind. And, nondirective listing totally permissive, psychological approach to life, you know, "What do people do? Oh, they just do. Yah!" – isn't going to get you anyplace! Because you – understand where you've got the pc, man! You just poured him over Niagara Falls in a barrel! And just as he left, you put in the next Fourth of July's entire stock of fireworks and a match! You put the lid on, and over the Niagara Falls he goes! And you're not going to help him out, huh? Whoa, brother! Of course, if you've got it in for him, why, go ahead, by all means, say, "Go on and list!"

Now, the main thing that's going to give you trouble at least for a while unless we get absolute patterns straightened out on it, things going to give you trouble is the top optterm, and the top terminal. Now, these are characterized as the final achievement of the goal. It is the nounal, final achievement of the goal. That is what the top optterm is. And the top terminal is simply negative – negative whatever that was. It's a negation of it.
Now, at... this leaves an awful lot to be – to be looked at. And because it's first on the bank, and it's first right up the top, and it's the first thing you're going to find, if you find it wrong, as you drag on through, your RR's going to shut off before you've gone five, six items. All of a sudden you've got no RR. Well, you don't look always at those to be wrong. But you look up toward them, and if you cannot find anything has been wrong way to, and nothing has been bypassed, and it all seems to be straight, and you haven't had any trouble, look for what you had trouble on. Look for the longest list you had to do, you know. That's an awful good tip. The earlier longest list, and so forth, good tip on that. You finally have to come back up to the top oppterms and top terminal and take a look at them again, and see if you can get something else functioning.

Because they're the most likely to have thrown it out. Now what are they? Well, actually they're what they are in the pc's aberrated consideration, having postulated the goal. He postulated the goal, so what is the final form of it? Now, he's going to try to sell you all kinds of final forms that don't have anything to do with the goal.

Well, he... I'll give you an example. You've got the goal "to be a tiger" and he's going to give you "a brilliant, beautiful animal." Nuts! It never will be! See? It'll be "tigers" or "the tigers" or something like that. Nor will it be "tigerness." That's a lower action – that's a lower item, see? And it's not going to be "tigerishness" or anything like that. It's not going to be one of those lower items. It's going to be something like "tigers," you see?

When we know some more about this, it'll be even we found a lot of them right. I don't think it's such a thing as "been tigers" or "becoming tigers" or something like that. But, you get into a – into some randomity. Now that's dead easy on "tigers." "To be a tiger." Oh, for heaven's sakes, that's nothing. Find that any day of the week. How about a goal like this – how about a goal like this: "To be the object of a whirlpool." Now, what's the top of this thing? Well, you say, "Obviously it's the object of a whirlpool." But that's probably the last thing that'll ever occur to the pc. It'll be "a whirlpool," is probably the first thing the pc will try to give you. All sorts of things of that character. But these goal wordings are tricky.

Now you take "to be the cook." Now you get "to be the cook." "The cook" is – what's the top of the opterms? It's probably "the cook" or something of that sort. Well, fine. It's what rocket reads, of course. Now you oppose that and what do you get? Well you've got a number of combinations, and they're liable to vary from pc to pc. But it's not "never the cook," but it might be. "Not the cook," "No, the cook," you've got these various negative choices, you see. And, remember that you can have a combination of this sort: "the not-cook." You can throw those negatives into the body of the thing.

And possibility is that you sometimes get a negative that turns out to – a double negative turning out to be a positive. That mustn't be ruled out as a possibility. It might make sense. But those two will most easily rocket read. Almost anything will rocket read up there. Oh, even the wrong one will rocket read, ooh! Isn't that horrible! Ooooh! Naturally, in a bank, "to catch catfish," "catfish," "caught catfish," "a catfish," "a caught catfish," "a cat-fish catcher," all of these things are liable to produce an RR. So your RR is not too reliable.

Your best test is having gotten them, they RRed, they opposed properly, your RR then didn't dwindle in finding subsequent items. So those things should be considered to be in a
state of being tested, even when you're up to about the twelfth RI in the bank. This bank is running all right, this bank's running fine, along about number six, nothing untoward had happened, I would start to relax about the top oppterm and the top terminal. But I'd keep them in mind that long.

Now, as far as wrong goals are concerned, there isn't much probability of finding a wrong goal or listing a wrong goal. Because the worst you would get would be the two top items that would be wrong and it'd suddenly become apparent to you that something was awfully wrong here somehow or another. But you should have been forewarned. The goal probably R/Sed – the thing has never been seen to read properly. There's something else goofy about this thing. And – and get this as the positive test – by the time you get down to the sixth or eighth item, the goal ought to be reading like a buzz saw. It ought to be reading beautifully.

The goal does not read well in the first four items. Well, of course, that's kind of late. But listen! If you found these items and they did rocket read, then you have a goal that is quite similar to them, even if it is the wrong goal, and it should be very easy, just on the process of saying, "Give me some variations for this goal" to get the right goal.

Well, I hope I haven't worried you too much! This is a worrisome subject! And I hope I haven't disturbed your sleep or this evening's session! In actual fact, if you look over the very few things that can be wrong, you will then stop being nervous about all the other nonsense that you may worry about. Because only those things can be wrong that I have enumerated and talked to you about in this lecture.

Actually, the most fun in auditing I think I've ever had is auditing 3M. And the most interest and the most violent a pc has ever been will be manifested in 3M. The pc's very interested. You can't stop a pc from going down a bank, or getting audited to Clear, with anything, once he's started. Once he's started you won't be able to stop him.

You can find somebody's goal and then he isn't too keen to have the first item found. But one fine day, if you want to see some bird who has found his goal – his goal has been found, and he doesn't seem to want to be audited from that point on, just get him in a casual conversation on a meter, and see if you can't find his top oppterm. And he won't stop then – that'll be that! That'll be that. If a goal is very close to present time it turns on lots of somatics. And they keep him very interested, keeping ahead of his own somatics.

All right? Well, that is the score with regard to directive listing. And that's a lot of the whys and wherefores back of directive listing. It is not a method of evaluating for the pc. You don't evaluate for him. You just tell him what the next item is he should put down.

Thank you very much.

Good night!
GOALS

A lecture given on 23 April 1963

Thank you. Thank you.
Thank you very much. This is the what?

_Audience: The 23rd._

Twenty-third? Somebody says it's the 24th.

_Audience: Twenty-third! April!

Yeah, well what GPM is it the 23rd of? [laughter]

All right. This is the 23rd of _abril_ ante [after] Dianetics 13. Pretty good, huh?

And we have some goals here. I want to congratulate those that found them, but it's pretty easy to find a goal, and why do I have to tell you, "Go on, find the goal!" you know? You know, you're supposed to know that all the time.

Going to talk to you about goals. I'd rather talk to you about the GPM. It's always more interesting talking about the living lightning you happen to be mixed up in at the moment. I'll just make a little note of that on the side. It's tricky, man. We're all tricky! Boy, we're tricky! _Tsk!_

Nuts! I just found out that not only does the goal decline to the point of the goal – but a thetan not being able to quit, now carries it on for a few millennia – just to be sure. He really gets all the good out of that goal that he possibly can. It's something like running – running a tire until its original casing is off, you know – and then retreading it, and running it until the retread is off – and then retreading the retread, you see, and running it off. And that's what he does with a goal.

You say, "Here's a goal 'to want'." So immediately of course the top is "want" and "not want," right? Obviously. Just like that. The hell it is!. There's about twenty more items above that point. And there's an ultimate-accomplishment opterm that is something like "everything wanted." And then that goes down through all the ",-ivities." "Everything wantedness. Everything wantedivity." With all the negatives on the terminal side. I consider this very fascinating.

In other words, the thetan gets all of the good he possibly can out of a goal. He even runs it in past tense. And I don't know what span of millennia that goal has been dead while he is still using it.

I had a wonderful example of this – the goal "to go away" becomes "gone away," becomes "gone." And "gone" then declines through all of the ",-ivities" and ",-ishnesses," you see.
Oh, it's remarkable. But imagine running on a goal that is "gone." Yeah, life is strewn with tombstones, you know, the "goneishness," you know – makes you inhabit cemeteries for a few millennia, you know. If you want to really feel good, go down to the cemetery, you know, and look at all the tombstones, so forth. That's good goneishness!

Oddly enough, this only appears on the opptermside of the fence – this decline of the goal. Of course, the goal has no opportunity to decline before the goal is postulated. So it just runs out on the opptermside, so you only find these "gone" and "gone away" and that sort of thing over as oppterms – and you find the "no – no gone," you see, and, "not gone," and "not goneishness" and all of this thing over on the terminal side – which I consider is quite interesting.

So these goals – you got a goal like "to have an audience," you see. Now, you'd consider that, well, an audience would be the final opptermside and you've succeeded, you see – something like that. And maybe that's true. It'll be some word like "audience," that's for sure. But much more likely to be "audienced." It has already happened, don't you see? So now we've got "audienced."

When you were first postulating goals and made up this pattern – it would have been more courteous of all of you to have done it in accordance with English syntax. And we wouldn't have to be bending English around corners and circles and so forth – because I know of a goal right now that everybody is very sure that "good" must be its top opptermside because in English there is no word which is "good" which can decline from "good." Don't you see? So, it's probably a coined word, like "goooded." Or "goood-ied." Or "goood-ly." It won't become "a saint," or something like that. They – always it's the same word, but it can have another thing in front of it – like it everything" or "absolute" or something like that.

We have somebody around here that's been saying all the time "Well it's, absolute is up there at the top." Yeah, that's right. There is something up there, above that level, about twenty items up, which has something like "absolute." And I got another one here that's been saying, "The pure light of..." "The pure light of..." you know. And everybody got awful tired of hearing this, but the thing would probably rocket read, you know, "The pure light of truth." It's something like that, it's "truthed" however, is probably much more appropriate. "Truthed" or some such thing.

But anyway, there's where these goals go. And what happens to a goal after it's dead? Well, it's carried on for another twenty items. Remarkable! Why don't you give up, you know?

Say, "Well, that's it. That's it. I postulated this goal – postulated this goal, "to be a saint," and uh – I became a saint, so now... uh – uh – that's fine. And then I – then I finally started..." see, here's your first decline. You'd think the guy – well, he became a saint, and he should say, "All right. Now I'll be a devil." you know? "And let's have a ball here for a while as a devil."

No, no, he doesn't do anything like that. Now he begins, while declining as a saint – to fight all of the ideas and attributes of a saint – until he finally fights the goal "to be a saint," and that's his worst enemy. And you'd think well, he's gone as far as he can go now. Oh, no,
not a thetan. No, no, no. Ha-ha-ha, no, no, no. There's a lot of rubber left on that casing yet! Can't throw it away.

I think that these electronics boys who... You ever been in an electronics man's basement or backyard, you know? All of the scrap metal, you know, and old pieces of wire – he snipped this piece of wire off in 1943 – and it's a piece of coaxial cable, you see, and it's about that long. And it might have some use. The only use for coaxial cable is if you have twenty or thirty feet of it, you see, and he's got this piece that long. And that has taken its company with all the burned out condensers, capacitors and charred rheostats and all that sort of thing.

So when this goal is dead – it's good and dead, you see – he... it's – his worst enemy, now, is this goal – now he carries on, you see. And the worst-enemyness of this goal now declines, with him refuting this all the way. You see, the goal goes downhill, now, and may go through two stages. Let's take the goal "to go away." It becomes "gone away." Well, you'd say, "Well, that's it – he's had it, you know."

Or let's take – it wouldn't be this word "to be sainted," it'd be something on the order... It wouldn't be "deified" but it'd be like "deified." You know, "canonized," only it won't be the word "canonized." It would probably be "sanctified," you see. "Sanctified." So he hits "sanctified." That's his worst enemy now – anything that is sanctified.

Well, you would say, "All right." Now he's got lots of ideas, all he's got to do is postulate himself a new goal and get on his way. Oh, no! No, no! He isn't going to do that. Man, do you realize there's still some fabric inside that casing? You know, you can still get a few more miles out of this goal. So he now – it shifts over to "sainted," see, or something like that. Or it'll be something like, "superlatively sainted," see. And boy, he goes all the way downhill on that, to the final drugs and dregs of the situation. And then he's there, he can't go any further after this. There's nothing left of him. There isn't enough left there, you see, to oppose anything. It isn't that he runs out of things, but it makes these – it jumps these things up to about eighty to a hundred, something like that, RIs. You better start finding one a minute, that's all.

I've been holding you, keeping you from going into a lot of early banks, and grabbing a lot of early goals and splattering yourselves all over the track, and you'll thank me for it someday; you might not be thanking me for it now.

But I've been suspecting all the way along the line that we hadn't the top. I ran into it head-on and I've been working like mad, trying to get the thing squared around. It's clean as a wolf's tooth, now, between there and the next bank. There isn't anything – there's always been a little shadow of blackness or something in there to the next bank. And then much to one's astonishment, you see – this little shadow of blackness opens out to be ten items. Small matter of ten items, you know. Any one of which, dropped off the pc's line plot, will cause him to moan and scream.

The big discovery that has been made on all this, of course, is that these goals are patterned one to the next, and that they are patterned pc to pc. And that is the big discovery of just the last two or three weeks. I never dreamed this was possible. But it's a damned good thing – we're just lucky. Because, let me tell you trying to get a pc to confront any part of a bank – trying to get him to confront any part of the bank is almost impossible. You just have to put his paws right on it, man. You have to put his paws right on it, and you say, "That is it.
This is what you are listing for." So he will list in that direction – he's got a prayer of getting it.

I was just examining a list of a pc who's gotten quite ill trying to find his top item – and he's been going around feeling very bad about it and so forth. And I just examined his list and I don't think it's on that list. And yet the list is about eighty, ninety items long. And it's not on that list.

And this is just history, as far as this is concerned. I look in vain on these lists to find what should belong on the list – if the pc is just permitted to list permissively. And that we have a plot that orients this thing is a godsend.

More important than that, the plot itself is getting very rapidly shaped up. I would normally take off a year or two to shape up something of this magnitude with this much meaningness. And you guys are riding right on my heels, and I can hardly keep my shoes on, you know. I mean, you keep stepping on my heels and I keep sliding out. And it's just flat out. As a matter of fact I've left the better part of fifteen banks just discharged slightly – about a tenth discharged, or something like that – in order to pick it up on a part of the track where it is in an unmixed-up state. And I've finally gotten back far enough to where it is fairly obvious what it is – and just won't go together unless it is exactly right, you see.

That isn't the worst of the plot. The plot is there's a switcheroo on your composite goals. You get down to the goal level and then it all switches. And you have, "have a gameishness" is opposed by "no game-haveishness." I think that's so cute! And then it turns around the other way, and makes "no game-haveishness" is the oppterm, I think at this stage, opposed by "have a gameishness" as the terminal. In other words, it's a double-switcheroo. Ugh!

So, when we announce that four goals have been found today, why, the people should be very happy. They're not going to be run into a brick wall or off the end of a cliff – but they should realize, and their auditors should realize what they're – what they're facing now on such goals as these.

For instance, on Ian, right away the auditor's – if we didn't have this data – is likely to grab something on the order of "infallible." That's the top oppterm. You know, and he goes along, just fine, you know? Meter reads, and he's getting blowdowns, and all of a sudden the pc is getting nastier and nastier. (Oh, Ian of course never gets nasty, we know that.) But gets nastier and nastier, and uses more and more livid language, and snarls, and so forth – and yet it's all going according to Hoyle – everything's going along just perfect, everything's fine – except of course we took off from about the upper-third of the bank. We didn't take off from the top.

Now, you have the interesting factor of trying to figure out what is the past tense, ne plus ultra, nounal version of "infallible" in a limited language, which doesn't composite easily like English.

See, all these things are in there as concepts. They're not expressed as words – Korzybski to the contrary. And you very often will find a goal on a pc and the pc, "Eechhh, found I had a goal – a goal – and so on and so on and so on." And all of a sudden he'll say, "Yeah! You know – yeah, yeah!" What's this comm lag? It isn't that he's stupid. It's the fact
that the English words haven't met up with the thought concept. The thought meaningness, don't you see. The thought meaningness actually stays there and stands there without words.

I studied this back in 1952 for quite a while – how it wasn't in words – it was in thought concepts and the thought concepts matched the words. And it's all very interesting because it means that nothing is stored in words. But English, for instance, re-echoes against these words. English echoes, in the words – that echoes against the thought concept – and that activates your cognition, or your blowdown. And you'll find very fascinatedly – you'll find some item like "catch catfish," you see, "catching catfish," and that's fine. Pc understands that very well. And you get your – get your rocket read, your blowdown. Sometimes you don't even get your rocket read, once in a blue moon. "Catch catfish." Didn't read the first time. Then the pc puts his attention on you and it – and you call it the second time and it reads like mad. Well, he just didn't have his words into the thought concept, you see.

Well, that's all very well, and that won't happen very often on something like "catch catfish." But let's get into something, "Catch catfishishness. Catch catfishishness." "See, mmmm-aaaaah-mmmm-ah-mmmm." And you say, "Well, it rocket read when you said it. Doesn't rocket read now." And you say, "No blowdown here." And the pc, "Well, catch catfishishness... Oh, yeah! Yeah!" And he gets this sudden idea of somebody standing on the porch of some country store ready to go down to the river, you know. But he isn't going to go down to the river. You know? And he's all dressed as though he's going to catch catfish. And of course he isn't going to catch catfish, or something like that. But he's the very model of somebody who catches catfish, you see. And that's "Cats – uh – cat – Catfishishness." And pc will all of a sudden get this, and all of a sudden you get your blowdown. He didn't understand it! And you, sometimes you can't even wrap your tongue around it.

I don't know what language these were installed in, but they were probably never installed in any language, you see. It's a method of group thinking which applies to any language. A person can group a great many items under one heading, with this one concept. And therefore he doesn't have to think. And it's just handy computational idiocy. All he's got to do is take one concept, you see – and this covers all of that. But it's interesting how accurate and how precise these concepts are.

Now, these goals, then, have their first entrance point of understanding at the moment they are found. And ordinarily you do not find a pc's goal or get the pc to pan out well, until the pc understands the goal. He can have put it down, "to catch catfish," you see. Just, "Well, so-and-so and so-and-so, and to catch catfish, and – uh – and to hunt deer, and to be a great hunter, and to uh – uhhh – spend a lot of idle time." And he's just been going down a goals list, don't you see. And he gives you all these goals. And he didn't bother to look at this when he went by – but there was a little red flag out there and it triggered, you know. And that was it. You get back, you're nulling this thing, pc's sitting there, you know – what wall, you know – and you're nulling, you see. And you hit "to catch catfish" and your normal reaction is "I didn't put that on the list! I don't recall putting that on the list!" See, it's a heavily charged area. Very often you get this reaction. "Did I put that on the list?"

I remember I had one goal oppose list. It's very easy finding internal goals. There's nothing to this now. Just make sure your list is complete, and you'll have the next goal. But
it's so remarkable. Went... it hadn't happened to me for a long time that I didn't know I had put it on the list. And all of a sudden the auditor reads to me "to be lucky." I feel the sensation of a rocket read, you know. "To be lucky – I didn't put that on the list! Where'd that come from?" You know? And it seemed that it was totally extraneous to the subject matter. It had just slid in sideways, you see. And so it's sort of on an automatic action. See, this thing has charge but the pc hasn't inspected it in any way.

All right. You sometimes will go down a goals list, and you're busy nulling and so on, and you don't get a rocket read. But you just get a tick. Or a DN, or something like that, around some certain area. Or you get a DR on a goal. So you leave it in. Now you come back – by reading the goal again the pc's attention goes onto this goal – and now by putting in your left-hand buttons the pc's attention goes onto it very thoroughly. And because the left-hand buttons take the suppression off of it, and put his attention on it – why, you get a rocket read off of the right goal. That is the mechanism that's followed.

It isn't that these things rocket read just natural and native. It isn't inevitable, don't you see. It requires some attention and alertness on the pc's part. This becomes very manifest when you're checking goals while doing a GPM. You read this goal, and the pc is still all tied up there in "catch catfishiness." And he's still trying to, you know – he's still cogniting on it. You've got it, and you've got it on the line plot. You're writing up something. You're writing the line plot down or something like this. And he's still – "aaaaa-catch-caaah-hmmm-fififinnn." And you say, "All right, to catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish." And you say, "Well, that ticked once. Yeah." And you go on and put down, "Goal, one tick" you see. He didn't have his attention on it yet.

If you were – there's not any reason to yank his attention over onto this. But just as a – just to show you what I'm talking about, if you say to the pc – at this stage of the game – you say to the pc, "Uh – now, uh – listen – listen to me very carefully just for a moment there. What – what are you thinking about? Oh, yeah. Well, all right. You just listen to me very carefully, now, listen to me very carefully..." – don't even tell him you're going to read the goal. But "Listen to me very carefully." You've just gotten one tick off of this goal, see. And you say, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," – ah – two rocket reads. In other words – the pc's attention.

The right thing will tick, whether the pc is looking at you or not. See, there's enough of you penetrates to him to give a tick. See, you'll always get some response. Although of course that could winnow out, too. But ordinarily, the pc could even be doped off, and you'll get a tick on a right goal, see. He didn't even hear you read it, but you'll get this tick.

Now, his attention has to be brought onto this thing in order to get an RR. And the reason nobody saw RRs before was the absence of the left-hand buttons. You should recognize that it was the mechanics of Scientology itself that made possible for a goal to be sufficiently unburdened that it would rocket read. I predicted the fact that a rocket read would exist – that a goal would read differently – and then a very short time afterwards got some buttons together that would remove the pc's efforts to squash in a certain area – which are, of course, nothing more than Suppress, Careful of and Fail to reveal. And for the first time we started
seeing rocket reads. Well, that's because by taking the pressure off and putting the pc's attention on, we get the phenomenon of a rocket read.

Now, a heavily charged item, even with the pc's... the item is different than the goal, see. The item he's... very immediate. He's right in the middle of this thing, and he could be just, *blah*. And most of the time, you read "catch catfishishness" or – to him, or something of the sort, and *psheewww!* You see a nice rocket read.

Now, the goal read and all of the items that are immediately attached to a goal, are rocket reads. So that you actually have three allied types of read. There are three types of read which are cousins to one another. And the first is a fall. You didn't expect that one! The first is a fall and the next is a rock slam, and the next is the rocket read. But the fall, can turn into either a rock slam or a rocket read, and a rocket read does not necessarily convert through a rock slam, when it fades away, but may simply fall. A rocket read may then degenerate to a rock slam – and degenerate to a fall – or may simply, strictly and straightly, degenerate into a fall.

Now, a rock slam – a rock slam – may become a fall, but is actually more likely to become a dirty needle. Now, what you – what you must realize about this is you are looking at different meter manifestations. You're looking at different meter manifestations but these things all stem from a certain pattern or a picture. And if we get a good picture of this – I want to show you here what you're really finding – in the way of a – of an RI – what you're really finding here. Let's take an RI. And let's see exactly what – when these goals were found, exactly what was being activated.

Now, here's your RI, and we take that as an item. It has mass. It has actual mass in it, and it is to be considered as a sort of a core, as the center – let's say a ball bearing dropped in cotton. You see, it is the ball bearing, see? All right. Now, around the edges of these things...

You'll be awful baffled if you don't remember this little diagram. You can get more baffled running Routine 3 than anything else I know, because so many things sometimes rocket read. You take somebody with an RI like mine – which is practically indestructible and reads on anything – you give me an item at a distance of a quarter of a mile and say the item to me, and if there's a rocket read on it, it'll rocket read, you see. And this is very upsetting researchwise. You want to know what the next item is. You've got to find somebody whose rocket read isn't all that good if you're going to do good research. Because then only the one that's supposed to be there will rocket read, you see?

Now, here's a whole bunch of items around this solid center item. You see that? There's a whole bunch of items around that item. Now, these things are lock RIs. Those things are just locks, see. That's a lock RI. "Catfish," see, is charged – so therefore, "fishing pole" – no, not – "catfish" is charged, so therefore "sturgeon," see, might RI. But it isn't the... RR. And it isn't the RI, you understand?

So you've got all of these lock... Now, they're all over it. It's just as though we had cross-sectioned it in any direction. Now there's – these things RR. They all RR, but when you

---

11 Editor's note: the diagram can be found in HCOB 29 April 1963. As it is not in the Red Vols it has been attached for reference.
found "catfish," they won't any longer RR. In other words, they borrowed their RR – they borrowed their RR – from the charge in the core of the thing, which is "catfish." You see, they borrowed their charge. They don't have any charge of their own.

Now, around here – this by the way, is all Routine 3 stuff. Now we'll move over into Routine 2.

Now, here's another whole series, and these things have been mushed – they're probably very neat, geometrically. They're probably neat as electrons geometrically. But in actual fact, they have become mushed and crushed by grouping and that sort of thing – until they appear to be so much black tar soup. And I had one spring out at me the other night in its pure, pristine form, because something was being found out of sequence – and you talk about something hard, it was as hard as trying to bite on a metal shell! It hadn't disintegrated at all. And it was a little sphere.

Now, these, out here are again lock RIs, of the second rank. Those are all lock RIs, and here they are, and there's lots of those. Oh, there's lots of those. And they R/S. See, these are RRs – and these are R/Ses. You know, this is more than a graphic analysis. You usually just do your graphic analysis. But this is – this is anatomy.

Now, this RI, if you approached it this close – your second rank, those that lie right up against it – you'd get RRs. And if you approach it that much further away, one more rank out from the core, you get R/Ses. See?

Now, there's another rank, outside of this – much more numerous, as you can imagine – much more numerous. And these things can't be called RIs at all. We're too far out, and it'd just be nonsense. But they still have some of the connotation in it of this central RI. And they DR.

Now what are those things? Well, they're all the things on your list that you get a little DR on when you read them but nothing ever happens to them. See, they were there! Now, you can examine any series of lists done – if a great long list has been done, and somebody has kept careful record of all the DRs – and all – you would keep record anyway, of all the R/Ses and RRs – but if he'd kept all of the DRs that he saw, and it was all meticulously kept – and it was a very long list, very long list – until the needle was totally clean, you would have had this population.

Now, when you take this picture here – this April 23rd picture – when you get that, you actually are looking at everything the pc has put on the list – if he did a full list, which we're not doing now. See? And that'd be one of these... Well, it's not exaggerated – this be – but there have been lists as long as eighty-seven pages. Well, an eighty-seven page list would certainly contain everything connected with it. But actually, probably everything connected with several. A fifteen-page list, a twelve-page list, something of this sort, pretty well covers the population.

Now, as the pc lists, on a 2-12 type listing – he simply is taking and repeating the thought concepts which are popping out of these. And they pop out of here at random – but they... he actually will list off at some point where his attention has already been fixated by life in this mass. He'll start there and he'll list out to the perimeter, and he'll list back in again,
and he'll list out, and he'll list in. And it's a random pattern of listing, you see. And eventually his attention will have encompassed this – and the charge in the area will have been labeled onto the list – so therefore the list ceases to fire or read while listing. You see what that's all about?

Now, in finding a goal, you can actually take these things and find the identity of the goal. Now, how do you do this? Well, let's take one more step. Let's take one more step, here. This is – this is one. Now, let's just take one more step. We've got that much picture.

And this is a picture of RIs. Each one of these spots is an RI. And we'll just make a lot of these spots here. And you know that big plot I just gave you, number one there, each one of these little circles I'm making here is a complete one of those. See? So we get these things, and we get something on the order of about eighty to a hundred of those groups contained in one GPM. There are about fifteen – see, they're finite numbers – there's about fifteen pages of listing covers the bulk, carelessly, of one of those RI groups – if you wanted to list them all out – and therefore, there's about eighty of those RI groups in a GPM.

So I... that's just a forecast number. I'm sure the number will eventually turn out to be finite. I'm not in the position to say exactly what it is. So it is the number of RIs in a GPM times the average number of items listed on a pc to get a clean needle, in one of those areas – that isn't to four or five, you see, that's fifteen pages, or something like that – would give you the DRs, the R/Ses and RIs contained in a GPM. A very rough guesstimate sort of figure, just to give you the order of magnitude, is fifteen times eighty.

See, you're not actually looking at very many DRing, R/Sing or RRing items at all. You're not looking at very many of them. Somewhat on the order of magnitude of fifteen times eighty. Now, you don't have to find each one of these, you see. It's not necessary to do so. I'm just telling you what's there. This is what's in the pot of blackberries, which it resembles very closely sometimes.

Anyway, here's your GPM. Now, this then is covered in its entirety with a goal. See, that's a goal. And every one of the fifteen times eighty – which is your rough estimate number – is dependent on the central postulate called a goal. And they are all built up from the pc having made that central postulate. Every one of those is built just on that one postulate. And all of the behavior and nonsense he goes through is dead on that central postulate.

Therefore, when you are trying to find goals – you can list the goals of any one of those little DRing items, any of the R/Sing items, particularly the RRing items, and certainly the central RI – list the goals of, or the goals it would be an overt against – depending if it was a terminal or an oppterm – and you'll come up with the goal of that GPM. And it's goals finding.

Now, there's – these mechanisms I've just been talking to you about are the basic mechanisms of goal finding. You've got that anatomy, your big RI, with the cluster of R Rings and then the R/Ses, and then the DRs. And then you've got – whatever the number is – fifty, eighty, something like that – it's greater than fifty. It's about eighty some, maybe a little bit greater than that. You've got that number of those things contained in here. And all of those are covered embraceably by a goal.
Now, the problem of goals finding is only complicated by one thing – is lots of these little, little DRing items and lots of these RRing items. The secondary items particularly have their own goals. Well, I'll give you an idea of this. The pc has not postulated this goal, but he thinks of a streetcar – which is a DR, see – he thinks of a streetcar as having the goal to carry passengers or to clang or something like that, see. He thinks of it as having a purpose or a goal all by itself. So when he starts listing goals – let's get right down to goals, here, now – when he starts listing goals, he starts in toward not one GPM – and again, fortunately, a very finite number – he starts straight in against thirty GPMs. And you've got something on the order – I'm just giving you a general number here, but it is, it's very close to the factual number, it's an educated guess – you've got about thirty goals. Thirty of these GPMs.

And when they're all crunched together – let's get this now. You understand, we're getting up to – we're getting up to what to the pc looks like light-years of space. A little RI looks to the pc to be about that big – about a foot, fourteen inches something like that, see. Sometimes they're little fat sausages. They're quite finite in shape. Pcs get up to a point where they can confront mass, they describe these. And when you get the outer part of the thing peeled off, you'll see the center shell of the item. But in order to get a visio on that sort of thing, it has to be done very wrong. You have to find it all out of sequence, and get the pc to tear it to pieces with his little thetan paws. And after that he's rather unhappy because it's hitting him in the face by now – but the anatomy is there.

Now, all of these GPMs crushed together, see, give you an appearance – although each one you see is like this – give you an appearance of islands of masses, see? It looks like a channel at first glance over here – and then they are liable to be stuff that looks like side channels. And you say, "Well, here's one channel of goals, and over here on the right someplace, here's another channel of goals. What's this all about? Am I ambivalent?" Yeah, you're worse than ambivalent! But, but it's just the fact that they have grouped on each other. It's just one channel of goals.

So here's this terrific mass. Now, let's take – this is then goals. And we'll say something on the order of thirty goals – I don't even think it's that many.

All right. Now let's walk this lecture backwards. There's your pc sitting in the chair. What are you looking at? You're looking at a body, which hasn't anything to do with it. Except as masses collapse on the body, you get an unfortunate increase of body mass. And every time you miss an item or a GPM, you increase the body's mass somewhat, because it comes in against the body. When these items are all found and everything else, you decrease the body's mass. It's quite spectacular. Sometimes your pc will become almost frantic because he's putting on mass at an alarming rate. Well, you know that this is a direct index of having missed a GPM or missed a whole series of items in a GPM. It's not a very worrisome factor – because as soon as you find all of the items in the GPM, or all the GPMs in sequence-that mass factor goes. Pfiff! Vanishes.

You're looking at a body – which can be influenced by it, or which can experience the pain of items and so forth, but which it itself does not contain any items. Now, in the skull... Back in the days of Greece they used to go into the stomach. I don't know why you did that – must have been because the Greek always said his soul was in his stomach, and they still cook
well down there today. Yeah, I'd like to have some Greek soup. The thetan is resident in or about this body. Now, a thetan in very terrible condition, very terrible condition, is outside the body and can't get in it. So he's at some remote point from the body – and it may be quite remote – but he's still in communication with you via the body.

And then a thetan who is not in too bad a condition is in a body. And then a thetan who is in terrific condition is more or less permanently outside the body, but able to get in or out of it, and doesn't worry about it but can control it from a distance – and then in terrific condition doesn't need one.

So there's the gradient scale of what you're looking at. And the fellow who is sitting in that chair is either, then, way outside the body and can't get in it, or is in the body, or is somewhere between these two points. He is certainly not outside the body as a good being. The more he talks about being outside the body as a good being, the more you should immediately suspect that he ain't.

The worst case that Freud ever tackled, and the cases he said were just unsolvable, were what he called the "detached case." He didn't know quite what was going on, but he'd already scented the fact that the guy was unable to approach his body. And he called this fellow a detached body. The fellow was never in his own valence, he was also always remote from his valence. Lecture 28, I think, Sigmund Freud, talks about this. At the end he concludes that nothing can be done for these people. Well, that's past history. It doesn't even worry you. I mean, everything can be done for these people, so what?

Now, such a person's goal may or may not be a little harder to find but he might not sit still well for you to find his goal. And that would be the only difference, the only actual difference – but from pc to pc is not the state of case, but it's how quietly he will sit there and be audited, don't you see? And some pcs are sufficiently agitated and so forth, they won't sit there quietly and be audited. And other pcs in pretty good condition who are being loused up also won't sit still and be loused up. There's all kinds of gradients of this.

All right. There sits the pc, and there's the thetan. And the body is communication media for the thetan – and the pc's whole personality, beingness, attributes and so forth – are actually expressed as a thetan and are as alive as a thetan, and aren't as a body. So you don't have anything to do with goals... with bodies in goals finding at all. You're never going to run across the GE and its goals, or get anything crossed up here, so stop worrying about it.

Now, let's consider, then, exactly what you're addressing. Here is goals – the GPMs – the Goals Problem Masses. They are there in their numbers, up to about thirty, and they are all around. And they are at various distances from the pc. Again, finite. You always – probably in dealing with the mind, thought you were dealing with the infinite. You may have thought that you were dealing with fantastic uncalculably great numbers of things and engrams and things like this. And it's actually quite remarkable to get how finite these things are.

Now, to a pc sometimes it looks like some of these GPMs go out there light-years. And maybe they do. But they're not ready to be run. The ones that he is most intimately connected with will be within a range of about fifty feet. And the ones which you find are at the range of zero feet. He is in the one that is firing. These are all very finite measurements. You
needn't be interested in anything closer than fifty feet – I mean further away than fifty feet. You can't run it anyhow.

All right. So there he sits in his nobility in the middle of all these black masses. Why are they black? That's because the energy has been burned down in them. They've been originally manufactured of good energy – and postulated good energy, and then the energy and so forth has been consumed – and you are looking at the unburnable residue. The clinkers. And this energy mass, these masses are black, or gray. There are no pictures. You start seeing pictures – you're in the wrong bank or something.

There's free track that runs alongside of these things, and out here on the boundary someplace, you may have some sections of free track that the pc can run on. Well, it has nothing to do with anything you want, so you never do anything with a picture. That is an inviolable rule. Don't do anything with the picture – because the actual GPM's pictures have long since been crunched and crushed to exactly *blah*. They're not there. And he doesn't see any pictures.

That's... and he all – thinks of all of it as instantaneous and right now. Only after he's got one partially run he's liable to look at you rather stunned and say, "I just spotted how old this thing is! It's about 56 trillion years," which you don't even bother to inquire into. Until a moment ago, he thought it was right now – it's instantaneous. There is no time in the reactive bank, that is what is wrong with it. There is no time in it – so it groups. And that's why you can get an instant read on something that's 216 trillion. You know, it'd take a long time for a – for a read to travel up through 216 trillion, unless the bank itself was instantaneous.

Well now, it may seem instantaneous to the pc, but actually there is a time difference which is expressed on the meter. The pc in various sections of the bank will read in those sections of the bank because of the actual existence of time in the bank. Looks to the pc to be instantaneous, he'll swear it is, all the results are – but as a matter of fact you move him a little later or a little earlier in the bank, you move him to an earlier GPM, is the way this is expressed, and the later GPM will not now read. In other words, you can move him into the proximity of reads. This is not something you do – I'm just telling you this is possible.

All right. So there he sits, there are these black clouds, gray clouds and so forth, which are visible or invisible to him. Sometimes pcs can see these things. Sometimes they have to be processed quite a while – and they eventually come up and their perception on the bank rises to the point where they can see them. A pc who has no perception of these things whatsoever is a little more difficult to run than one who is high enough up to have perception of what's actually going on here.

So there are his goals. Now, you're trying to find – that one of these thirty goals that will read and can be run. And that's what you're trying to do with Routine 2. You're trying to put your paws on that goal which will read and can be run.

Now, in actual fact, of these thirty GPMs which are scattered about – again you understand that's just a guesstimate number – of these thirty GPMs that are scattered about, the bulk of them will not read on the meter because of the actual existence of some time in them. He is not necessarily in present time with regard to the GPM – and the GPM you get is not necessarily the present time GPM. It just happens to be the one he's closest to, and usually which is
worded "to be offered." "Never to be offered" will of course get offered on its – on its terminal, which is "to be offered." See? So a negative sounding goal will get handed up immediately, or a positive sounding goal is liable to be handed up immediately – like the goal "to find," see. Well, auditor is trying to find something, so he'll get the goal, "to find," see.

Now, the single difference amongst thetans is the significance of these goals. They have quite a few of them in common, particularly on the early track. But as they continue to live, their divergences of significance as to the character of the goal becomes different. So you find all kinds of different goals. And someday you will get very, very bushed, and very upset for this one reason: You will just realize that all of those goals lists that this pc is handing you – these fantastic numbers of goals that the pc is handing you – are almost infinite combinations. There's an infinity of word combinations and therefore it looks like an infinity of goals.

Well, don't worry about it, that's a finite number, too. The longest a pc has ever held out with a goal on straight listing is 5,000 goals. Finite number! It's considered rather uncommon and real rough for a pc to hold out 3,000 goals. Very uncommon. Average number of goals listed to a goal on the list is 153. One hundred and fifty-three goals, just listed straight, for the pc's actual goal to be found on the list. Pretty good, huh? That average does not include some of these heroic numbers of goals – the average is actually just taken with the small group, 153 goals. Starts listing goals, 153 goals later somewhere on that list you have the pc's goal.

What percentage of pcs is this true of? I wouldn't know offhand. But it's a much larger percentage, I know, than you would suspect. It's something like 50, 60 – some such respectable percentage.

This is the majority. Probably the bare majority of pcs this would be true of. And you just tell them to give you the goal and you're talking to them from altitude – and you write it down, you're not causing them any trouble at all, and when you go over the thing and null that list – if you do a good job of it and null the thing – why, you will take your... put your left-hand buttons in on what's left there with a dirty read, and you'll be staring at rocket reads. Actually, on such a list it's quite common to find four or five rocket reading goals.

All right. Let's get back to anatomy here. You're shooting at (a guesstimate number) of thirty banks – thirty GPMs. Thirty, of which twenty-five (another guesstimate number) are not available because they are too old or too stiff or too big or too overwhelming. Not because their meanings are too esoteric. The hardest goal I ever found had nothing to do with "be found" or "not found." That was probably the trouble with it. It was just a sort of a goal like "to drink water," you know. Gave me an awful lot of – hard time! Nothing in it offered, nothing took it away. And yet it had to be found because it was the nearest to PT.

So you're going in toward five available goals. Any one of five goals is liable to fall into your paws, any one of which will be a valid goal. You just do a list of those, stretched out along the track – you'll get any one of the top five – which of course cuts down the averages enormously. I mean, it cuts down the liabilities of, and difficulties of finding goals enormously. You can find any one of those five. You will probably find the one which has the most offering or refusing type wording. And you'll probably miss the one which is most inert
"Never to have my goal found!" Give me any pc who has such a goal, man, because of course his oppterm hands it up instantly. It'll be number one on the list.

"Never to have my goal found."

"That rocket reads, thank you very much, go over and get it checked out!"

"Oh, I wonder how that ever read! I know that's a very secret goal!"

Spare me the inert ones – "to drink water." Socially acceptable, no difficulties connected with it, and you just go on and on and on and on and on and on and on and you don't come across this goal. And then all of a sudden one day the pc is feeling in a very lukewarm state of mind, with no enthusiasm, not trying, he's very relaxed, and that little concept in his mind opens up and he says, "to drink water." Pow! That rocket reads and away we go.

So that's the first look you get at the pc. You've got five of those banks – five – not just one. You probably thought it was just one. You've got five, and you'll get the one of those five that is the most easily offered. And then you have a goal. Let's go to the next stage here, you have a goal. A goal! The pc considers it's very precious, very remarkable, cherishes it, pulls it to his bosom and cognites on it as he very well should.

He doesn't at this stage recognize the horrible fact that this goal has a very remote chance of being his first goal – very remote. It's the first goal to be run, and you will run it. If you got your hands on it and it rocket reads, run it, you understand? That's a rule. But it has a very remote chance of being his first goal on the track. Because it usually is offered as an offering.

Let's look – take these goals who have just been found here, and you'll see what I mean. First one has the words, "to find" in it – so naturally it was found. The next one is "to have an audience," – naturally the auditor is the audience, so the goal is offered. The next one is, "to be infallible." The thetan proves it by handing out the goal and saying it is right. And the next one is "to understand," and of course the pc has been trying to understand this goal for some time.

Such a factor is understood – comes immediately across. That has nothing to do with these goals. These are all valid, fine goals. Nobody's running these goals down, and thank you for giving me the use of them. I'll let you use my goals. [laughter]

Do you see that?

Audience: Yeah.

Now there's just a complete random selection. It's just the goals which happen to have just been found. Naturally they loan themselves to it.

Now, two of these goals have a narrowing RR as they're checked out. Well, I suppose you might as well go ahead and run them – but it means they are not up to present time. You got your paws on them, run them. And then the next thing comes in. You've got this – you've got the goal.

And by the way, you try to find the goals forward to present time, not back to the beginning of track! They're most easily found back to the beginning of track – but the ones you
want are forward to present time from where you are. Harder to find. All you do is list the reverse RI oppose list, however. You take the goal you've just found, find out what goal would oppose it and you'll get the goal above it.

You could actually take any one of these goals at this moment and do an RI oppose list on it – even though it is not run – reverse, you see; "What goal would oppose this goal?" – and you'll get the goal closer to present time. "What goal would this oppose?" – any one of these goals – you'll get the goal earlier than this. Because they're in an endless chain and interdependent one upon another.

All right. So we've got a goal. Now we're going to enter this goal – and we've got to go in up at the top of the bank here, with the top oppterm – and we don't dare enter it anywhere else. Because if we enter it anywhere else it won't discharge. The charge still has to be passed down. If you find the middle of a goal, and you then find the top of the goal, you still have to pass the charge through the middle of the goal you've already found.

All right. So you're going to find that goal, and you bring it all the way down through. And you are finding – in every case, where you find an RI there – you find your first picture here – you get yourself a cluster like this for every RI that you're finding in that bank. And they run something like eighty RIs in the bank. Multiply the eighty times fifteen – you'll get how many things you might have to list in that one bank if you didn't know what the central RIs are – because I'll let you in on it: the pc never will put down the central RIs. His attention is so bunged-off on each one of these.

You understand, this is a picture of each one of those. And this is a picture of a cluster of those. And that's exactly what you're finding, and exactly what you're doing in clearing. That's what you're looking for. That's the goal, then - the goal that you are looking for – is simply the goal of one of these – and that you can find at least five of those banks are wide open to have their goal found. And all you had to do is get into the goal channel and then by opposing goals or goal-oppose-goals-type lists, you could move up and down the whole channel. I wouldn't advise this, but you could probably plot out every goal the pc's got long before you run any RIs, if it didn't kill the pc.

Because I remember the first time the goal "to create – to create" was checked out. The big mid ruds were put in on it because it was ticking. And boy, that bank started swelling up and going zing, cross, creak! And it did no more than tick. It wouldn't rocket read, you see – it was too beefy to run. But the more it was drilled, why, the more uncomfortable and horrible it got. So, of course, the best answer is to run what you've got your hands on, and then try to move forward to present time. And then when you've got it all the way to present time, then pass the charge all the way back – which is by reading the line plot of the pc, practically – move right on back down the track, and here we go, and we will eventually arrive at the beginning of the track with the pc in a good condition.

And we will have discharged this mass, this compulsive mass. Because it is this mass which holds the thetan a prisoner in the universe – it is this mass which holds him a prisoner in his body. It is these masses, these significances, these clusters, which I have seen, which make the pc fixate and do aberrated things, and they don't help him a bit. He'll say, "Once
upon a time I could move around freely, and now I can't anymore. What has happened to me?" Well, he's just added a few too many GPMs onto the track.

Now, there's the full anatomy of what you're trying to do in running GPMs and goals. It's taken quite a while to put together that anatomy, but the end is in sight. And what you're trying to find when you're trying to find a goal should look, after this lecture, a little easier to you. You're not really shooting at a -- in the dark with a pin-gun, at a knothole 150 paces away in a high wind! You actually are standing there with a sawed-off shotgun, inside a barn, trying to hit the barn. The goal you will find will be the goal that the pc is most likely to offer up by its own wording -- and let's hope it's not so early on the track it half-kills the pc to be... to have the goal run.

If this did happen, there is still a remedy for it. Just goal oppose list -- you could boost him forward to present time on the whole line. If you -- if he could make it, if he could make it. If you could move him enough on the track by doing that. Possibility that will someday become a procedure which we use. But I haven't experimented with it, and right now I know that you can get away with it by running any goal you got your paws on. As long as you remember to go up toward present time, not the easy way, back toward the beginning. Because the whole bank wants to run back toward the beginning. And it won't. It'll go just so far, and then brrrr!

You even try to run a bank backwards, and the next thing you know... This happened to us last night. You try to run a bank backwards, from the bottom to the top -- and I cut in on a bank and tried to run it up to the top, and much to our embarrassment a couple of hours later I found out I'd been running from the top down. It looked like it was all the other way to, you know? But it wasn't. And in actual sequence, I was running toward the bottom of the bank.

The natural inclination of the bank and the thetan is to go in reverse to the way it was lived. And run back toward the beginning. And if you keep on doing this, and leaving banks in present time -- I'm afraid your pc is going to be terribly uncomfortable, because he keeps pulling all of his PTPs and hidden standards back through tough goals in the past.

But it's rather easy to run out a bank, do a good job on the bank, and then move forward to a bank closer to present time, the next bank, run that out, polish it up, and then move forward again. And don't be too surprised if you find out that you're ten banks from present time -- don't be too amazed.

If the pc tends to get sick and creak and have an awful time running a bank, just assume it's too early. Try to find the later bank.

All right. Well, that's a lot of gen. I'm awfully glad to talk to you out here today, and I hope that you... Let's see, you've got about twenty-six, twenty-eight more goals to go. Let's have those by the next lecture Thursday. Okay?

_Audience: Yes! Yeah!_

All right, good night!
Diagram from HCOB 29 April 1963:
Finding Goals
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Thank you.
You keep that up, I'll feel you're glad to see me! Gee-whiz! [laughs]
All right, what is this, 25th of April?
Male voice: Yes.
AD 13, and Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. Well, we're at that time of Scientology when the gates are crashing open and open sesames are occurring all over the place. And the reasons why it has not been easy to get a pc rocket reading or started down the channel are gradually emerging. I'm doing an even more fundamental goals pattern. And fifteen, fifteenth goal, three hundred and five trillion. And the early track is quite – it's much greater in magnitude of charge. Late track, you get one of these RIs and you pull all the black cotton wool off the top of it and take a look at it, be about two, three inches in diameter – quite tiny. That's all the late banks and that sort of thing, that have crushed in on it, and all that sort of thing.

One of these earlier track ones and so forth – you know what a mine looks like? One of these big spherical mines? That's about the size of it. It's right in that order of magnitude. And charge is about a hundred to one over late track. Tells you why you shouldn't be pulling a pc through one of these early goals, even if you get your hands on it.

And you get a goal – you see, most of these early track goals are fairly standard. There are certain goals that are standard to every case. And the rest of the pattern is different. But certain of them – everybody has certain goals. You got goals about cause and goals about create, those are common. You'll have a goal something about a game, or something like that, that'll be in common. And these are all awfully early track. These are along about tenth, twelfth, fifteenth goals, see, they're way back. I don't think a pc could live through one. I mean, if you just grabbed him by the hair of the head and said, "Everybody has got the goal to create. All right, let's find the top oppterm, creation, that fires." Yawww! It's an interesting invitation to do so.

The lecture I'm giving you, however, is about goals, not so much about running the bank. Now, the first thing you should know about finding a goal is that the goal you will find will be the one offered, by its wording; that's the most likely. Most likely goal is the one offered by its wording, and the less offerish a goal's wording is, the longer it's going to take you to find it.

Now, we've gone previously on the basis that the goal "to be hidden" would be much harder to find, you see, than some other goal, and the easy goals to find were the neutral
goals, that didn't try to hide themselves and otherwise. But remember, that – now this is a new datum to you – seventy... I could tell you a lot about this. In later days, philosophers will philosophize on this subject. I can see tomes, now, that you can't see over, being compiled and lectured over, you see, I can see it now. Harvard – the Harvard study group, you see – you've probably written some of these textbooks, you see. And they philosophize on subjects such as this and let me just tell you that there's plenty there to philosophize on.

Seventy-five percent – that's a rough figure, but just to give you the order of magnitude – seventy-five percent of the RIs are anti-self in a GPM, leaving somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five percent of them beneficial from the goal.

Now, that's interesting, isn't it? There's... in other words, there's just this little percentage. Guy postulates the goal, you see, to be such-and-so and so-and-so and he makes this postulate and this only carries him... and the beneficial – the items beneficial on it – are less than twenty.

I can give you almost exactly the finite number of RIs or will be able to in another couple of days, in any goal. It's a number that won't vary. But it's somewhere around the eighty to a hundred area. Closer to eighty than a hundred.

Now, only the first few of these are driving the goal along towards success – and you might say, self-beneficial. Only that few. Now the remaining lot, all that tremendous column which is only one third of the terminals, as you go up the line – two thirds of those then, are dead against it. That's the terminals. And then the whole of the oppterm column is against it, all forty-plus of them. Isn't that interesting?

That means that you could make this loose statement that three quarters of the RIs are against the thetan and inhibit his livingness. And only about a quarter of them have any slightest possibility of assisting. And of course, they don't assist either because they're fixations.

Now, this tells you that if you were just running out somebody's goals, so that you could free up his attention, you would be justified in freeing up his attention, but you might run into the interesting cross-argument – well, what's he going to do without his goals? Every once in a while a thetan thinks of this. Well, what's he going to do without his goals? What's he going to do without these seventy-five percent anti-self RIs? That's the question! Well, the answer is he's going to do! Because he sure as the dickens hasn't been done, in any other way than down. You see, quantitatively then, seventy-five percent of the RIs contained in the bank are against self and have nothing to do with assisting this goal, but only impeding the goal and the individual. Something for you to recognize. That's a fantastic different percentage.

You'd say, well, fifty percent of them – it should be this way, you know: Aristotelian – there's just so much good in the world and there's just so much bad in the world. And all things achieve a balance of the mean, you see. And if there are fifty devils, therefore there must be fifty angels. And all this sort of thing, you know. And all things come down to a mean. Emerson, you see, carrying on this philosophy, could explain to you how if you're going to have five days of bad weather, you of course then are going to have five days of good
weather. [laughter] You go out here and talk to anybody around Sussex about the weather and they may sooner or later bring this on you: "Well, we've had an awfully wet spring, so it should be a dry summer," you see. This is the idea of averages.

Now, that idea of averages carries through into the normal view of one's own goals. That if it's done you some bad it's done you some good, you see. And it was really all for the best in this best of all possible reactive minds, you see. This, you'd look at it and possibly up to this instant, you yourself may have looked at it as a sort of a fifty-fifty proposition, you see. Well, those aren't the averages. This is something like the odds in a Las Vegas slot machine.

I... in a yacht club one time I had the job of ordering, according to the board's dictates – got the small job of ordering some gaming devices and so forth for club members. And I was fascinated listening to this checker-suited tough mug, who was giving me da lowdown on dese here machines, see? Now what we want? What we want? Did we want da twenty percent payoffs? See? Of course, you could fix it up so it was no payoff, too, see? [laughter]

There's little devices in the back of these machines so that it can be adjusted, so that they pay off on different percentages. And the average machine that you walk up to innocently and throw something in and pull the lever on, is rigged for a twenty percent payoff. See, dat's da law of averages, see? The reason the public plays them is they believe implicitly in the law of averages. They think fifty percent of the time you pull that handle you should win. Actually, it's only twenty percent.

Well, this view carries forward instinctively, rather, into a view of the reactive bank. If a fellow went to all this trouble to have a bank and so forth, it must be fifty percent good and fifty percent bad. And lo and behold, the actual figures – this isn't my opinion, see – the actual figures on the thing show that the payoff is very little bit better than the Las Vegas slot machine. You might have had a goal "to be beautiful." Well, that means that you've got something on the order of twenty or so, because those upper RIs really aren't very assistive: "An exhausted beauty," you know, something like that. So, you've got about twenty there that would give you the idea that you should be beautiful, see. And that leaves eighty-plus – or pardon me, it's somewhere between sixty and eighty – that just determine that the last thing in the world you want to have anything to do with is being beautiful. That's the slot machine. The slot machine percentage.

Now, undoubtedly professors in times to come will tell you – tell the – not you, but tell the public, this or future scholars this, in very flowery language. And will deplore any comparison to crude devices and practices. But actually there is no crude device or practice amongst man which is quite as rigged against man as the reactive bank. He's got a goal there "to be bright." Twenty percent of those RIs tell him to be bright, in varying degree. Mostly a decline. And the remaining RIs make him absolutely Rrrrr on the subject of anything bright or being bright or anything else.

This is basically the overt act-motivator sequence at work. Now, I'm investigating the early track, to find out what's this regularity – that's made me very suspicious. Frankly, I haven't learned too much in terms of the basic philosophy of Scientology and axioms and that sort of thing out of running goals. I knew all these already. But I have discovered a few new things and one of them, give you an idea, is quite important. If it weren't for this totally
agreed-upon overt-motivator sequence, if it weren't for this – which is one of the fundamen-
tals of the bank, and which gives us this overpowering anti-self percentage of RIs – and if it
weren't for the bank, which resulted from one's considerations of the overt-motivator se-
quence, the process of living would be therapeutic.

Now, the mystic, the mystic has been saying that you have to do some living, too. Every once in a while you'll find some Scientologist, he never quite got it out of the corner of
his skull. He tells you, well, it's all right to be processed, but you've got to do some living,
too, you see. They say this at – they say this about – mostly after they've just met a pretty girl,
or something like that. [laughter, laughs]

Now, the only – the only idea I've had that – run into, in running banks, that suddenly
reversed my concept of things on any point, has been this general observation that I've looked
this over and it rather makes me pop-eyed. If it weren't for the bank and you wanted to feel
better, you'd live a few days and you would feel better.

Now, to some degree a thetan is always doing this. I touched on this at the congress
but very, very lightly. A thetan's always doing this. Well, in a few days he will – the wound
will heal, you see. And the bruise will go away. He counts on this, you see. Well, the thing
that defeats it is the bank and the overt-motivator sequence. This other computation is de-
feated by this.

If you wanted to be Clear, if you didn't have a bank – sounds very funny, I mean – all
you'd have to do is live for a few years. This is quite remarkable; it's quite revelatory to me. It
doesn't sound like much of a point and as it stacks up against things like the Axioms and Fac-
tors, and things like this, it isn't much of a point. But it's rather a surprise to me to find out that
it is therapeutic to live in this universe. That comes to me as a terrific shock. Reverses my
ideas entirely!

In the absence of a bank, in the absence of a – of all these GPMs, why, if you wanted
to be bright, you would live a few years and if you wanted to be brighter you'd live a few
more, see? And if you wanted to be talented you would live a few more years and then you –
real talented, you'd just live a few more years, you see. Sort of take it easy on the line and
you'd wind up better.

Because the process of familiarization, as you know very well, is a highly therapeutic
process. You'll get somebody running Touch – Reach and Withdraw from a car and he can
drive the car better. Well, why doesn't this work in life? You add it up. You've seen it under
your own hands as an auditor, that a Touch Assist has banished some bruises and that sort of
thing. Well, why doesn't this work in life? Well, the thing that keeps it from working in life is
fundamentally the overt-motivator sequence which underlies the bank, and the existence
of the bank.

The fact that a bank has been built and maintained and added to, works against just
achieving higher levels of beingness in the process of livingness. And that is all that prevents
it. And this is quite – was quite revelatory to me.

You'd say this is not much of a point and it's true enough, it isn't much of a point. It's
one of these elementary things that doesn't change around the basic concepts of Scientology
any. But it does this, it does this: it puts a different complexion on this universe; and it puts a different complexion on what you might care to do; and it puts a different complexion on your future for the next two hundred trillion. See, this changes that. Your concept that the only thing you could do is get to a point where you could get totally out of this universe, or something like that – if you had such a concept – the only way you could ever win is to just get away from all this MEST and space and so forth – those concepts are, apparently, invalid. Which is a very hopeful happy note. I feel like a certain Pollyanna idiocy taking over, you see?


Now of course, the technology with which you are dealing, from a standpoint of processing, has not existed before. The laws or the put-togethers or anatomies of things, have been existing through the trillennia. These things as they are, don't you see? What is the composition of a time track? What is the behavior of an engram? What is the human behavior factor: given certain stimuli, what response will you get? All of this data is invariable. What are the laws of beingness, as you find them in the Factors and you find them in the Axioms? These things are strictly in concrete. Although they have not been known, although they have not been known, in general, they have been adhered to. And they are, in that relative sense, they are truth. They are the true things which have existed back of human behavior, reaction, liv-ingness, beingness, all these other factors.

Now, what you are handling that is new, and that hasn't existed in the universe before, is the know-how of handling this material. The know-how of knowing and handling this material. The know-how of handling another thetan. The know-how of putting together a bank. The know-how of running an assist; things like the Auditor's Code and that sort of thing. These are new.

Now, people in their confusion of course say, "Well, when Ron dreamed up all these Factors and so forth, when he dreamed up those basic Axioms – and it's mighty wicked of him to do that," you see.

Well, it's all very well for me to say, "Well I didn't dream those up." I didn't! I was there amongst you but you had your share, man! I distinctly remember, when the vote was taken, I distinctly remember your loud clear aye! [laughs]

"Shall there be a general agreement, on the subject of the overt-motivator seq...?" I remember your aye clearly! It was shattering!

Well, those basic laws we have had to dig up all the way along the line. But they are dug up.

Now, you should look at the other side of the fence: What has been invented in Scientology? What has actually been originated? What have I originated, and so forth? And that's your technical handling of the materials which have been discovered. An auditing session. The handling of the preclear. The this and that. You're entered in a new track there. And it frankly only to some degree is restimulative, because it'll bing in on somebody's goal, some-
body's goals will get in his road, one way or the other in auditing. Seldom assistive because of this 20-80.

Even if the goal, you see, was "to audit pcs," then you'd have eighty items, you see, that would say, "These damn pcs can't be audited and it'll kill me." See? So therefore, these things do not assist when they're in place. Of course, when they're pulled up you've got all the experiential track available and they suddenly are of tremendous value. Gone, they're valuable. Here, they're nothing. All in place they are nothing.

So, auditing a pc is something you're doing that is not a former action. And therefore should be clean, clear and learnable. And the more you work at it, regardless of the aberrations of the bank, why the better you ought to get at it. And when you get a bank gone – or two or six or ten – all slicked up, they'll be just nothing in your road at all. There's very little standing in your road of auditing a pc except a piece of bank here and there, a rock slam on something or other that's locked onto the top of the bank. But these things all can be overcome.

You recognize that everything that has been done in Scientology has been done in spite of the bank, you see. It's just been done on the basis of – well, hell, it can be done, there's no reason to be aberrated and there's no reason to react to it. Somehow or another, with the scruff of the neck, why, you pull yourself out of the – well, you find yourself unreasonably angry about something or other, and you start nipping and snarling around about one way or the other, grab yourself by the scruff of the neck and say, "Well, even though I don't know what might be biting me, this is certainly aberrated conduct," and do otherwise.

Now, in auditing – in auditing you get a consistent hammer and pound in Routine 3 and Routine 2 now, of your own bank as an auditor, because you're handling the bank materials to which you have to be risen superior, all the time you are handling them. Well, that takes some doing. You understand what I mean, don't you? You see. You're handling and restimulating the very materials which you must rise superior to. And the only thing I can point out to you along that particular line is, it's been done. It can be done and is done more often than you think. Mary Sue and I are having a bad time on some of this bank-plotting. If you think it's easy to sit in the middle of a bank and – not knowing its pattern, it is already too crushing to have much to do with – and not just find the item that fires, but then list enough additional items to cross-check to make sure that the RI has been knocked out, you see, on the basis that you won't get another item on that subject firing, or with a similar wording firing, if you've got the RI in the middle of the cluster that I showed you the other day. And you won't, either.

So, you not only have to find the RI, but you have to make sure there isn't any other RI in that position, see. And that causes more listing. And there's... you've already got your item, see. And things are going creak and falling apart and your skull is starting to slip along the center cleavage of it, don't you see, and somebody – mass is already too tight because you've missed a whole band above this and you don't know why. And now somebody says, "You have to list a few more."

You're just about feeling relieved, just having gotten rid of that one, you see, and you have to tackle it again, something like that. Or there's a little more charge here or something like this, you know. And cross-checking while getting better. Well, of course, tempers can get
rather sharp, under these circumstances; ARC breaks can become quite exclamatory. And auditor blows, and pc blows, and so forth, could very easily be reached under these circumstances. And things were going worse to worst by Tuesday night, they were getting pretty rough; things were pretty rough. Everything was going by the boards, so she and I took a look at each other and straightened it all out, and so forth, and it was – got it all sailing again.

Not because we'd audited anything out, don't you see. Because we said, "Oh, hell all – it's just bank!" you know? "Let's get the show on the road," see? Get the idea?

Don't think then that what you're going through is uncommon or is peculiar. I would say this: The only reprehensible thing – it is not reprehensible to have ARC breaks, it's not reprehensible to miss somebody's goals and get so restimulated, to do this, to do that, something or other, have ARC breaks and blow for twenty-four hours and lie quietly in the shrubbery sobbing, knowing you will be dead any day now; knowing it's all gone too far and that nobody is ever going to help you and Ron was wrong, you know! And all this kind of thing. Sad, sad, sad! The only thing reprehensible is not doing that, but when you have done it – picking yourself up by the scruff of the neck, sooner or later, in that period, and putting yourself back on the rails again, knowing that you can rise superior to it and surmount it. See. That's the only thing that's reprehensible, it's not doing that sooner or later, you see.

Blow, explode and break up all the furniture, see, that's all very well, but if in a week or so, at the absolute outside, you haven't gotten yourself by the scruff of the neck, just realize you're not rising superior to your bank. And the only thing that got us where we are is just rising superior. Without even any thetan bootstraps to grab hold of, see. It's quite important to know that. Because the road is stony. And goals, being an entrance point, can get very thoroughly in one's way.

Now, the goal you think you are going to find on the pc – reverting to this now – the goal you think you are going to find on the pc would be a neutral goal, right? Would be this – the lie in there. Actually, that is the hardest goal to find.

The length of time it takes you to find a goal on a pc is monitored by two things. First and foremost is the degree he is not rising superior to his bank. Now that first – that first is a very embracive statement. It looks like a small statement when you first look at it, but it's a very, very broad statement. He's not rising superior to his bank.

Now, let's take the full gradient of this – the full gradient. A person who has a goal that has the capability of driving him mad, if not risen superior to, would bring about madness. Correct? So the bird down in the loony bin – in the spinbin – who is mad, has not risen superior to his bank. You understand?

Now, it's the degree of charge and the significance is what makes a bank hard to handle. First and foremost: degree of charge on the bank, that's primary; and then the significance of what the bank consists of is secondary. Those are the two points. Those are two subpoints, not the two points I just mentioned a moment ago. You see, that's what keeps a person from rising superior to his bank. That's A and B under Point 1.
I want to repeat that, because it sounds terribly, terribly simple and you're liable to bypass it and say, "Oh yes, of course." But this means a great deal to you as an auditor. It's the amount of charge.

By... what do we characterize as charge? Well, it's actually electrical thought impulses. And there can be an erg's worth or a kilowatt worth, don't you see? It's measurable, you measure it on your meter all the time. You know what have we got, a hundred and twenty volts going through the power lines or two hundred and fifty volts? All right, well, that's just a quantity of flow. But is there enough power coming through that line to light a fifteen-hundred-watt lamp, or only enough to light a flashlight? In such general terms, we are speaking of charge, see. Lots of power and force, or little power and force, see.

And that's primary and the other one is significance. Now, confound you, don't get those reversed! Don't get those two importances reversed! Because if you do, you'll have been -- be continuing a mistake which we have been making for a number of years. We were giving charge secondary importance and giving significance primary importance.

Fellow had a goal, see, fellow had the goal "to spit." All right, another fellow had a goal "to spit." One spat all the time and the other didn't spit at all. You say, "Well, he's in different parts of the bank." No, no, no, the fellow who isn't spitting is not necessarily in a different part of the bank, but that goal may not be very heavily charged. See, the restimulative locks and the overts he's committed and so forth, all might be insufficient to hold tremendous quantities of charge there.

Now, secondarily, one of them just doesn't spit and we can assume the fact that he just doesn't, you see, or the fact that he has the goal "to spit" and he's running the negative opperms, so we can say that. But he's not worried about it either.

And the other one has a goal "to spit" and he just spits all the time, and there we are and so forth and nothing can stop him of it and he's been to the Mayo Clinic to have his spitter repaired and so forth. You know, they've done practically everything for him they could. There's the -- that's a difference of charge, see. One's got a very charged-up goal and the other, same goal, see, and it's not very charged up.

All right. Now, significance is secondary but still important. Still important. This is very much in the running. Now, this becomes important to you from a number of ways. If you can discharge a bank, no matter how, then the dramatization of the bank will drop. If you just take the significance out of the bank without removing the charge, the dramatization will continue.

Therefore, you're going to be very puzzled someday. You're going to see somebody that some HAS has run a full bank on and this is the bank "to fly." And, he's run this full bank and yet the person talks about flying all the time and flaps his wings and tells everybody he has a goal, you know, "I have a goal, you know 'to fly.' That's my goal, you know? That's my goal." And he's flapping his arms all the time, and running up and down the street. "That's why I do this, you know?"

No, that isn't why he does this. The other hidden part of the thing is, it's very heavily charged. So that his effort not to do it inflicts considerable pain and pressure upon him. The
bank contains a self-punishing mechanism. And when he doesn't obey the bank and its dictates, then he gets pain and he gets all kinds of spinniness, and sen and he gets sick. And the way not to get any of these things, he hopes, is to run up and down the street and flap his arms. In other words this thetan is protecting his body and beingness from the amount of pain, shock, pressure, incident to that bank. And if he disobeys these RIs, he goes up against this shock and pressure, and if he sort of tries to go along with it, it doesn't drop on his head. Do you see that?

Now some people – this is a very early thing, I've – telling Suzie last night this – this was Academy material of 1951, Wichita. There are two things that a thetan can do with an engram; and one of them is dramatize it in full and the other is get sick from it. I hadn't connected the two things up thoroughly, you see. Yet I could see, sort of, that if he didn't dramatize it, he'd get sick from it. So the actual taught statement was – is engrams have either mental or physical compulsion. And some engrams have a physical compulsion and the same engram in somebody else will have a mental compulsion. And thus you have some odd difference, thetan to thetan. Well, actually, you don't necessarily have an odd difference thetan to thetan, but you've certainly got a difference in the charge. In other words, the same engram, heavily charged, causes a person to be physically ill which in somebody else would cause him to dramatize only, see. He doesn't become ill from it, or even hurt from it. He simply dramatizes because of it.

Now, it is a basic difference in the being. The being is unwilling to face, confront or stand up to that much charge; he feels overwhelmed by it and feeling overwhelmed by it, therefore obeys it. And therefore you get a mental dramatization. So, you can either be sick or crazy. Wide choice!

Fortunately there is a third, which is rise superior to it. Now oddly enough you can rise superior, it isn't all mechanical the way the scientist would love you to think. You can rise superior to almost any quantity of charge if your intention to rise superior to it is – has as much charge on it as the charge you are facing. You got it? And you don't have to dramatize it mentally or suffer from it physically, particularly, but it's certain that in the process of rising superior to it, because you are bucking against it, there is going to be a certain amount of physical reaction. See, you might escape the mental reaction totally, but the physical reaction you probably could never, as long as you've got a body and so forth, never get totally away from. You'd say, "All right, I've got this – I've just got this idea that I've got to walk down the street sedately. To hell with it! I'm not going to go on walking sedately down the street." You've noticed that you're always being sedate when walking down the street, see – noticed this about yourself. Well, you've got some kind of an item, see. It's not necessarily as fundamental as a goal, it – you can actually – "A sedate walker" or something on the goal "to walk," you see?

And you say, "Well, I'm not going to do that. Not going to do that anymore. I'm going to walk anyway I please." And after you've gone fifteen or twenty paces, you've got an awful pain in your side and you wonder where that came from. And you say, "Well, I must be walking too fast; I must be getting short of air." No, no, you've refuted, you see, the dictates of that RI and it starts to key in physically, because you're exciting and protesting against the charge of it.
The reason a bank comes into action, then, is basically the eighteen buttons are being disobeyed in the physical universe. In other words a whole – that's true of the whole reactive bank, is the eighteen buttons. It's not much more than the eighteen, there are a lot of nuances and so forth. But, you could practically clean one with these. The eighteen buttons are being dismayed. See? You're invalidating, you know? Suppressing, protesting – the items that are connected with the bank, you see? And those things then, being pushed back out of sight and so forth, various physical and mental reactions occur.

Now, the pc – this is less – could be more tightly connected to the subject of goals, but I just want to give you an idea of exactly what you are looking at there, you see. Your next consideration then, recognizing that somebody can rise superior to charge, is recognize that nobody in a black sphere ever sees the outside of it. If he's in it, he never sees the outside of it. It really isn't necessary for him to crawl out of this black sphere to know he is in it, however. But the goal you want is the one the pc is in, which therefore is capable of exerting against him the most charge. And is therefore capable of making him dramatize it to the degree that he dramatizes it. And your best trick – and hear me now – your best trick in goal finding is to attain and maintain a high state of morale in the pc during the finding of goals, in such a wise he can rise superior to his bank.

Now, the number of goals which you have seen RR on an upset, chopped-up, can't-never-find-my-goal-type pc, are exactly nil. It isn't the pc is incapable of RRing, but the pc – you could almost go over the top of his goal, could practically read it straight into his teeth. He hasn't ever collided with this yet, without getting any much – very much needle activation. His reality is too low on it. If he goes up against this goal, if he ceases to dramatize it mentally or physically, in any way, he's going to get a kickback from it. So, he plays it safe, he doesn't rise superior to his bank and, "Uhh, uhh, to catch catfish, not really that goal, blah – nothing to do with me. No."

It will, however, fortunately tick. It never gets quite all the way out, see.

It'll tick; what a microscopic tick, sometimes. Sometimes you get a clang and then a tick and then it disappears and you can't make it read. But because it did something peculiar, you keep your interest on the thing and you start putting in your big mid ruds; now what are you doing? These contain the buttons which, going out in life, create a bank. So running these things out on the subject of that goal permits the person to rise superior to it, even fleetingly enough to get a reality on it and make it read.

Now, if you understand that, you will see why you have to do what you have to do in order to find a goal, and you could actually predict how a goal will work or run under your hands as an auditor. It's a creepy thing because you know that if you were just to get it on a long list and read the list in a very disinterested tone of voice with the pc not interested in it and nothing much interested anyplace anyhow, and no session in progress, the pc not being assisted by you as the auditor to hold his head up and so forth about existence, and he had no reality on it doing anything for him anyhow, you know, and this old wah wah wah, you could read it right on down the list and you'd probably go right on over the top of it, and it would – nothing would happen and it'd never react.
Oddly enough a little bit later, maybe a minute, maybe a page, pc starts to get nasty. But you could say, possibly, he could be so unreal on the subject that he wouldn't even have an ARC break. So you can't count on that either. It's a good indicator but it's not a perfect one.

So, what state do you find this goal in? Based on the remarks I've been making to you here, what state is this goal in?

It's quite interesting that you can find one at all. Because it is the least confronted, the most dramatized point in the present time area. But fortunately, it's also the most charged. And maybe the pc is so overwhelmed that he doesn't react much, but you can sometimes see the goal go ssswww, like you're letting the air out of a tire. Sometimes you can find a goal that isn't ready to be run. It's an earlier track goal that is pulled up toward present time, not ready to be run at all. It's not on the pc's goal channel, don't you see. And you hit the thing and the pc sort of cognites on it. And the air goes out of the tire and the pc feels much better and the tone arm action goes down and everything is fine and now you can't make the goal fire. That's fairly common. It's terribly beneficial, because it's opened the track and improved the pc's reality. You let the charge of the thing off like letting the air out of a balloon. And it probably had the line blocked and the pc's confront blocked. It wasn't the goal, but you were likely to find the goal soon afterwards.

You might have two, three, four of these things, even five of them, in the process of looking for a pc's goal. In other words, charge then also can apply to the solid goals line.

Let's just consider a list of twenty goals that the pc has got, twenty banks, or something like that, and the list – let's handle this as "a bank." And it has only the significance of goals, and just neglect the RIs entirely, just forget what's under all these things. And just treat him as a concatenation of goals. Unless you let some charge off the subject of goals you're not going to find a goal.

So once again, charge goes down and then the significance can emerge. Because charge can totally mask significance and is practically the only thing that does mask it. Although significance tells the pc how to be aberrated, it is charge and his inability to rise superior to it that causes him to act aberratedly or suffer physically from having a bank.

So you see, you can actually go up and down the parade of pcs' goals lists, every once in a while hit one of the goals on these channels or some lock goal on top of that goal.

Now let's say it's the goal "to catch catfish," and he's given you the goal "to bait fishhooks." And this "to bait fishhooks" is a goal of one of the RIs, you know, and it goes Pssswww! See, something like that. You get a nice blowdown, it all looks pretty, it all looks very nice, it's all beautiful; how interesting! But it wasn't his goal and you can't make it read after that. If it reads for a while with a rocket read and continues to read and won't ever go out and keeps coming in and going out and you just can't ever get rid of the thing, it's probably his goal. You should certainly test for top oppterm and that sort of thing on it if you can't get rid of it forever and you can't find his goal.

But normally, the whole subject of goals will release some charge. Then looking for any old goal – if you do it well as an auditor, holding up the pc's morale so that he can rise superior to his bank – will release charge and therefore permit significance to be viewed or
confronted. And then getting goals of a particular kind will bleed some more charge off the bank and all of a sudden you're sitting there looking at the pc's goal.

How long does it take you to accomplish these actions? You possibly look on the finding of goals as a matter of luck. Well, after my experience in this line, I find out I have been more spoiled by luck than assisted by it. I found quite a few goals in fifteen minutes on a pc. Leaves you in this kind of a frame of mind: "What the hell is wrong with auditors that they can't find these goals, see?"

I got my comeuppance. Took me two years to find one goal. Pretty good. So I had to get down and study this subject. What's this subject all about? Fortunately, it took me two years to find it, because I did make the study then and I got quite interested in it. And eventually, toward the end of that period of time, was sufficiently informed on the subject so that if I had to find that person's goal again it would probably only take me twenty-five, fifty hours, see.

And what's all this about? Well, the pc is not out here someplace, four or five feet away looking at this point which is his goal, and just won't give it to you. That is not the pc's situation or position. The pc is in the middle of this goal, being this goal, is this goal, and the last thing he could look at is himself. The old philosophers used to say, "Physician, heal thyself," "Know thyself," all this sort of thing, it – obviously the last thing you could see was yourself. Well, even with the help of mirrors it's sometimes difficult. So, you're actually not finding a goal, as your best statement of what you're doing. You're actually discharging a bank on the subject of goals and improving the confront of the pc until he can recognize what goal he is sitting in, with your assistance, and then you find the pc's goal.

And that's how you find goals. Now, the assistive character of a goal causes it to present itself. The goal which is hidden causes it to present itself: "to hide," you see. Why, it's got – it's got all these oppterms that tell it to present itself. They'd be – actually are the easiest goals to find. They're the ones that pop up at once. Well, they've got eighty RIs that say they should be found, you see. They say they should "not be hidden." And they only got twenty that said they should hide. A little more difficult goal to find is one which says, "Find me," because it's only got twenty saying, "Find me," and it's got eighty saying, "Things that get found are no damned good," see.

So, your neutral goal, however, your neutral goal is the hardest one to find. It doesn't get blown into view by any of its significance. It is as heavily charged, but it's usually quite abstruse, compared to the pc's behavior. You'll swear this pc – you'll swear this pc has a goal "to ride horses," see. You'll just swear that the pc must have such a goal, because the pc just talks all the time, about horses. Can't get off the subject of horses, can't get off of horses! Hates horses, gets walked over by horses, see for...

"Aw man!" you say, "Well, what's about horses here? What's about horses? Something about horses? Animals! Must be a fifth dynamic goal." You figure yourself wild, you see. You'll eventually find out, when you do find it, why you will say, "Well, I'll be a son of a gun," you see, you'll say – one day say, "What was all that about horses?" And all of a sudden you'll cognite, see. Well, it'll be something like "to never go anyplace." Way the guy is executing his goal is to be fond of horses, see. You know, death on cars. Death on airplanes, you
know? Telling everybody old methods of transport are best, see? That's just a method of never going anyplace.

And it'll be... So trying to track a goal down by the significance of the bank is one of the most thankless activities you can engage upon. By all means engage upon it, but just recognize that it is a thankless activity. It's lots of fun, it's like playing charades or something. But always be prepared to be knocked off your pins on how far you were out because you're never dead-on. It'll be – it'll be something which is as wide as "to never go anyplace" and "to ride horses," see. It looks quite wide, you see. And you just never would guess it. And the auditor that thinks goal finding consists of a large series of guesses and is a guessing game, and that he will find the goal if he is lucky, and won't find the goal if he isn't lucky, you understand, misunderstands to a degree what he is doing.

But because these other things are so attractive – the significance of it all is so attractive – because of these other odd bits into the situation; the pc's talk, you see, the pc's dramatizing, the pc's this, the pc's that. And you start following down, look at his 2-12 list, and you find out he just says nothing but children, children, children, children, children on the 2-12 list. "I wonder if this pc doesn't have a goal 'to have children.' Do you suppose so? 'To be a child.' So on, so on, so on, so on, so on, so on...

You finally find out the pc has a goal "to like new things." [laughter] It's just way out, man, always! And you just never would guess it, because the pc is of the least possible assistance.

You recognize, then, that the significance channel is limited to simply giving him the significance of items to list goals from so as to bring him in close, and the significance of items which occur on lists to list goals from, and the significance of listing questions. Like the most non-survival goal you can think of, you see, to list from. Very assistive list questions can be used, and so forth. Trying to guess the pc's goal, however, is a very thankless task and very time wasting and very exasperating. And the auditor's liable to become extremely exasperated trying this. He should recognize that these two things monitor whether or not you get the goal. It's the charge on the thing, and the pc getting the charge off or rising superior to it. See, he's got to rise superior to this charge. Or you've got to take some of the charge off. And actually you do both. You do both.

It makes a great deal of difference for a pc to find out where he's located in the bank. Even though he's located too early in the bank, you very often will find that you have to walk a pc forward to present time, just as fast as you can get him there through the banks. You don't dare go back, you don't dare go earlier, don't go into any earlier banks, because he's already handling one that's too much for him.

If he actually is handling a bank that is far too much for him, it is better for you to do the goal oppose list and move in to an earlier bank before you do anything more. You can actually move a pc up and down his goals channel by doing goal oppose: "What goal would oppose..." list, you see. "What goal would..." – You found the goal "to ride horses." "What goal would oppose to ride horses?" And you'll move him right up into his next bank.

But there's more air for the next goal when you do that and it's easier to do it with the charge off. So your first choice is to handle the goal that you got your hands on. But if it's just
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obviously impossible for him to handle this goal, you just can't make it any way, shape or form, don't struggle around with it, move him up the bank a ways. Recognize that the goal you've got was the one which was most offerable, or unofferable, according to its wording. Not because it was closest to present time. And therefore, you will move him forward, and you very well may find that you were looking for an inert goal, it doesn't offer itself, it doesn't refuse to offer itself, so therefore, there it is, you see. It'll be some kind of an inert goal of some kind or another which is "to be happy." There's an absolute killer to try to find. That goal is around. But it just sort of never turns up.

Now, when you find a goal which is a neutral goal, you want to kind of pat yourself on the back, because it was – it was found by taking charge off and by being a good auditor. Not because the goal walked up and said, "Hey! Whhitt whhitt! Hey-hey! Here I am! Here, here, here!"

"Oh! 'To be here!' All right, there you are."

That's the way you find goals. Any pc that doesn't put his goal immediately on the list, is either bucking an auditor who isn't raising his morale, or he's just so charged up in all direc-
tions it's almost impossible to do anything for him. The speed with which a pc's goal is found then, is monitored by the amount of charge, the significance and the degree that the auditor can raise his morale and discharge the general charge off the subject of goals. And you'll find it's easy. That's the way you find goals.

The fast way to find goals is not by a magic significance, but by very smooth, clever – cleverness must not be gainsaid – smooth, clever auditing, that keeps the pc winning all the time on the subject of goals, raising his morale, getting him to confront them, getting charge off that goal's bank, finding on little short lists of a page or two a goal that'll blow, blow the tone arm down. And then finding another one that will. And so forth. And he goes on and he removes charge. And all of a sudden as the pc's morale is coming up, why all of a sudden the pc says, "Heh heh! What do you know! What do you know, here's a goal. I've been sitting right here, it's 'to be here!' Ho ho ho! Here it is." Fine, great, you've got the goal.

That's what goal finding consists of, and it's monitored by the character of the bank. Goals ride over as a layer, over the whole of the GPM. And the subject of goals, then, lies as a layer over the whole of the reactive bank. And you can stick little pins in it here or there and get the charge off. And get the pc alert, and get him seeing things better, and hold his – hold him up and carry him forward, and the next thing you know you've got the pc's goal. It's not because you guessed it, it's not because you guessed it. We can't rule out luck entirely, but so far as possible, is you should just neglect it as a factor. It... because you'll find that pc's goal to the degree that you get the charge off, get the pc to confront the bank, and as you are assisted in the significance of the goal and, of course, as you hold the pc's morale up and keep him confronting and keep him happy about it and not frantically looking, "Oh my goodness, what are my goal – what's my goal? What's my goal? Oh! I'll just die if I don't have my goal by tomorrow."

Some auditors, "Well, I haven't gotten your goal yet, what's the matter with you? Why haven't you put your goal on the list?" and so forth. "Hmpf! You realize you're making me look bad?" you know. "Everybody's looking at us, hour after hour, month after month, no
goal. What's the matter with you?" You see? That's not the way to find the pc's goal, because it violates the morale factor and it doesn't get the charge off. It just caves the pc in further. Thing to do is cheer him up about how much progress we're making with his state of case and how much better he looks, now that we've been over a few goals lists. Keep leading him. And next thing you know, bang! There's his goal: "To be here."

Okay?

Thank you very much. Good night.
Thank you!

All right, this is the 30th of April, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, we had a record last week. We had a record last week. We had a – I think there were more than this but they weren't checked out in the week so we didn't count them – but we had a dozen goals found last week. A dozen.

So let's give them a hand, huh? [applause]

Well, I had an awful lot of trouble keeping my shoes on. It's very hard for me to keep my shoes on, because people keep walking on my heels and slipping them off! And, this has been – this has been technically quite a rat race because it's been necessary for me to take – oh, I don't know – I was telling Suzie this morning, my customary attitude toward this thing is take about a thousand years and go down on a desert island, you know, and figure it all out.

But due to the various stresses and strains involved with it that hasn't been possible so it had to be condensed into a few weeks! And the pattern of the GPM – that's been pure slaughter because trying to find this pattern has been – well, it's not only difficult to find the pattern but you actually have to hunt and punch through a bank to make sure that the pattern is in agreement, bank to bank, and you haven't got any time to run the banks, so therefore you have to pick up an early enough bank, you see, so as to tip the charge off later banks, you see, and look it all over, and that leaves your case in a horrible condition, let me assure you.

And you go back fifteen goals, with no fully run goals ahead of those fifteen goals, and it's a slaughter. Well, I don't mean to put up the poor victim to you or even tell you, you must appreciate the information. All I'm saying is that it's been a flat out proposition and we do have the information. And that pattern of the bank which you have now – it's horrified me in the past – but we continued to get new items. And I figured, well, some of these are certainly lock items on the items we've already gotten, so it was necessary to shake them all out – what were the actual items in the pattern of a GPM? And were all those items present in a GPM?

It's all shaken out now, except a little band which won't disturb you, since it's an easy band to find anything in, on the level in your bulletin there, "have a game." And, there's a little place where I drew wiggly lines across and said there might be some items in there. Well,
it's kind of mysterious why the noun of the GPM – top noun or action or conditional form, final achievement of the goal is what it is – it's sort of mysterious that that declines completely. You've got that completely declined. And then you go into the "ivities" and so forth for it, and then you get the goal as an oppterm and, well, you don't think these things are hard to find, man. I must have gone across eight banks without... and I said, "Someplace the goal becomes an oppterm! I know it!"

And I thought it might be at the top and it might be in the middle, but at someplace the goal became an oppterm. It was just in the cards that this would be true. And by George, it wasn't till I was about fifteen banks back that I finally found the goal as an oppterm. Wow! And there it sits, it's right in that position exactly.

Well, now, your goal declines through those same... fortunately, it repeats its pattern, and it declines totally, all the way down, and then goes into the "ivities." It declines – I mean it goes through "absolute" and "perfect" and so forth, then it goes down into the "ivities." And then the end of the goal suddenly takes over after you get – you've gotten down there, you've got the end of the goal like "to catch catfish." You've now got "catch catfish" you see, so you've got "catching catfish." And mysteriously the end of the goal doesn't decline. And I haven't been able to find any place it declines. It simply goes through its – the forms which you see there on the "have a game" plot.

That's mysterious! Why does it do this? But it doesn't decline anything I can find at this particular time. But I've got a lot of banks to run. I've got to clean up all these banks now that I've been through. And on my actual auditing time I figure out this will only take twenty-five hundred hours of auditing to do this because each item will have to be cleaned up now, and this brings me Clear – this brings you at least a one-goal Clear, you see, some time in the next few weeks, and it brings me Clear in 1973, you see. [laughter]

So, just be kind to me in the meanwhile, and don't make snide remarks about it because... The worst that happens on this sort of thing is body weight starts knocking you around. The front of your body takes a beating. And at times I thought the machinery of the body was going to cave in on some of this. None of that happens in the type of auditing which you're doing at this particular time.

It's the residue, the uncleared items and that sort of thing banging into the body which increases body weight. People will ask you about this and you occasionally – banging into a goal, unable to get its top oppterm, unwilling to spend the next two or three months of auditing just to get this character's top oppterm – you're perfectly at liberty to cut into it someplace when the goal is an oppterm and just force that blocked charge off and then force the lower blocked charge off and, you know, take the bottom of the goal off and then go back and find it because it'll now be in view. You see the strategy involved with it.

But if you do this, why, you will be aware of the fact that your pc's body mass will increase because you've got all that top bank and it settles down on the body. It wasn't part of the body's weight up to the time when it was restimulated and pulled in on the body, you see? But now it is, so that adds some body mass. And when you clean it up the body mass will go away, see.
This is one of the oldest findings in the field of havingness and in the field of living-ness. And this goes back, I think, to 1950 – well certainly, certainly 54. I remember it in 54 – on the subject of making mock-ups and pushing them into the body and increasing the body's weight and then taking and throwing them away and decreasing the body's weight – so that somebody or something was busy. And this was used as a proof of the existence of a thetan rather than the... and using the fact that the thetan did have something to do with the construction of mass and the creation of mass and that sort of thing – what was the source of energy and mass.

All of that was used, by the way, in confirmation of the early Axioms. And that was all axiomatic, theoretical work. Well, here we are facing the same principles again that if you don't clean up an RI before leaving it, you have residual mass and that residual mass tends to add itself to the body and the body tends to increase in weight. And when you have run this out, the body then decreases in weight. You can almost control the body's weight with RIs. It'd depend on how thoroughly you handle the situation.

Well, anyway, that isn't too much the point involved here. The point I am making is that the upper masses, or any GPM uncleared masses, tend to add themselves to the body's mass. Because they are... they pin down against the body more thoroughly than they have been. And, you see, here was a thetan and he's just been dragging these old tin cans and chains around, but if you don't thoroughly clean the thing up, why, the old tin cans and chains get added onto the body's mass and it will register on the bathroom scales. We're not talking about any esoteric mass; we're just talking about what weighs on a scale. It's as easy as that. And, you see, the stuff you're handling is finite mass just as much as that crayon is a mass, you see. It's nothing – "mental mass is different than physical mass." Well, it's – the only difference is it's thinner. It's less massy, and, that's about all. And somebody here the other day... Every once in a while on the backtrack they'd say – in Dianetics, Scientology – I'd mentioned something about mass and somebody'd say, "Well, I part company with Hubbard at that point, you know, on mass, seeing mass, and that sort of thing... Who can see mass?"

And a lot of people couldn't see mass. In fact, I think the bulk of people couldn't see mass. And we had somebody here in Z Unit the other day and all of a sudden a few RIs down a bank, and all of a sudden, "Hey! You know? There it is! You know?" That isn't all the mass that shows up. Sometimes very interesting things show up, like a complete spaceship or a steam engine complete with wheels and so forth. It's solid enough that you feel that you could reach over and kick it and it would clang.

That isn't a GPM. That's exterior to a GPM or has gotten mixed up in a GPM. GPM mass is normally a steel shell – looks like a steel shell – or is a sphere of some kind or another covered with a black or gray cloud. The mass on a half-discharged bank looks like gray cotton wool. A mass that's been black will turn into gray cotton wool sort of a look and it has finite, finite dimensions. It isn't something that's esoterically a million miles from here or something like that. It's seventy-five feet long and twenty-five feet wide and you could practically tape measure it. And it's actual mass.

And the funny thing is sometimes you get a wrong item. You'll throw a mass into restim for the pc and he all of a sudden is sitting there looking at a black mass that wasn't there a
moment ago. And it's one of the tests of whether it's a right item or not – is how much mass
did it turn on. I've used that a great deal in research. Something didn't turn on mass; some-
thing did turn on mass; something turned on no mass at all. Well, it was the one that turned on
a little bit of mass, the way the thing turned out.

It turned on a tiny bit of mass. And those that were very comfortable and turned on no
mass at all didn't turn out to be the item. They were outside the perimeter of the thing. And
this mass is... alternates. You've got a black bank and a gray bank and a black bank and a gray
bank as you look on down the track. Some of them black, some of them gray. You might say
they're positive-negative charges. And they're all stretched out. They look like black islands
of mass.

And a black bank, when discharged, turns gray and – that is, partially discharged it'll
turn gray – it's still got a couple of dozen items scattered through it that you haven't got,
something like that. It'll turn a dirty brown; that's one of the weirdest shades. It's sort of a bly-
yaaahh, 'urky, 'orrible mustard brown and it looks very floppy, and so forth. And you pull a
couple of more pins and that starts unraveling. And you pull a couple of more items... You
can see these things start to shake to pieces and diminish, and so forth, as they are run. And
it's very funny to stand off and look at a bank that you have just partially run, let's say it's two-
thirds of the items – or even less than that; half of the items – are out of the thing and watch
the bank start to shake and start going to pieces.

It's trying to go to pieces. And it goes zzzzzz. And it shakes and the corners shake
and it shivers and it sort of folds up and gets smaller and shivers some more and it can't quite
make it, you see, because it's still got an awful lot of items in it. But taking charge – it's al-
most geometric. I wouldn't say that it is geometric in its progression, but the first items off
take proportionately more charge off than the next items off and then these take proportion-
ately more charge off than the next items off. And if you're going down the bank toward the
bottom of the bank, when you get into the lower areas about the only dangerous thing you can
do is leave any of those lower RIs alive and walk off and leave the bank.

You can leave the upper ones alive and it won't kill the pc. See, that just squashes him
and puts him in the wine press and gets him published, one way or the other. It's uncomfort-
able. It's just physically uncomfortable to have these things left. But you get down to the bot-
tom of the bank and what holds the bank together are those bottom RIs. Goal, that one, has an
RI, you see. "The goal to _______ '' you know, that one has an RI; "Somebody or something
with the goal to _______ '' and a couple of those optterms.

You walk off and you leave those things, and man, you've had it because that bank
will stay stiff as a poker. You see, these are the fundamental keystones on which that bank is
built. And it's just there – it's just there, man! And if you were to leave those on and go over
the bank again, the bank would get stiffer. And by extrapolation – I haven't been able to take a
third time over a bank with the bottom items in, but apparently it would just go stiffer. In
other words, it gets to a point where it'll charge up if it is still held in place at the bottom.

It'll continue to discharge. If you take the top off, you can take lots of charge off the
bank, you see? The top items are not very vital. They're just uncomfortable; they're upsetting;
they're annoying. Pc keeps dragging them through the bank and they keep getting in his road.
And you get down in the lower third of the bank, without the decline of "perfect" and "absolute," you know, all that sort of stuff, and those things will start flying back up to the top of the bank. You've dragged them all the way to the bottom of the bank, you see. And you'll say one of those lower oppterms, you see – very low oppterms – and all of a sudden, why, one of these things will go bzzzzupp! And you'll say – you'll say to the auditor something silly. Let's say the top of the goal is "catfish" and you're trying to run off the decline of "catching catfish," you see. And, you'll say, "An absolute catfish – oh no, I mean – I mean – uh – uh – catching big catfish! No, I'm – uh – uh – catching – no, just catching catfish is what I'm trying to say!" In other words, those top items are pulled down. But if those bottom items are left in a bank, why, just nothing discharges. You get to a point of no return. You could run items and run items and run items and run items and run items and nothing, no charge is coming off the bank.

But the pc is getting more and more uncomfortable and the pressure is getting greater and greater and it's becoming very upsetting indeed. The keystone – the keystone – of the bank that keeps it in the channel is the lowest oppterm. That is the real keystone of the bank that keeps it in channel with the other goals. That is how that can be kept in. Because it is always a mixture between the goal you're running and the next earlier goal on the track. And it's a cross – that bottom oppterm is a cross between those two goals, you see?

Let's say "to know" – it wouldn't be – is the lower goal to "to catch catfish," see. All right, so that one in the bank, "to catch catfish," that GPM, that bottom oppterm is "knowing about catching catfish," you see. Or something like that. "Knowing about the nonexistence of catfish," or – it'll be something weird – but it'll be a cross between those two banks. But I say that's a keystone as far as the channel of goals is concerned. That's goal one, two, three, four. That's how they keep in sequence: that bottom-bottom oppterm.

But what keeps the bank stiff and what keeps the bank charged up is the goal. And there's a correction coming out on the plan of handling. I got a little more data on that – and picked up this other data about the stiffening of the bank. But you should run out – the only correction is that when you run down one of these banks, you shouldn't keep going earlier, you should go to present time. Well, all that's okay. But it's what should you do about these bottom oppterms? Well, you should run them. And what should you do about the lowest goal – that goal as an RI – what should you do about that?

Well, that's an enormous question. There's a terrific amount of theory could go on about what you should do about it. If you get the pc into the earlier goal, he, of course, is going to be so interested in it that nothing will do but he runs it. And the next thing you know you've got a pc six goals from the present time goal, you see, and he's now going earlier. And because you've got present time goals on top of it, they're going to follow him back just like the top of the bank is going to follow him back. And any time he peels off some RIs he's sitting there looking at a black wall. What's this black wall? Well, that's just the top goals following him down, see? You take any goal out of the sequence of goals, just at random, and try to chop it out, and as you run the top oppterms you run into the later goal on the track, you see, and as you hit the bottom you're going to run into the earlier goals on the track.
So what do you do about these bottom oppterms? Well, you've certainly had better run them. Well, how about that — how about that bottom oppterms? You can't get that unless you've got the next goal. Well, unfortunately, or fortunately, it's not necessary to get it. Just have the pc string a long bow at it and put anything that RRs and put it down, see, and adjust it when you come back down the track after having run to present time.

Well, what do you do about this goal as an RI? Actually, I made an actual test after the release of the bulletin which opened my eyes. I thought you could leave them on. Almost killed me. I thought you could leave it on. You can't do it, man! You got to list that. "On what goal would it oppose?" or "Who or what would it oppose?" and have the pc put some goals on as an answer to the question and get yourself a complete list. By George, don't leave that list incomplete! Go fifty beyond your last RR or R/S just as though you're going right down there and find that goal, see? You're going to find that earlier goal even knowing that the pc is liable to cognite on it. If he cognites on it, God help you, you see!

You can't let him run it. You mustn't let him run it because you've got to come back up to PT on these banks. Not go earlier, earlier, earlier, earlier, earlier because he starts running into stuff that the devil himself couldn't handle, you see? And he's got all these upper banks that are going to follow him down. So you can't let him go earlier. And if he gets that goal and suddenly realizes what the goal is, and that sort of thing, just talk him out of it. Say, "That's all very interesting! We're awfully glad to have this goal 'to be a game warden.' Awfully glad to have this goal! That's fine. That's fine. Thank you very much!" Make sure you complete the list even if he cognites on the goal because he'll ARC break, you see, if you don't complete a list. It's true of any list.

All right. Do that, RI – goal as an RI, oppose at the bottom and don't null the list. Just leave it as a complete list. Pc will be perfectly happy. And then go back up to the top of the first bank you run and find its goal with the opposite oppose and go on to PT. But what do you do with that? That's been one of the major problems. This doesn't look like much of a problem to you, but it looks like a big – it's looked like a big problem to me because there are many chances that you take in even approaching the earlier bank at all. And the main one is – the pc is so interested the top oppterms pop up. He even gives you the top oppterms, maybe. You look like you're running it, see, you're on your way and you say, "I have no other choice to run it," because you do have your hands on a goal. I'd say the temptation to run it is enormous and it just must not be done. It just must not be done.

You've got to take him around and go on top of the bank. And that list is always harder to do; it's more difficult to find the later goal than the earlier one. And you've now got two live goals firing. And for a long time I didn't know if you could have two goals firing. Well, I'll let you in on something: You can have fifteen goals firing all at the same time. So, don't worry about that! That worried me for quite a while but I found out that it was one of these points one didn't have to worry about.

Anyway, this situation – of what do you do with the bank, and so on – is all answered on the basis of what are you trying to do with a pc. Well, if you're trying to clear a pc, then you will audit the pc for the best auditing gains that you could obtain per unit of auditing
time. Not the most you can do mechanically per unit of auditing time but the best gain you can get per unit of auditing time.

Now, it is true that it is totally a mechanical proposition: The more items you get off a bank and the more banks you run, the less charge there is and the more the pc can cognize. That is true. That is true. There is nothing wrong with that at all. But when running a pc under special conditions that you yourself, as a Scientologist, recognize as special conditions – but nobody else would. You're running a thetan in a body and that just about ruins 90 percent of the things that you could do heroically. You got a body. It has a beating heart. It has lung machinery. It's constructed; it's a piece of electronic construction. And it gets in the road. And you're auditing a bank with a frail human body interposed between the bank and the pc. Now, that is what has given me trouble in research; nothing else has given me any trouble in research. Well, all these little minor points come up and stew about them for a little while and finally wrap them up and so forth. But the restraint point comes under the thing that the universe is most concerned with on these planets and that is care of the body – care of the body. What are you going to do, see?

Because the pc is put into danger to this extent: How are you going to continue to audit a dead body? And if you've got him halfway through a bank, he's sufficiently restimulated that he'd probably have difficulty picking up a new body. Do you see that? It's a neat point. Now, I don't intend any Scientologist be caught with this one, so if the body knocked off in the middle of running a bank, then how's this character going to function, see? He's all restimulated and so forth. Well, he'd undoubtedly be – go key out and be better off eventually, and so forth. But he feels terribly betrayed because the hope factor is way up, you see?

So therefore, auditing is monitored as to what gains you can achieve in spite of the fact that the pc has a body between himself and the bank. Now, this is not esoteric. This is simply very blunt – very, very blunt indeed. There is a body and there is the pc and there is the bank, you see. And what influences the pc tends to influence the body; and what the pc throws into restimulation throws restimulation around the body. And it's geographical. I mean, the pc's bank extends around you, the auditor, to the left and right and back and front as – probably as you're sitting in the auditing chair the pc's bank is up there, a mile or two – that is, the total bank – and back of him maybe half a mile, or something like this. It may be that big. It's hardly any bigger than that.

But the bank that you're running is right in the room that you're auditing in and his body's in that room, and so forth. Now, it isn't going to infect or influence your body. Don't worry about that. You could worry about that far more than is justified. But that bank, remember, is capable of influencing the body which is capable of influencing the E-Meter. How do you think the bank charge gets through to the E-Meter? Well, it gets through the pc's body – his hands – to the electrodes, to the wire, to the E-Meter, see? So you got a closed circuit going on there. Well, there are other closed circuits which exist in this, too, and the auditor is not much influenced with this bank. This bank is physically connected up to the thetan that you are auditing and it's not physically connected up to the auditor. Now, what you do run into, auditing in an uncleared situation is – in trying to figure out the pc's bank – you, you knucklehead, will occasionally remember what you had there or what it might be in your goal.
I've only seen this happen once in being audited as a pc. All of a sudden the auditor
ducked like somebody had hit her over the head with a sledgehammer, see. And a tremendous
somatic had practically taken off the side of her skull. And we were having a little difficulty
trying to work out this scale, you see. And she had said to herself – I finally got this off and
we continued on but she said to herself, "What – what – what would there be at this level in
my bank? Let's see. There would be a..." bang! You see?

Now, an auditor could very easily believe – an auditor could easily believe that he was
being influenced by the pc's bank or that it was doing something weird to his bank. But these
are on quite different wavelengths. And the collision factor there is so remote as to be totally
neglectable. But what does happen, he gets a restimulation because of his own think-think and
what he is doing and kicks his own bank into restimulation and he could make a mistake and
think that the pc's bank was knocking him around.

Well, the pc's bank could knock him around if he had an item "being knocked around
by the pc's bank." But this physicalness of the bank is saved by this – and this is just guess –
guesstimate stuff: theory. Not only can a radio have one... a certain wavelength, you see, but
matter can have a wavelength. Just stretch your imagination a little bit further. And there's
practically an infinite number of potential wavelengths. And the matter of the bank apparently
exists. You occasionally have met some human being that you have said "Soul mate!" see.
Every once in a blue moon you have suddenly run into somebody and have this feeling like –
very great closeness and you've met them before and you knew them, and so forth, and all that
sort of thing. Well, you've probably got a near-wavelength proposition. You find also this
person has the power of irritating you far beyond any other human being's power of irritating
you; or pleasing you far beyond the power of any other human being in pleasing you, you see.
What you've done is probably get one of these close – close tune-ins of harmonics. You have-
'n't even got the same wavelength, you see.

And then there's the possibility that you knew the bloke before. There are always –
that possibility exists. It isn't often that you meet the people that you know, and it... some –
some trickier Scientologist in the early days used to notice this – used to use this in order to
get the sympathy and interest of girls. This is one of their favorite tricks. I used to talk them
out of it if I possibly could. I said I disliked having to procure girlfriends for them as well as
clear them, and so I thought it was too much.

But the point – they would tell them, "Well, I've known you in a earlier life," don't you
see, and "Don't you remember... ?" something or other. And naturally people having lived
through all these periods get the period restimulated and all kinds of wild things can occur
from that point on. But that's crossrestimulation. It's just overtly restimulating somebody's
bank. It is true enough, however, that's the – that's the insane harmonic of the true fact, you
see. All things that are good have some harmonic way down below which is awful. And, this
"known you before" is one of these – one of these. Perfectly true! Perfectly true that around
you, you have run into some people you have known before. And that's – no doubt about this
 whatsoever. And any person that you feel very closely drawn to, concerned about, terribly
interested about, and that sort of thing, falls into either of these two: either you've got a close,
close wavelength harmonic going or you've known them before. And this is "you takes your
money and pays your chance." The thing is one or the other. But maybe you knew them before because of the close harmonic of the banks, you see, so that also works out.

People – you get some real idiocies. This becomes very unpopular very easily because some nut will ride it into the ground, you know. "I can't get off my overt because life after life all I've done is kill Ron," you see, and so forth and so on. Well, I just haven't been getting killed. It's a patent lie, you know? All kinds of wild oddball things can be dreamed up in this. And some true facts do exist, however, below the nonsense and you mustn't totally avoid them.

Now, you get people around who claim they are so affected by other people's energy and masses and so drawn down by it that they just can't stand to confront or audit somebody or speak to people in a group or something like that. Well, you eventually will run this down to the fact they're just dead scared, see. [laughter] They'll have some RI saying they mustn't speak to the group, you see, or people steal their energy or something like this, you know. The actual phenomenon is not at fault. It's the restimulative factor which is at fault.

Well, all of this stuff is very well worth knowing. You'll run into it one way or the other but it's questions you might be asking yourself about it.

Now, in handling a bank – this is a bank – you are associated with the problem of how you handle banks. Now, let's pull this down in its most finite, possible way. You've got the problem of the thetan plus body plus bank. See, that's your problem as it walks up to you, see? That's a thetan plus body plus bank. And that's the whole shooting match. That bank consists of free track that hasn't been drawn into the GPM. It consists of all of the goals, all of the GPMs, all of the locks, all of the secondaries, all of the engrams, the whole – the... all of the circuits; everything there, you see, plus the body, you see, which is in the road of all this. And then the thetan is also plus the physical universe and its present time problems. And how often as an auditor have you found it necessary to handle a pc's present time problem before you could audit the pc? Well, so that gets added on, too.

And you could go out by extrapolation and realize that you were, in auditing one pc – don't take this as anything but a joke – in auditing one pc, you recognize clearly that you are auditing the whole physical universe and everything in it, you see. That's the reductio ad absurdum. You feel like that sometimes. Some of these pcs [laughs] – how many PTPs they can get! Well, those are simply where the pc impinges. It is very seldom necessary for the auditor to handle the environment of the pc. But when you get into the field of the very neurotic, psychotic families that surround the pc – an insane pc, and so forth – you definitely are in a position where you have to handle the environment.

Well, we're not dealing in that particular sphere at this particular time and have no intentions to do so at this particular time. But some time later, after there've been some white flags raised over the center of the American Medical Association, Health, Education and Welfare building, and the Congress – which I think supports psychiatry, totally – I think when they get a few white flags raised up around there and allow free thought to exist again in the world, you may find yourself with some of these problems. They won't keep leaving it to the witch doctor, believe me, if somebody can do something about it, you see. As the years roll along they won't completely neglect this forever.
We're not in that business but it is a factor which should be part of your technology. You have to handle the environment in, that is, a severely insane person – you have to get that person so he can't knock himself to pieces so that he can be audited. This padded cell proposition, you see.

And now let's take the body. You know that if you try to audit a severely ill pc or try to do much more than give an assist to make him feel happier, you know that you're in trouble and – that is, in trouble with the body, and so forth – and therefore you shouldn't go around using Scientology to try to heal somebody. Well, let him get well if he can. Give him an assist, make him happier, bring him up to present time, do what you want to but don't bother to try to treat what is wrong with him. That is well outside your province. Similarly, in auditing him, don't knock him around to a point where the body comes in too much – for too much of a beating – it can stand quite a beating, I assure you – between the thetan and the bank. This again is a factor which you have to take into consideration. If you had this – this person walks up to you and he's just a thetan and a bank and somehow or another you can get him on an E-Meter, I assure you you could clear him much faster because you would handle him quite brutally. You would just chase him down the track, man! You'd pick up basic-basic and shake the bank out, you know, and then go back up to the beginning and knock out some of the goals and discharge everything that you could discharge and get your hands on and then come back up to present time, run it all the way back from present time to the earliest bank and you'd have an OT on your hands. In other words, you probably would proceed on some sort of an heroic basis like that.

It's in the cards if he can run the first bank out right now. Of course, you've taken the kingpin out of every other bank and therefore they run much easier, and so forth. Well, you can't do that with a body around because at the time he accumulated the first bank he didn't have a body. And his adventures were far more strenuous than a body can stand up to and the mental energy masses contained in those early banks do make – make no allowance whatsoever for a body.

This is why people get sick. They get restimulations of banks that the body can't handle and it knocks them around most ghastly. Now, you can make somebody quite ill by overtly chasing them down the track into early banks and badly handling them. And it's something that you must safeguard the pc from. Therefore, you find what you can get your hands on and get him up to PT and run the PT banks back. Before you've gone too far you probably will be auditing a thetan who is not interposing a body between himself and the banks. But if you run him back early, early, early, early, early you will have no choice but to continue to interpose this body between the thetan and the bank.

So the body is an unwanted chip in most respects but you need it as an auditor in order to get something to hold on to the electrodes. So regard it as a useful adjunct and put up with its liabilities; such as it gets hungry and it has to go to the bathroom and other things that get in the road of an auditor. Just thank the Lord that you at least have something to hook the electrodes on, and safeguard that to the degree of not interposing it into too savage a situation. Now, that doesn't require any adjudication on your part or any doingness on your part beyond this one thing: Stay with your standard procedures as they are developed because they contain these factors as an inherent part of auditing. These are taken care of to that degree and there's
no sense in your beating somebody up just to find out what would happen because it will happen!

The point I'm making here is that you run what you get your hands on that can be run and run it well with a minimum of stress on the body. And we just don't care how much stress occurs on the pc. Thetans are indestructible. So you just couldn't care less how much stress. Where that stress moves over into concern about the body, the fact that the lungs aren't breathing too well and the heart isn't beating too well and the skull feels like it's about to have a stroke, well, "ware shoal."

Now, what can you do that would produce those things? What can you do? There's very definite things that you could do that would produce those conditions. One is to fail to clear the bank you are working on but go dancing off to other banks because the fields were so green. Early or late, go dancing off to other banks, see. Fail to clear the bank you are working on.

The next one is refuse utterly to go earlier before you've gone later. In other words, run the banks closer to present time. Don't get persuaded into the backtrack banks.

Another thing is try, as far as possible, to run a bank from its extreme top to the bottom. Now, another point – that is completely aside from don't bypass items and that sort of thing – this is an adjunct to the last and modifies the last one – don't keep auditing the pc over and over and over and over finding nothing and not discharging the bank because that is very hard. So you see, between the last two I've given you there is the medium situation that you could take huge slabs out of this bank and still discharge the bank. In other words, your auditing must not continuously idle around on one unfound item with lose after lose after lose for the pc – hour after hour of hunt and punch, see. Knock it off. Knock it off. Find something that can be found in this bank.

Now, of course, we get down to the ordinary auditing precautions. Don't find a wrong item. Don't run a wrong goal – much more important than bypassing an item or something. Do a workmanlike job of auditing. And then, of course, we get this one – and this will sound odd to you – follow the pattern; your pc is not different. Your pc simply won't rocket read well at some portions of the GPM.

I had one last night on that last one that would amuse you greatly. I had a pc that said it was not "impartial!" – or no – it was not "incomparable," but "unconquerable." And that argument was so succinct! It was backed up by the fact that the only thing that was firing on the list was not "incomparable," but the thing that was firing on the list was "unconquerable." There was only one thing wrong with it. Every time "unconquerable" fired, three or four other items also fired on the same list. I just went by the rules of auditing and I got enough listing done and enough listing done and enough listing done, and by God, it turned out to be "incomparable."

Twenty minutes' worth of random listing and seven pages of actual listing later, it turned out to be "incomparable." So it's just charge which prevents the right item from firing. Your pc isn't different. Your pc is simply too charged up to fire. And you keep at it long enough and the pc will fire.
Now, although this is more or less a general talk on handling pcs and so forth, at the risk of overrunning this a little bit – I am going to – I'm going to show you a method of handling this which takes care of most everything I've been saying except handling the bank – banks. You know, run them forward, and so forth, which I've talked to you about. Now, just as the pc has many goals and many banks – a finite number fortunately, a very small number – so he has many RIs; many RIs in one GPM.

Now, instead of worrying about all the GPMs there are to run while you're auditing this pc, you should worry in this regard: how well you clear up the RIs you got your hands on. Just as if you half-ran half the banks, so if you half-run half the RIs in a bank, your pc sooner or later is going to feel queasy. The monitoring factor here is audit what you've got your hands on. You've got your hands on it. Well, audit it! Now, when I say audit it, I mean audit the pc in front of you. Don't run Routine 3 on a pc; audit the pc with Routine 3. And that goes for every auditing skill that we have.

For instance, I never see check a pc. Never been known to. I audit the pc with Sec Checking, see. I don't find goals on a pc; I audit the pc with goals finding. Now, if you keep that frame of reference, you'll win all the way. But if you simply run Routine 3 on the pc, you're going to run yourself right off a cliff someplace. This is "run the pc in front of you." I'm not talking about fixating your attention on it.

But what is the running of Routine 3 doing to your pc? And what are you doing about it? It actually doesn't mean that any more steps are added. It doesn't mean that anything new or peculiar particularly is done. But you've got a pc sitting in front of you. And that is a thetan plus a bank plus a body in a physical universe. Ghastly!

If the body wasn't there, you could probably do all sorts of things. But it is there! So how does this pc feel? I – shades of the 3rd or 4th London ACC – I said that you should be able to audit a pc straight through without a single somatic. That's a ne plus ultra perfection definition, you know. You audit so beautifully and so well and so smoothly that you pull him out of it all without him ever having sunk into it deeper than he's in. Of course, that is just a postulated theoretical ideal. But you know it's almost possible to do that with Routine 3? Sounds incredible.

If you do this – if you use everything you are doing at the moment you are doing it to clear the pc of what you've got your hands on, see, if you use that every moment to clear the pc of what you've got your hands on, you will then all of a sudden have a miraculous series of runs with the pc and you'll get something like this: The first RI takes two and an half hours. The next thirty RIs take a half an hour apiece. The next thirty RIs take twenty-five minutes apiece. The next thirty RIs take fifteen minutes apiece. The next bank takes you forty-five minutes to get your first RI. Takes you half an hour to get – each – to get the next half dozen. Takes you fifteen minutes each to get the next thirty. Takes you ten minutes each to get the next thirty. Takes you five minutes each to get the next thirty – using the same process every time.

Why? Because you are building on a gradient scale the thetan's confidence. And you're, of course, sending the case into the stars because you're clearing everything you lay
your hands on. There is nothing behind you to worry about. I am not now talking about an ideal. I'm talking about an attainable fact. This is attainable.

Now, there are mechanics involved with this attainability and there are ways to audit which attain this. The first rule you've got to follow is if you've spent a session or two trying to get somebody's top oppterm firing, whatcha going to do, make a career out of this top oppterm? So for some peculiar reason on this peculiar case, "Caught catfish" doesn't apply and you just can't get anything to fire. Well, look, you've got the whole goal "to catch catfish." You don't need that top oppterm. You've got the ending of the goal. You've got an item in there – "catching catfish." You've got the whole bottom of the goal as far as that's concerned. You've got "catfish catcher" over there as a terminal. You can cut in with that block and go on down.

By the way, no matter how hard you try to go up in a bank, you always go down. This will fool the auditor and fool the pc more often. They'll say they're going up in the bank and they'll just get a couple of items reversed, but they'll only be going – running down in the bank, which is quite interesting. You'll always... it's so funny, you sit there after a while and you look with your jaw dropped and you realize we're going down in this bank. And we've been trying to list up in it, see. Nope, you always go down.

Well, you've got all these points where you can cut in. Well, which one fires native and natural on the pc? Which one fires? Which one can you make fire? Well, you know they're there. You could unburden the case and go forward. This doesn't excuse you, however, from not getting the top oppterm the first time and following it through, you know. So what, you couldn't do it. Well, let's not take... make the next seventy-five hours of auditing the contest for finding something that can't be found. Assume there's some reason why it can't be found and find something that can be run because your first interest is to get charge off. You get charge off of that bank and the pc can confront it. You fail to get charge off of that bank and the pc can't confront it. And so, of course, you're just left there walking in the mud.

And if there's any doubt remains in your mind as to what the top oppterm is – you can't get the top oppterm and nothing seems to fire; you can't get any "absolute" form; you can't get any "perfect" form; you can't get these things – huhu-uuuh-liaaa-yaaa-ughhh! – don't make a career out of it man! Leave it to the politicians to make a career out of being inept! You're supposed to be effective.

Well, just stretch back and say, "Well, we're having a bit of trouble finding – finding this top oppterm. Can't seem to get anything to fire on this, and there's some discussion as to what it is and what it isn't, and all that sort of thing. We're going to cut in on the goal line and see if we can get that."

Well, of course, you had the goal firing so you can certainly get the goal as an oppterm firing and tear on down using the pattern of the bank from there, see? Tear that out!

But you get some slabs out of that bank! That's your first job. But when you've got your hands on it, clean it. Clean it up. Make sure it's right.

Now, a pc's bank doesn't go "absolute catfish," "catfish absolute," "perfect in-ness to catfishing," "eager catfish" "catfish eagering." It doesn't go like that. If... it'll go "catfish abso-
lute" or "absolute catfish" or "absolutely catfish" or "catfish absolutely" or "an absolute catfish." It'll establish a pattern and that pattern will contain certain things. And after you've got that pattern, man, there isn't anything varies. The next one isn't swap-ended, see. It isn't "eager catfish" in one place and in another place "degraded catfish," you understand? It doesn't say "eagerly catfish" and then "perfectedness catfish," see?

You got a constant. When you establish that pattern – which is your heaviest job – once that pattern is established that pattern holds. So you better make sure that the pattern is right and cleared when you get it, see? Now, it really doesn't go in the upper part of the bank – it varies somewhat in the lower part of the bank – but it doesn't go "not perfect catfish," "no catfish perfect," "catfish no eager," "eager catfish not" and "can't eager catfish," see, and "not degraded ain't" – nothing else present. Doesn't go like that! See, it just doesn't go like that. It'll go "no perfect catfish," see, and "no eager catfish," whatever it is.

If it's "eagerly catfish" it'll be "no eagerly catfish." Once that pattern is established that pattern continues. It doesn't bounce all over the place.

Now, you've got countless locks which fire. When you first enter a bank – let's got a bank "to have catfish catch tigers"; "tigers," "catfish," anything will fire and rocket read. You work on it long enough, any part of that goal wording will fire. Anything! Any combination of it. "Catfish catch tiger-ishness" will fire, see. "No – no havingness of catfish catch tigerishness"; that will fire. Anything fires! Why? Because you're looking at the whole mass. And it is so cross-charged, well, the pc's name will fire in it. Anything fires! Any kind of a combination will fire. You can find any top oppterm known to man or beast. You can take any part of the goal or any tense of any part of the goal and put it in as a top oppterm and it'll fire.

That's a horrible liability isn't it? Terrible! So that makes the top oppterm the hardest part to find. If you can't find it, for God's sakes take some charge off the bank so it can be found. Because after you've got the charge off then all of these weird combinations don't fire. Now it's getting simmered down. Just as the bank itself is a shell – just as an item, an RI, is a shell with a lot of RRing items and RSing items around it – as I've just given you in a bullet-in – just as you've got a cross section of that, so the whole bank operates that way and the most ridiculous things will fire. The more bank, the more things will fire. The more things will be restimulated, too, in life. The more bank he's got the more nervy he is.

It's just a matter of charge. If you can bisect charge out of there, if you can get – that's why you mustn't stand around with your hands in your pockets, you see, trying to find something, find something, find something, find something, find something, trying to find something and not find anything. You better go someplace where he can find something.

Now, you better clear everything you get your paws on. Everything you can get your paws on, clear it. Now, what's that mean? Well, that means if you get your hands on an RI, you clear it. Most of the pcs around will not fire first off on the pattern. Pattern does not begin by rocket reading. And therefore, auditors will be invited to believe that it's a different pattern.

---
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– this pc has a different pattern. I don't pretend that pattern is perfect. That pattern's awful close in, though, man!

Now, your problem with all this other thing is first and foremost, very well may be, simply how to get the pc to rocket read at all on these items. That's the problem you may find yourself wrestling with. So therefore, you need technology that develops a rocket read. And let me recommend to you something on this order. This is – I'm just about to put out Routine 3N which includes simply things which you have, which is directive listing and random listing. These things are included in it.

Your pattern isn't very esoteric. But let's take something like this. Now, we know this character's item is going to be "absolute," but that "absolute" can also be "total" or "all." It all depends on what it is. The other words don't seem to vary – but perhaps that one can vary. I don't say that it can either. But, let's just take – let's just have "absolutely caught catfish." "Absolutely caught catfish." Let's just take these items, see, and tell the pc to give us the items. And we tell the pc to give us the items so we can put them on the list – we don't just put them on the list. And that's to blow charge, see. So we tell the pc "absolutely caught catfish," "catfish – caught catfish absolutely," "absolute caught catfish," whatever this thing is. We're going to get various combinations of this. This will maybe amount – this first one's going to be longer because we're establishing pattern and we're going to get all kinds of possibilities – endings and combinations – we can and so therefore it may amount to quite a few items. Be quite a few items on this. And after we got all these things down, we've carefully noted that one or two of them fell when the pc said them.

We didn't expect any rocket reads. Just don't expect any rocket reads at this stage of this operation, I mean, when you're doing this. Be gratified if something rocket reads, but don't expect any. You're looking for falls and you find out that "absolutely caught catfish" falls. Isn't that nice! In fact, we put it on a couple of times and it fell. Ha-ha! We know what our item is!

Now, we simply say to the pc, "All right, we've probably got the item on this list. Now, there are a great many secondary items, however, that you probably are very greatly interested in so I just want you to do some random listing on this and tell me the answers as fast as you can think of them – to this auditing question: Who or what would 'no caught catfish' oppose?" And the pc says so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. You don't write down a thing. You just sit there with your meter in front of you and the pc going on and you giving him an occasional half-acknowledgment "Mm-mm, okay, fine."

He's listing, see. But you're not writing it down so he can list at a rather tremendous rate. And if he stops listing, you damn well get him started again by getting in Suppressed and Invalidate. See? That's always the way to get a person listing, is put in Suppress and Invalidate. And don't put them in prepcheckwise, see, just put them in on the meter – Suppress and Invalidate.

And he'll start listing again probably before you can get them in. And let him go on talking. And you let him talk until we no longer are seeing rocket reads and rock slams and DRs on this meter.
How long does it take? I don't know. How long is a piece of string? How charged is a pc? And you will eventually get a very smooth needle – one of the cleanest needles you ever laid your eyes on – beautiful, smooth, flowing needle. And you say, "All right, thank you very much," and you stop him listing at this point, and now you list "no caught catfish" question. You say this to him, "no caught catfish" to see if it reacts. And if it doesn't rough up the needle appreciably – that's appreciably, see, you don't have the perfection of cleaness, because remember there's still a pin on this, there's still the bottom of the bank – and you got no, you got no instant reaction on it and it seemed cl... it didn't rough up the needle. Asked the question, this doesn't rough up things very much. It maybe gives a tiny speeded rise or something like this. Don't bother with that. You say, "All right, now we're going to read to you your item," and we read a couple of these things that fell. We don't even ask him again, see. We read him a couple of these things that fell to see if a couple of them are rocket reading.

And when you call that "absolutely caught catfish" which you already saw fall, you're going to see the most beautiful rocket read you're ever going to see. And the pc says that's it and he cognites on it and everything is fine. Didn't rocket read before. Why not? Obscured by charge. Got that? You just follow that pattern. Item after item, terminal or oppterm, and you've got it made, man! I just was running this one over the jumps. And not using it for harassing the pc to get it on the list.

Two and a half hours it took to find an item. This other one took a half an hour. Apparently lengthy, isn't it? But that time will shorten. And what have you done in essence? You have discharged or cleared the RI you were working with. I'll give you another discussion of this as to the exact theory of all this and why this happens this way. But remember there's a charge where it faces one oppterm and a charge where it faces the other oppterm and there's another charge that connects it to the bottom of the bank and this item is surrounded by RIs – by potential RIs that you could get wrong – that rocket read like crazy. But they're just rocket reading items, they're rock slamming items and they're dirty reading items and you've got them on there by the ton! And before we started doing this it was customary in the top of the bank to have the tone arm ride high. If you do this one and clear every one of those RIs just this way, you will watch this confounded needle go on down here to clear read – even for a girl – and come back up and pump down and go back up and pump down. You can actually run – you don't have to run the tone arm action out of it – but you suddenly find yourself auditing the pc at clear read.

He puts a new item on the list, you go to a new section and he'll go up. But then by the time you've discharged it, he's at Clear read. When you gave him the item, you don't get much blowdown because it's blown down. You'll find something else. You'll find something else that's terribly intriguing – is – this is why you must do it – the item you are listing from will always RR again. And that is because the first time you gave it to the pc the charge suppressed it and only by listing it do you get the charge back on it in a clean pure state so that it can blow. In other words, it implodes before it explodes.

Quite fascinating. In other words, you're listing from "no caught catfish" and he... you put "absolutely caught catfish" on your line plot. You put this on your line plot and it falls. And you could read your meter at this moment and you wouldn't find "no caught catfish" firing. But you list it for five minutes and then read "no caught catfish" and it gives you a rocket...
read! Oh-ho-ho! But you've got the item on the list already. Oh, I think this is fascinating! In other words, there was that much blasting charge left on the thing; but there is a method to clean it.

I've often told you you might have to do something with the RIs but I didn't know what it would be. Well, what you do with them is list them. List them random. You don't write it down. Gives the PC the weirdest feeling when he's already trained into having his every word recorded, you know, to have the auditor just sitting there staring at the thing, you know. "Thank you, all right. Okay. All right. Well, that's enough now." Don't even write it down again.

But supposing you couldn't get anything to rocket read at the end of this thing. Then you'd have to work with the PC to get something on the list. But it will now rocket read. Previously, if you hadn't taken this step just the way I'd given it to you, you could get a half a dozen perfectly satisfactory RIs in the place of this one and therefore have a half a dozen chances to get wrong ones. And then your errors mount and you find it harder and harder and you think this is wasting time. No, his lists are going to get shorter and shorter. I've already seen this. In the first bank the lists were three pages; in the second bank they're two pages; in the next bank they're one page, don't you see? But list those RRs and R/Ses off of that RI just by making him answer the question and you're going to see some of the cleanest needles and some of the happiest PCs you've ever seen. And that tone arm will come right on down.

Now, if the tone arm doesn't come down, you goofed. You said, "Well, this PC is different. It wasn't 'absolute'." Or it'd -- "absolute" can vary because that's just blaa! That's just sabilaa! "It wasn't-it wasn't 'eager,' it was 'excited'." Oh, "excited" would fire! Oh, I guarantee "excited" would fire! So you put down "excited." Now, when you don't put it down at the top of the list you're going to get a very long list. The right item must be on the list first before you give any random listing. And that's why you put it down at the top of the list. You've already got the right item on the list so therefore the list will be relatively short and blow easily. Now, if you didn't put the right item on at the top of the list the PC would list for a couple of hours without putting the item on. See? You already triggered it. You already triggered it and made it collapse in on itself and then you've listed the debris off, see. You've done an heroic job. So this makes it up to you, the auditor, to know what item goes on the list -- ha-ha -- before the PC puts it on. You can consult the PC, you can get his opinion, but he will inevitably tell you, particularly early on in processing and so forth, "No, it is not 'perfect,' it is 'exquisite'." And "exquisite" will rocket read, unfortunately. "Perfect" won't, but "exquisite" will.

And after you've got the random listing, what do you find, you find yourself looking -- "exquisite" doesn't even read. He'll even tell you now, "well, it isn't" exquisite,' it's 'perfect' of course." In other words, he comes around that way. Then people can say, "Yes! PCs are forced to list according to this pattern! They're forced to list according to this pattern! And the pattern actually isn't what is in the bank at all!" See, they can have all sorts of arguments.

But here's the proof. You now can't get anything else to rocket read on that question. You can't get any more rocket reading items on it. But if you had taken "exquisite," if you had
gone back to it, you would have found out you'd get another half a dozen rocket reading items in that same area. Isn't that interesting? In other words what lists it flat is the pattern.

Now, when we transfer this into French, German, Swedish, Scandinavian, Chinese and other tongues, we're probably going to be in trouble. And even when we try to run it on a twelve-year-old child that has never heard of such a word as "incomparable," we're going to be in trouble, aren't we? Well, people have already been in trouble as auditors trying to run the mid ruds on an eighteen-year-old girl that just couldn't seem to get it through her head what "suppress" meant. So the auditor sat down and taught her the language. So we need a glossary which defines by dictionary, and with an idiot's definition, of every single word that is used in the bank. And I'm going to get one together or get somebody to get one together.

Now, we say, there's the definitions and these suffixes. What does "-ivity" really mean? Well, this is educating the pc, but unfortunately he won't go Clear unless you do! So some pc says – you have to give him an – give him a test, a literacy test, you see – and you say, "What does incomparable mean?" And he says, "Incomp... in-in – what? You mean uncononchible?"

I thought for a while, here, just a short time ago, that the – only literate people were ever going to get Clear. They were probably more educated when they laid these things in than they are now, but, then I suddenly realized, well, they can learn those words, they learn new words all the time. They can learn those, too. It's a finite number of words. All we got to do is write up a glossary that's well defined with a good idiot's definition following the dictionary definition. You know, a very clear dictionary definition and then an idiot's definition that gives it all in patty-cake. Eventually they would come up to being very fond of these words.

So there is your method of handling whereby you keep the body from getting knocked off while you're auditing the thetan, and this has the single practical aspect, of course, of continuing to have a pair of hands to wrap around your E-Meter electrodes. I wish to, however, call this to your attention because my earlier researches on a "thetan meter" – which was a small antenna, read by the magic eye type of response on a thetan – didn't pan out. Worked on it in 1952, 53. And the difficulty with this universe is that the fields of television stations, radio stations, and all that sort of thing, and the fields of a live body in the vicinity of that antenna can raise the devil with it. But it isn't so much the TV fields as it is the live body. And Lord knows where the thetan would have to be – no you, as an auditor, would have to be in order to audit the thetan. Now, he could be in the vicinity of the antenna but you would have to be – what do you know – over twenty-five feet away. You'd have to audit twenty-five feet from your meter. And then of course every wire that is run in toward the antenna sets up its own field. So I'm just recommending to you, to keep the pc alive and so that you can have a pair of hands to put on the E-Meter electrodes – and this is... I can't recommend this to you too strongly because it's embarrassing.

Now, we thought we would run into a problem whereby: how do you audit somebody OT? Well, that's very easy because all he's got to do is keep in touch with the body and you'll continue to get your rocket reads. But how do you audit a thetan that doesn't have a body to put on the meter? And we haven't got that solved and I'm pointing that out to you and strongly
recommending, therefore, that you clear the banks – that you contact and clear every item in the bank before going on to the next item and therefore you'll continue to have live hands on the electrodes.

  Okay? All right.

  Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Well, here we are at the what?

*Audience voices: Second of May.*

We've arrived at the 2nd of May. Gee-whiz. We got through another May Day, 1963, AD 13. We celebrated, last Wednesday, the 2nd anniversary of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and the course is into its 3rd year as of now. And we turn out better auditors all the time. Turn out better auditors all the time. Even you! And our successes are – of the past aren't even comparable to the successes that we're going to have up the line here.

Now, today I'm going to talk to you severely – ordinarily I jolly you along, you know, and everybody looks...

Well, I hate to be this severe, but you are on the edges of the great adventure. And this separates the sheep from the goats, man. And separates the children from the characters who can do it. And you are adventured upon a period of auditing which requires far more precision, auditor presence and TRs than any auditing we have ever had.

There's certain ways to do this right, and there's certain ways to do it wrong. The number of ways to do it wrong far exceed the ways to do it right. Any time you have somebody in training, he can always invent some new ways to do it wrong, but it's very, very funny that he never invents – almost never – some way to do it right. Because the odds are very bad. The truth of the matter is that the auditing which you are embarked upon is in actual fact simpler than you would believe and simpler than you will believe for some time. And the main thing you are doing with it is far too much complication. That's all. Just the complexities you're adding into it are defeating you. And you're taking too much time to accomplish what you're accomplishing.

And the only difficult thing that you must learn – and I can assure you this is not easily learned – is with total, excellent ARC, totally control the pc in session. Now, that is asking a lot. Because the pc is walking – you know, these, the Hunha Kapunah Unah Unahs had – that's a tribe that were bred by the Hunahs after they were defeated by the Punahs – and they used to walk across live coals and other tricks like this. But man, this pc, he isn't just walking across a live bed of coals, see, he's walking across eternity. And he feels it.

And the least – the least rancor, upset, unsmoothness on the part of the auditor records itself very heavily on the pc during Routine 3. And you say, "Well, we'll be a good fellow and we will just audit permissively and go along with what the pc says." See, that's one answer to not making the pc upset. You've got several answers, you know. And one of them is just to sit there, you know, and be agreeable. And that is the worst answer.
Because the pc will dig himself into and get more ideas about digging himself into and get himself dug into more trouble if you follow his advice exclusively, than you can easily repair. I assure you of this. If he tells you that you ought to re-list some item and if he – if you do that, that's all right, you – very often you have to take his – the statement of what item it is that's bothering him, you see. But do you this and he gets dissatisfied and he says it's some other item and then he says it's some other item, and then you follow through and you do this, you see, and then you say some other item and so forth and all of a sudden you notice the pc is in a state of total collapse.

Well what put him there? The pc? No, it's just the failure of the auditor to exercise session control. No good blaming the pc and saying, "Well he dug himself in." I don't know, this... you sit comfortably under the palm tree on the bank of the stream, you see, and he swims through this river full of alligators, and you didn't tell him to go upstream or downstream, and he goes upstream and gets "et" and you say, "Well, he did it."

No, you're there to tell him how to get across the river, see. If the pc digs himself in, it's the auditor's fault. And it's nobody else's fault. There's nobody else to blame in the session. If the auditor fails to take the pc's advice, and gets into trouble thereby, it is the auditor's fault. If the auditor does take the pc's advice and gets into trouble, it is the auditor's fault. If the pc gives good advice, it's the auditor's credit, but it's his fault. Understand? And when you look at a session, don't look at it as a dual activity of mutually shared responsibility, in the great togetherness of all us wogs, you see? I mean, that's wogishness, see.

If you want to know what is responsibility on this planet, it is enough people in the same place. And that makes a responsibility. I mean, it's as weak as that. You see, they elect a lousy president in the United States and they say, well therefore the whole population took responsibility for electing the president so therefore it's nobody's fault. I think it's somebody's fault, see. But you wouldn't get any conviction in this particular line, you see.

So if you have five people together, immediately there can be no responsibility, you see, except the group responsibility of all five. Well, you have to get out of that way of thinking. It isn't an auditing group of two with mutually shared responsibility. It isn't, man! There happen to be two bodies there, but there's only one responsible factor, and that's the auditor.

And the pc isn't responsible for a living thing. Not one thing. You go around and say, "Well, he's a bad pc, or he's a nattery pc, or he's a this pc or he's a that pc." It's very strange that if you straighten out the points on the case that ought to be straightened out, he ceases to be a nattery pc. I think it's quite remarkable.

All right, now if he's a nattery pc or a good pc, maybe give him the credit for being a good pc, don't you see? You can go that far, but actually you can't give him the credit for being a nattery pc. Because as far as the session is concerned, why, the pc runs as the auditor says. The auditor never has the out of "the pc... something or other." The only time the auditor has an out is when a pc does something out of session that he ought to be brained for. I had a pc come to session once, I had the pc running beautifully, the pc came into session all caved in. Been all right during the last session, but was all caved in when he arrived at this session.

Well, the pc had taken it – had taken this interesting action. Had decided that something was it and had listed it. So happened that it was listed backwards, and no advises on
this, you see, pc had no advises. And had listed about 10 or 12 pages backwards on an item, you see, and thought, "Just a little more listing now and it'll be all right." But of course you start listing one backwards, a little more listing makes it that much wronger. And I didn't half-clobber that pc, see? "You chuckleheaded idiot," you know? I mean, this was the general course of my existence. The pc didn't do it again.

But what was I doing? I was exerting, then, auditor control out of session for auditing being done out of session. And the only way I could do it is, "If you do this just one more time," you know, blank, blank, blank, blank, blank, blank, see. The only way I could do, you see, was to impress the pc that this must not be done. Did. We never had any more trouble of that particular kind.

But it wasn't the auditor's fault if a pc gets themselves wrapped around a telegraph pole between session by some self-auditing action, except to this degree: In this case the auditor had not been expressive enough to meet that eventuality and had not smelled the fact that the pc was going to do it.

Now, you say, that's pretty – that's pretty far. Well, actually it is pretty far afield. That is stretching it just a little bit. Auditor responsibility is just being stretched a little bit. But the next time it didn't happen because auditor responsibility at that point asserted itself, and so this pc is doing things out of session, that are interfering with the session, therefore we must lower the boom and – took responsibility and lowered the boom.

Now this lowering of the boom can actually also consist of, "If you have just one more fight with your wife, if you talk to your wife just once more about your goal I'm going to give you the wrong top opperm and list you on it for hours, you understand?" [laughter] "So come off of this because I won't stand for it." That's asserted auditor responsibility, don't you see. You're perfectly within your rights to assert your responsibility that way.

You aren't responsible for the pc having walked back into the third or fourth session you gave him all spun in because they went home and told the wife, "My goal is..." and the wife said so-and-so and so forth, you can't be held responsible for suddenly realizing that he was liable to go home and tell his wife his goal and his wife was liable to invalidate his goal and et cetera. That's asking just a little bit too much. You see? But it is within your zone of responsibility that you find out he's doing such things, to lower the boom, see? Give him a heart-to-heart talk.

You don't give him these heart-to-heart talks in session, by the way; you end the session. And when you've given him the heart-to-heart talk you start the session again. But the point I... then they can never accuse you of having broken the Auditor's Code.

But this will go quite a distance. This will go quite a distance. You find out that somebody is doing something outside of session that is upsetting your auditing. Well, it isn't up to somebody else to tell him, it's up to you. Now, you can tell them persuasively or any other way, don't you see, but you've got to make it stick. That's taking responsibility for the pc in extremis. Anymore... "every Monday you come in here, every Monday you come in here walking on both sides of the room. What's going on? What do you do weekends? All right, I'll pull a few of those withholds. We're not in session. See? This is not a session. I'm pulling a few of these withholds, and just so-and-so... All right. Okay, so that's what you do, and that's
why. All right, now listen: I'll let you in on something. You're not going to do it again, you hear me?" And make it stick. Because they're getting in your hair as an auditor. Now, you have a perfect right to do that sort of thing. But how do you do it so that the pc doesn't hate your guts forevemore? This is where diplomacy comes in. So many people have died from it – that's... [laughter, laughs] All casualties of the last two world wars.

Now, these points of out-of-sessionness and so forth, well, take them up with almost any rancor that you want to. But the truth of the matter is, you start controlling a pc misemotionally, while he is running Routine 3, and this is a horse of another hue. You can just start looking mean during a session and you'll practically spin him. He can't cope with the bank. And it comes back to the old *Original Thesis*, those rules and laws in *The Original Thesis*: auditor plus pc greater than pc's bank, you see. But auditor plus pc's bank versus pc, you see, auditor plus pc's bank is greater than the pc, and you cave him in.

So it's an interesting point. How do you control a pc without enturbulating the pc or pushing the pc underneath the bounding billows? How do you do this? Well, it's a very smooth level of control. It's extremely smooth control that is required. And there is a type of control that works in it, which doesn't Q and A. And yet which doesn't leave the pc sitting out on a limb either. You follow the formula of acknowledging completely everything the pc says. You understand it and you acknowledge it.

Then you say, to the effect that, although what he is saying undoubtedly contains great validity, it happens at the moment that it is necessary to take this other course. But that if anything needs to be done which he said, you will take care of it afterwards. Or at some later time. You got the idea?

Now, actually, that isn't just a casual series of phrases I have strung together, it has a very hard-bound formula back of it. Pc says – doesn't matter what the pc says. Pc says, "There is a goal – there's a whole bank between the bank we are running and the last bank we ran."

And you say, "All right, you can see it, huh?"

"Yeah, oh, yeah, yessir, yessir. A whole bank in there, and we've just missed it clean, cold and it's it. And we're now running the next bank below that, and we shouldn't be there."

Now, if you adjudicate this on the basis of, "Should you do what the pc says, or shouldn't you do what the pc says" or, "The reason why you mustn't do things is because the pc said to do them," you'll make as many mistakes you see, as in following the pc's advice. What you must do is treat anything the pc gives you as data. And that is all it is. It is never an order, it is never an invitation, it's never a this or never a that. It's just data. And it's quite valuable data. Make a mention of it on the auditor's report: "The pc says there's a bank between these two banks."

Now the only reason a pc is going to become upset with you is not if you don't immediately find that intermediate goal and run it instead of the bank you're running, but if *the pc thinks you have missed the information*. Now you can underscore that. If the pc thinks you have missed the information, you now get into a very heavily ARC broke situation. Pc says, "But I told you there is a bank, a whole bank sitting there!" And he starts asserting the existence of the bank and he'll start keying it in.
Well, the wrong way to handle it is to just say, "All right, yes, all right, I know – I know – I know, well, go on and answer the question which we are doing right now." "Yes," he says, "but there's a bank, I've just seen it. It's – you know, it's between here and so on and on and the whole thing is caving in on me and it's terrible."

And you say, "Yes, well, thank you, thank you, good, all right. Now, just go on and answer the question which I am asking, you know..."

And the pc now, he says, "But I doo-rrraa-paa-rrreh..." Bow! See?

"Well," you say, "well, why is he so upset?" Well, he's so upset because you have evidently missed the information. He's not sure you've got this information. So your – just your ordinary toss-off, "Yes, okay, fine, thank you..." That isn't going to work. Because it'll create what is in essence a missed withhold. And the pc explodes accordingly and he explodes bank-sized missed withhold, see? Now, the way to handle that is to look at what I told you in the first place, you see.

"Oh. Oh. All right, I – all right. I got that. A whole bank. Okay. All right. Let me make a note of that." Put it on the auditor's report because it might be very interesting, and you might not go on auditing him for a long period of time. Draw a square around it, you know, so that it stands out plain. Say, "All right, I got that information. Any more about that?"

"Yes, so-and-so and so-and-so. I could even tell you its goal."

"That's very interesting. All right. Says the goal is 'to catch catfish.' All right. Good. All right. Good."

Now, this is possibly an approach, but I myself would not use it, so I'm giving it to you as where you could again perhaps fail. You say, "Well, is it all right with you if we keep on running the command which we are running now?" And I've heard so many of you use that that I'm injecting it as an – "Is it all right if we do that..." I never ask the pc if it's all right. He sat down on the other side of the auditing table from me, I just assume that at that moment he has said that it's all right if I do anything I do from there on in that session, see. I just assume if he'll sit down there to be audited – the only pcs I have any trouble with is that won't be audited and won't sit down. You see? I assume if he's sitting there, it's all right.

So I never ask him, "Is it all right if we go on doing what we are doing and do something with that later," see, I don't go into that gambit at all. I say, "All right, I'll tell you what. It so happens we've got our hands on a..." tell him the truth, see. "It so happens we've got our paws on this goal and we're this far into this bank. If we leave this at this particular time..." it'd have to be the truth or I wouldn't tell him this – "...if we leave it at this particular time, why, we're so many in, I don't think the other goal would fire. So I'll tell you what, this is probably going to be very uncomfortable, we know the other bank is there and so forth, and when we finish running this one, we'll get that one. All right?"

Pc will say, "That's fine." He'll go on with the chest mass falling all over him and having an awful time, but he'll go ahead and run that bank for you. You understand? It's on a basis of truth. And you treat anything the pc says as valid data. That is the secret of it all. Anything the pc says as valid data. Because he's the one who is observing it.
The pc is right far – about the data – the pc is right about the data far more often than you suspect. Right about the data. And about what to do with it, is a hundred and – not just a hundred, but a hundred and ten percent wrong. See, so you learn to differentiate. You learn to differentiate between an order to do something and just data. And you always be very happy to get the pc's data, and you pat him on the back about his orders. The diplomacy all comes in under the heading of orders, not about data.

If you handle the data this way, you never have to have any diplomacy, and actually, you won't get into orders. He only gets into orders when he's sure that you're not going to do anything about it.

Now, you better know this trick well. Because you're about to embark upon something – and I've prefaced this lecture on Routine 3 with this diplomatic approach to auditing, learning the lesson of controlling with a steel paw in a velvet glove. Learn that lesson well, because the only real troubles you're going to get into is feeling so insecure about what you're doing that the pc says to do something and you do it. And he's not a hundred percent wrong, but a hundred and ten.

Remember his data is always right, see? He tells you that there's an item "glumpelsks," and it's in a foreign tongue, and it lies immediately on the southwest corner of the item you're running. That's data. Good, fine. Now, it's just a question now of do you need this datum or don't you need this datum. That's the only thing. And what you do with the datum is your business, but just make sure you get the datum.

Now, if you – if you let a – this can go too far. If you let a pc start describing all the still pictures that are turning up, you will also wish you hadn't, because one of the ways of getting the pc in an engram is having described the largest object. It was the rule of the last largest object. "What was the last large object you saw in that engram?" He'll tell you and he's right back in the engram again, don't you see?

Well, you don't want him in an engram, so he's giving you data that it's there, I'd be more likely to turn it off something like this: "Well, now, we'll go on running this – and you tell me if it changes. Be sure and tell me if you... if it changes any." And he promptly forgets about it. I don't go on and ask him for details in those stuck pictures, don't you see. He's liable to give me all sorts of data about the lineup of the bank and how many items we've missed and how we should go and... but here's where it goes: "I'm very happy to hear that we've missed a pattern of four items that are lying someplace." There they are, he sees them, they're black. Everything else is gray. And he sees this patch of black.

And he says, "There's three or four items there."

I'm very happy to learn about that. I'm liable to make a little notation on the line plot. "Pc says there's four items here," see. "Four untouched items here." I'm liable to make that. And where I get in trouble – where I'd get in trouble, and where you would drown, is just right here: go back and get them. Take his order. "We had better get these now, because this is what's causing the ARC break that I've been having."

Oh, cut your throat, man! It's a much easier existence in the next few hours just mopping up a little blood. You differentiate the difference here? Pc says, "We've missed four
items." They're right there, he can see them. Fine. Cheers. And his next following remark is, "We had better get them because that's why I am so ARC broke." Cut your throat, man. If you take that order, you've had it. Not because of the mechanics that it throws him in control of the session and on self-audit, but it's just because it's not the thing to do! You see? It... you mustn't do that.

Now, if you – now, here's – listen to this: If you fail to take proper note of the data and understand it, it will almost always be followed by an order to do something about it because your failure to acknowledge the pc has thrown the pc on self-audit. And that is possibly what you haven't seen in the mechanics of this. You understand that? Your failure to take that data down or into account, or pay attention to it or acknowledge it, makes him feel that you're not in control of it. So he takes the session control out of your hands and orders you to do something about those items. See, so when you've failed on receiving the pc's data and paying attention to what the pc is telling you – you will then get your barrage of orders. And any time a pc starts giving you orders, you must realize that you have failed to take into account some data. And one of the ways to shut off the order flow, since the orders are, oh man...

Let's take somebody in the middle of a tar pit, with the tar all over him, don't you see, and have him direct the redecoration of the Louvre, see? It'll be just that silly. He isn't even there. He can see, but what he sees, we're not too sure of that. But we can take that because there's nobody else looking, don't you see. We're not any skull-looking there. Let's take the other thing of, however, he's in a state to audit? Oh, no. Uh-uh. He sure isn't. And the way to cure him of giving you orders is to find out what data you didn't receive. And you're liable to get a wildly vit... he's been very mildly ordering you to do things – you're liable to get a wildly vituperative number of things which he has been unable to communicate to you. See? You've got your missed withholds, straighten it out. You'll find out there's some vital data connected with it.

This is – this is one way of taking a pc's grab-control of the session back off of the pc. See? That's one way of returning session control to the auditor. This is find out what he hasn't found out about. Of course, you do this mechanically by just mechanically pulling missed withholds off the pc, but you should appreciate that you also have, "Well, just what have you tried to communicate to me you see, that I didn't understand?" or "What data here haven't I paid attention to?"

And he usually starts in at... it's very interesting to see a normally mild pc say, "Well, you silly idiot, you..." see, and here he goes. What he's doing is relinquishing session control. He gets it off, squared up, all of a sudden, why, he's brighter.

So, smoothness of auditing is how do you control the pc without ARC breaking the pc or chopping the pc, and it also includes, then, doesn't it, getting control back from the pc if you've lost it. And actually, that's the whole story of getting control back from the pc. Find out what the pc wasn't able to point out to you that he then has to do something about. Because his doing something about it is all wrong. He will never do the right thing with it, I assure you.

See, you could give him – you could give him the next five items, and say, "All right, all right, just – just add them up and move the charge down – down the bank, with these five
items." And if you check up what he's doing he will have opposed half of them backwards and forgotten the other half, you see. He's just not in shape to audit. That's all. I wouldn't even point this out to the pc. The question of his auditing would never come up. But if I found a pc giving me orders as an auditor, then I would simply try to find out what the pc has not succeeded in communicating to me.

I could do that with the meter, I could do it with persuasion; it might have happened in earlier sessions. But I would square that up right now.

Now, although the pc may be in an ARC break from other causes and reasons, I am likely to take that as the first step. Because the data connected up with this ARC break might be of great value. I would also do an ARC break assessment Routine 3 to find out what I had missed, but that is purely technical. Although it cures ARC breaks.

This other, how do you get control back from a pc, will very often form a considerable problem to you auditing in Routine 3. Pc is telling you, "You've got to do this, you've got to do that, you've got to – and we've really got to run into a later bank because this early bank that we are doing now is too much for me and we should run it later on the track, and we should do this and I've already told you that I've cognited on my goal in present time, and you should take this goal in present time and the top opperms of it are 'catfish' and 'catfish-no-catfish.' And we've got all that and so forth so you really ought to be kind of running that now, because after all I've told you and told you..." And you'll notice that all of his orders have got "I've told you and I've told you," let's find out what he told. He very often wasn't articulate while he was doing the "tolding" and you'll finally find out that he actually is heading for the – for the early bank because he hasn't been able to communicate to you, he thought, because your TR 2 might have been poor at the moment, or you didn't make note of it or something of the sort, that there's a whole slab of the material you have been doing he is in great doubt of. He just doesn't believe it, something like that. And he's gotten desperate about ever understanding it. So he's made a decision there that he'd better get an early bank that he can understand. And of course to do that would be utterly fatal. But the datum there that he hasn't understood it might come as a brand-new datum to the auditor. Oh, yeah? "Well I told you!" The hell he did, man, he never said a word about it. He was sitting there going on just as nice as you please, you see.

"Oh, yes, yes, yes, absolutely catfish, yes," he's going on about it, you know, "Oh, yes... Oh, yes, yes, I understand. Yes, yes, yes. Eager catfish. Oh, yeah, I understand that you know, oh, yeah." Now he tells you he hasn't understood a single one of them. Not only that but he tells you that he's told you he didn't understand a single one of them.

All right, so your reality is betrayed. Remember, he's running in the least reality, he's running in the exact hurricane middle of the reactive bank. There is nothing goofier than where he is at. It isn't that he is – is or isn't goofy, but the area where he is at the moment hobo-nobbing is Spin Corner, man! Crazy Avenue goes up in one direction and Dementia Praecox Boulevard runs in the other. [laughter] You're going to take this guy's orders, huh? Hah-hah-hah! This is silly. His data, always. His orders, never.
Very important for you to realize that, and the orders come when you haven't taken the data.

Now, we realize that banks are hard to run. Go ahead and realize it all you want to, and treat them with respect and so forth, but there's one thing you mustn't do. Now, you're going to misinterpret this and everybody's going to misinterpret this and get it all wrong. It'll be the source of argument here for years. I can see that, unless I make myself absolutely plain on this subject. Now – now, the wording of this is very carefully worked out, so don't write it down or quote it carelessly. Never rerun a partially run bank. Never rerun a partially run GPM. And that first word was "Never." And I point your attention to "partially." Now, let's get this real straight, because I don't want this datum to go to anybody's head goofywise, because it could be interpreted as "Never rerun a GPM," or that there's something bad about rerunning a GPM. There is nothing bad about rerunning a GPM. There is everything deadly about rerunning a partially run GPM. That one you mustn't do. Don't rerun a partially run GPM.

If you've got your paws on it, fur, claws and all, and you can continue it in the run, you continue running it right straight on through to the bitter end. What's the bitter end? The goal as an RI at the bottom of the bank, listed fifty items beyond the last RR and R/S. And when you've gotten that far, you can consider that the bank can now be rerun. You don't have to null that list to make the bank rerunnable. You understand what I mean, now?

Only then is it safe to rerun a GPM. Now, this means a great deal, it means a lot more than you think – you think of at the first matter. Means a great deal. You say, "What if it's wrong? What if the pc's ARC breaking?" I don't know, what if spring comes? What if the law of gravity works? Sure, a pc will ARC break. So what? They'll spin if you run it – rerun it. Uhhh!

You're going to get in nothing like the trouble you get into by running wrong upside-down backed-up mixed-up items, as rerunning a whole area to get the items right. Because that makes the bank more charged than it was. And it's then much harder on the pc. Charge in a bank runs from the top of the bank to the bottom of the bank. In consecutive order. And any time you take an area that you've rerun without running the rest of the bank – you take an area that you have run, and rerun that area, good, bad or indifferent, right or wrong, or anything else – any time you rerun that area, you just stack up a stiffening of the missed withholds. They're good and missed, now.

But there's a charge factor involved here. Because the charge runs from the top of the bank to the bottom of the bank, when you back up anything beyond a pair of items – quite allowable a pair of items because you're always working on a pair of items – you go any further back than that and start rerunning something, and not entirely understood by me at this moment – I'm simply telling you the empirical finding. This is not a theoretical finding at all. This is learned the hard way, you know? Any time you go back a few items and decide to rerun that little span again, without running clear to the bottom of the bank, you sort of let the water back in the battery, you know? Something weird happens. Just let me put it that way rather than try to give you a theoretical explanation that might not be right. Just something weird happens. The bank gets stiffer. Sort of like putting – you wash this shirt, see, and you
wash this shirt, and you look at it, and by golly the collar's still dirty. Well, in ordinary wash-
ing this wouldn't happen, but you wash it again and now it's too stiff to wear. It's very curious, curious; it's a phenomena.

It's as though the second wash water always adds a couple of gallons of starch. The bank beefs up. I can give you lots of explanations for this, but just take this as an empirical datum. The bank will beef up. The pressures will become greater on the pc. The stresses will become greater on the pc. The actual physical might of the bank apparently increases. Just take it as a datum.

Let's run – let's run from the top oppterm down to the goal. I'll give you an example, see? These are very concrete examples. We go from the – from the top oppterm down to the goal, I don't know, something, a matter of a fifth of the bank or something like this, see. Now, we've gotten the goal as an oppterm and we're going to go ahead through the rest of the bank. And all of a sudden – now these other remarks get very, very pertinent because we get a hard sell is liable to go on here – the pc's... this is visual, gets visual to the pc – he sort of looks up the bank and he says, "We've got uh – we've got uh – 'want catching catfish.' And that's wrong. That's wrong. That should be – that should be 'wantably catch catfish.' Oh, look. That's why I was ARC broke. Yeah. Yeah, look. I – that – that - yeah, that – that's wrong, so that makes the... no, the uh – that's wrong, and uh – oh, and there's a couple above that. A couple a – oh, no wonder I was so ARC broke. Look-a-there! You got about five items missing there, right in a row, you know? And uh – you must have given me the wrong item. Uh – 'cause there it is, and so forth."

And if you sit there casually listening to all this and apparently don't take it down any, and don't do anything about it, then the pc's going to start giving you orders about it. And the pc will say, "Well, we should go back up there – go back up there, to 'eagerly caught catfish,' and we should smooth that out and pass the charge down to where we are. Because if we keep going like this, why it'll just for sure mean additional ARC breaks."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much, well, we're going on now, and so forth..." And you see, that was... you've been practicing "die-plomacy," not diplomacy, and you're going to about get it, right in about two seconds, see. And you say, "Well fine, that's it, thank you, and we'll go on now, and we'll go on down the rest of the bank," and pc will say, "But look, I'm trying to tell you – I'm trying to tell you, there's this 'wantable – wantable caught catfish,' and that's wrong. Because actually there are about five items in that area and that's why I ARC broke in that area."

"Yeah, well thank you very much, well, we'll go on with this..." Of course his brains start spattering all over, and he says, "You've got to go back. Now I'll tell you what you do. You go back and – you go back and you catch that now..."

The next stage is, when you don't follow those orders, is he will go back and say, "See if this reads now: 'wantably caught catfish,' 'wantably caught...'just – just look at your meter. Get your eyes on your meter." [laughter] See what your inevitable cycle is? He not only gives you the orders, but he starts carrying them out! [laughter] And that's because somewhere along the line you haven't handled any of this.
Now, I'm actually giving you two data which go hand in glove, but they could form entirely separate lectures. The... don't rerun a partially run bank.

There are other reasons why you mustn't follow the pc's orders, but this is amongst the chiefest of them. Did you ever run engram or a withhold – they behave the same way – on somebody that wouldn't discharge? And seemed like the more you ran it, the stiffer it got? Why? Actually the answer is in Book One, and you'll find the answer's in the withhold system. You ain't got basic on the chain, that's why. The funny part of it is, the more you go over it the worse the pc's going to get with it.

You get this pc telling you about this withhold, see? He stole this car, see. And my God, every auditor he's had has had this withhold, and it's apparently getting up to be – you know, he's getting this withhold off, it's getting to be a total obsession. It's what's known – it has a technical name, it's the recurrent withhold. He gives it to every auditor and it comes up every third session, see? It's a recurrent withhold. He just keeps giving that withhold.

Now, if you were to look at that withhold very critically, you'd find out the pc is getting more and more obsessed with this withhold. That withhold is beefing up. Because hitting it causes all of the earlier withholds to be missed. It excites and activates the whole chain of stealing cars. And the more you try to get this particular car, without getting the first car stolen, the more you activate those lower ones and get missed withholds. Therefore, actually, no Prepchecking, or no Sec Checking can be done in total ignorance of the withhold system. You just can't do it, because on any given pc – of course, the key-out factors, anything keys out usually within three to ten days, but where a person is being consistently audited on the same item, same item, same withhold, same engram, same this... Oh, I – in the old days we used to have certain engrams, the pc would always come along with the engrams. The same engram, see. It was only a basic on the chain, that's all. Basic was still on there. It's enough to get out just the basic engram on that chain. You don't have to get the basic-basic engram of the case off, don't you see?

Well, because of the repetitive nature of the bank, in a goal "to game," you would have the word "game" being repeated the length and breadth of the bank. "To catch catfish," my God, "catfish" are all over this bank.

Well, oddly enough, you can get away with – and get some success on discharging a withhold or an engram on a one-pass. You know, you can always ask the auditing command once. You know, you can always – actually, you can always ask it a couple of times. But you can always ask it once. You can always pull the withhold once. See, you can always do it once. And the pc'll feel better, see. Oh, you can – you could get this one, Freudian analysis, poor devils, they must have run into this constantly. Because they dig and evaluate in these things, you know.

This guy would all of a sudden – which was... gave them their thing of – all of a sudden remember that his mother used to sing "Tipperary" in the bathroom. Ah! And he remembers this, and it cheers him up, see. Feels great. Feels great, you know, ha – remembers this. Ha! What the – what do you know! Oh, wow! Gee. Terrific! It's all right, man, this Freudian analysis really works.
Now the analyst says, "Now, what significance can you read into this, about that? And you give me a few more data, and give me some of your dreams so that we can integrate them with this Tipperary so that this Tipperary, we can make some sense out of this, see? Now..."

And all that gain goes, just like that. It's gone right now, see? It's out. Never to return. It's the wildest phenomenon you ever cared to do. I'm just talking about empirical actions now, that you can do as an auditor.

You say, "Well, what's the earliest recollection you have in your childhood?" see, something like this.

And the person says, "Oh, that's pretty good. Graduating from college." [laughter, laughs]

And you say, "Well, now, all right, that's – that's – that's fine. That's fine. What was particularly notable about that?"

"I was embarrassed when the dean gave me the diploma. Ha-ha! Come to think about it, I was. Well, what do you know? I feel better."

Fellow auditors, leave it alone. Let it drop with a soundless thud at that point. You see, this is so late. The fact that he got any gain or send out of it at all is miraculous. But just tapping it bled a little charge off of it, don't you see? But to hit it again will reactivate it. And then it'll hit all this chain of embarrassment. And you could go back into this incident and sometimes when it doesn't have a chain, you could run it as a little engram or as a lock, you see, and it'd clean up beautifully. And most of them don't have chains, so therefore you would get the idea eventually that you could run almost anything, you see, as an engram.

But let's say it's that unlucky chance that this one has a chain. Embarrassment goes all the way back to Freud, see. And you – you're going to hit this one, see? The dean gave him his diploma and there it was, and he's going to run that. And this one's got a real beefy chain on it, you see? Right along side of it you could have caught oh, incident after incident that you could have run, don't you see, because they're not in chains. And you get this one, and you run it, and he sees less to it now. Run it again, it seems more sticky. Seems more difficult to get to. He does it again, and he starts worrying more about this now. And he does it again, and he finds some more in it, but if you ask him about mass or if he knew about mass, you'd find the mass was beefing up. Why? You're hitting too late on the chain.

In other words, you could hit it for a moment, you could bleed the charge off of it and you could get out of there and you're okay. We know this from a long time auditing experience. On anything which has a long chain, similar actions, you see, repeated, repeated, repeated, repeated, if you don't get the basic on that chain, the chain will not blow. And trying to work later than the basic on it will cause a beef-up for lack of a better word, a strengthening of the mass, a increase of pressure, an increase of energy masses connected with it. You can run one of these things till everything gets three-dimensional, man.

Now, it's only to basic. You don't have to have the basic-basic for the whole case to dispel this illusion. You only need the basic on that chain, which is embarrassment, let us say, in this lifetime. The first time you were ever embarrassed. You get that, the whole thing will tear up. But if you keep hanging around with this late incident of embarrassment, that chain is
not going to tear up, that is going to get beefier. Now, I don't say that we are dealing with exactly the same phenomena when we deal with the GPM, that would be too great a conclusion. I'll merely tell you the same phenomenon is present in the GPM. But you can knock the charge out of items A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, in consecutive order. You can find the item, you see? You can list for the item. Everything is going to go along just very nice and so forth. You can get the random items off of them, you see, and blow the rocket read off the thing, and move down to the next one and so forth.

And if you go back, and you go back over A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, or you just go back over G – let's adjust G. Let's go back and get the pc shadowboxing trying to find the right G when we've already got Q, see. You find this pc start to get desperate after a while. And if you did this very consistently, you would find that there was greater mass on his case now. You would increase the amount of apparent mass. Actually you haven't increased the amount of mass, there isn't any increase in the mass, you've simply made him more aware of the mass that was there.

For instance, if it made him slightly deaf going over A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P – I know my alphabet, anyway-made him slightly deaf, you know, to go over those. Now, you go back over G, you know, H, I, J, he gets – starts getting a heavier ear ring. See, you got away with it before, but now it's kind of rrrrrrrrr. And you go over these things again, you adjust them out.

Now, you will feel that this isn't true because occasionally you over rerun a little section and straighten it up and bring the charge down and you apparently will get away with it, because the pc was ARC broke because it was missed, see? Actually, you won't have gotten away with it at all. That area has increased because you've reactivated the bottom of the bank. That's where the apparent greater charge comes from. You see, you start hitting, and you hit it again and you hit it again. Well, if you were just coming along taking the charge off as you went on down, it doesn't have a chance to get activated, see. But by hitting this area, getting stuck in the quicksand, in other words, of this area, you keep hitting that and not taking any charge off the lower and keep hitting it and not taking any charge off the lower, then all that lower charge is getting into restimulation. And just about blows the pc's head off.

So you never rerun a partially run bank. You just don't do it. No matter what persuasions there are. You can go back and adjust a couple of items.

You very often have to adjust a couple of items. You're already adjusting one, at any given time, while you're running. You can... you sometimes find you have to adjust the item just before that. It just won't discharge; it just keeps on sporadically rocket reading or something like that. It wasn't right in the first place and that's why you can't get your next item. You keep trying to get this next item and trying to get this next item. You can't get the next item. Then we get bright and read the item just back of it and find out the thing's rocket reading. It's very embarrassing. Extend that list and adjust that and then take her from there and you're all right. That's a perfectly normal action, providing you don't take more than two thousand hours to get the right item just back of you. That's said in sarcasm.

There's your – there is your – the essence of the situation. Go back a block of six, six RIs? Oh, brother, cut your throat. The same thing. Because none of these RIs are ready to run.
At no time are you ever running an RI that is ready to run. They're never ready to run. They're supposed to be there forever. See, they've lasted this long, and so forth.

Well, the funny part of it is, is you can discharge the basic of the bank. Now, this means then that there's only one direction that you can run in a GPM. It also forces you to run in this direction, and that is from top to bottom. You cannot run from bottom to top. You think you're running from bottom to top sometimes, and then find out you're running from top to bottom anyway. Oh, he's getting the items all backwards, but try to run a – the pattern in reverse sometime if you want a picnic. You've got all of these words now, in sequence, and they're in the proper sequence, so keep feeding them to the pc, and try to move up in the bank.

He – the pc starts going aaaaah-uuuuhh. What are you doing? You see, you're moving away from basic. See, the fundamental RI on the bank of course is the goal at the bottom of the bank. And that's holding everything in place. In order to get it discharged you've got to discharge the rest of the bank. Well, that's done with the once-over-lightly, don't you see? You discharge every item in rotation as fast as you can and as well as you can, and on to the next item and discharge that and as fast and as well as you can, and on to the next item. And you'll win the whole way, charge will be blowing off, and the pc feels fine. That's necessary charge to remove.

Now, all of a sudden you go back, you move back. Let's go back a dozen items, and you're going to correct the bank, because now you have found correctness is necessary. You've had it. You start moving down that channel, now, yes, they will all fire again, you ought to consider that's mysterious, we were all over these things once and they're all firing again. It's because the basic charge on the bank hasn't been drawn, of course they'll fire again. Only, where are they getting that charge? That's leaking up from the bottom. So here we go.

Next thing you know, the pc's sort of looking very haggard and the eye circles get – first they come down to here, and then they come down to here, and then he's just – doesn't have a face any more, he just has one large eye pouch. All that comes from rerunning.

Now the one thing therefore that I have to teach you on the thing is, in handling auditing, to be very adroit and don't get yourself into a situation where you have a whole bunch of missed, bypassed items, and this and that and the other thing and so forth and a bunch of ARC breaks. You can become technically accurate enough so that you don't do that. But even if you did bypass some items and run into an ARC break, so that you can handle the situation well enough as an auditor, telling the pc, "Oh, well, yes, oh, oh all right, all right, that's wrong, huh? Okay. Let me make a note here, pc says it's wrong, and... all right. You say there's five more items up above 'want'? All right. Let's... pc says these items need to be corrected, all right. The next time we run this bank down from the top we'll correct them. How's that, huh?"

Pc says, "All right. Okay. Okay. All right, fine, fine." Right on. Don't try to overwhelm him with the fact that you're now going to go on over his dead body, don't you see?

Teach you those things, it becomes necessary that you know them well. There are many reasons why you should know them, but the principal amongst those reasons happens to be this fact about you can't rerun a partially run GPM. Can't be done. You get into trouble, pc
go upset, oh yeah, you can get the right items, oh, yeah, you can get it all corrected, oh, yeah, uuuuhhh!

Of course it'll all come off, and the consequences of having done so will all straighten out when you get to the bottom of the bank and so forth, but you'll have a very rough and uncomfortable time of it for a while.

You can't get the top oppterms – you've got a pair of items. Well, you can fool around quite a while with that pair of items. You can fool around quite a while, but if you can't get anything to fire after about five hours, man, you'd better cut in with the goal as an RI, oppose – as oppterm, you know, the goal as an oppterm, cut in and cut the bottom of the bank off of it. Tell the pc, "This is going to be very uncomfortable. The mass is probably going to follow you all the way down. We've missed all of those items. I think there's about fifty of them above where we're operating, and we've missed all of them. I'm sorry, but there isn't anything else we can do. And when we come back and get this, why, you'll get your top oppterm easily."

But let us suppose we just took the goal as an oppterm area out, and then so we've taken enough charge off the bank, now we're going to go back and find the top oppterm. Ohhhhh. Oh, no. That comes under the heading of rerunning a partially run bank. You must always run a bank down. If you start at any point, you must go south. There is no north running. For instance, if you cut it in as the goal as an oppterm, it's uncomfortable, fine, run it all the way down on the pattern but get it right on down to finding his next – doing his RI oppgoal as an RI opposed. But don't null it, because he'll get the next goal. And he'll be interested, and other things will happen that are catastrophic.

Now, I've tried – I've tried all versions of stopping short of doing just that, and the only step that – I give you this very seriously – the only step that can be omitted is nulling that final list to find the next goal below or earlier than the goal you're running. That can be omitted. If the list is complete, the pc will not ARC break, and all... you run the risk of his cognite – cogniting on the goal. Because practically all he's got to do is look over his shoulder and he can tell what it is.

But the pc will tell you what the goal is, and if you're plum foolish, you won't take enough note of it, and won't make enough – you know – receive it hard enough, make a note of it, and all that, that you've got that, that's fine and the pc will then assert that he's got to run it. And then if you still don't receive that well enough according to the pc, he'll run it. He'll start giving you the top oppterms. It's all under the heading of assert.

And you've got the top of your bank – of the one you just left isn't run. Now you want it, and everything's going to – ha-ha! No, thank you. No, you've got to go back up and finish the top of that off and pass your charge on down the bank and get that well discharged.

That, of course, is not as good a program as starting at the proper top and going all the way to the end, but is preferable to spending seventy-five hours trying to find two top oppterms. Because that soon gets into a position of rerunning a bank. It'll activate those lower RIs and it'll get more and more uncomfortable. The absolute time limit on it is something like about five hours. And if you can't find it in then you have no other choice. You've got to cut from under and get lower and go south. And then come back and get that top, cut the top off
Even though you have to pass the charge on down to the bottom again, it's a better plan to do it. And you will – takes you less time to do it that way.

Yes, it's uncomfortable to run a pc with a fifth of the bank unrune above him. Yes, it's uncomfortable. It's far more comfortable than to rerun and rerun and rerun and try and ffffzzz. Got to teach you one thing, is to overcome the sales tactics of the pc and his orders, so that you won't make the errors which he himself is bound to make. That's a definite professional liability, because he sounds so reasonable. Teach you the mechanics of that, and we've got to teach you also that the bank itself must be run, not fooled with. When you start running it, run it. When you get your hands on a bank, go man, go. Keep going.

Now, there are some here whose cases I have used to see whether or not these laws were generally holding true. And so forth. That is, I wasn't restraining them from going. But it's followed through consistently. They would have been better off in any case to have cut into that bank anywhere. They would have been better off just to have run a series of locks off the top of the bank than to have fooled around for the top oppterms.

"Well, what's the top item for this bank?"

"Well, I've got one here that's 'someone who – who coughs – who – who coughs.' Yes, 'someone who coughs.' Yeah, that's part of the goal 'To catch catfish.'"

"All right, that's fine. Now, is that a terminal or an oppterms? All right. Well, that's a terminal, 'someone who coughs.' Very good. Now what – who or what would someone who coughs oppose?"

"Oh, well, let's see, there's... 'dreamy days.'"

"All right, that's fine, that RR's."

I'm not kidding you. I'm not kidding you. It'd be better to go through the bank in that fashion. Of course, that's terrible to go through the bank that way, because you'll get strays and you'll skip. You'll all of a sudden find items like "steam locomotive," you know.

There are many ways you could run a bank. But the way you mustn't run one is to partially run one and then rerun it. Don't ever rerun a partially run bank. Don't ever try to repair a partially run bank. Only repair and run wholly done banks. Don't spend any time finding top oppterms – if it seems impossible, cut in and run something. I've got to teach you that when you get your hands on a bank you run the thing. You go, you know? Don't stand around man. You go.

I've had a lot of – a lot of cases, and done a lot of work on this and adjudication on this, I've got subjective-objective cases like mad, and that's the conclusion I have finally arrived at – finally arrived at. One, that the auditor has to be a sufficient diplomat, as to not find himself in a position – he's got to be able to handle a situation then, even though it is wrong, and keep going. You see? Becomes a requisite, see.

Tell the pc, "All right. Yeah, I – well – all right, okay, I got it. All right.

These are – we've missed those withholds. All right, we missed all those items, all right, well, we'll get them on the way back, is that all right with you?" Settle the ARC break that way, you see? You know? Learn to handle it without – without having to redo it. And the
other thing is, once you get your paws on a bank, go! Don't stand around, man, don't do it. Go! Get the next item and the next item and the next item and the next item – oh, so he can't start in at the top of the bank and find the item and the next item. All right, man, skip the top of the bank. Get in there and go!

You... it's something like walking across crust ice, see? You must not linger. And the pc will just shine if you do it rapidly and fast. And he will bog to the degree that you redo it.

Accuracy is absolutely imperative, so long as you run. But accuracy only and without item after item after item being found in good order – out. Pc ARC broke. Bah, the pc'll just go into a complete apathy. The pc is getting loses, the pc feels upset, the pc isn't up to getting in there and pitching now. The pc's enthusiasm is gone. The pc doesn't have the lift necessary to rise superior to this bank because he's being crushed by the fact that he's not getting anywhere, see? You mustn't just stand around and mill. Find a place you can go and go. And do it right when you come back through. You understand?

You get the right rocket reading items, of course your pc – you'll have no trouble with your pc at all. You've got the pattern of those items now, and that pattern's getting more exact every day. In fact I even know the exact words. Isn't that horrible? And it's getting so there's nothing left. It's "wantably" and "wantable." Ever hear of those words? I never did. Anyhow, they're in the bank.

Probably the character and the high-toned character of the bank and its parts of speech is what keeps modern language as what it is.

Anyway, well, there it is. I hope you can learn those things, but it... but take them to heart. They're the essence of running a GPM.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

I appreciate that. Earned it.

And this is what? May the 14th, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, a pc's got his own goal and he's got a GPM of his own and so forth and you can find all that. And that's Routine 3M2 and that's a buttoned up piece of technology and recall it as a piece of technology and compartment it as a piece of technology.

You're about to get 3N and 3N you are more or less doing at this particular instant. It's simply a stripped down, directive Routine 3 which uses line plots and is as crude as: prop up the HCOB May 12th in front of the pc and prop up the copy of it in front of yourself and use that copy as a line plot. And when you direct the pc's attention, direct it by number. "Give me number one hundred and fourteen," and the pc does so because pcs lose their place very easily. And the next thing you know you've got the whole bottom of the thing having missed the whole top and the pc's ARC broken and neither of you know why until you suddenly figure out that he's missed. The auditor has to be very careful the pc doesn't miss.

And you don't check the goal and you don't pay any attention to blowdown. You run exclusively by rocket read. And you just drop all these little bits and pieces. Actually you're getting items almost as fast as you and the pc can talk. And it's about one a minute and you can tear up a bank so fast that it would make your head swim. And the pc just does fine, because he's not being plowed into it.

And the only time you random list is when you can't get something to fire. You can't get the right item to fire. And the way you random list is you carry a spare piece of paper over to the side, you transfer the item number only to the piece of paper and that is list number one hundred and thirty-two or whatever it is, you see. And that coordinates back onto your line plot. So you don't write, "Who or what would oppose something or other." You just write, "hundred and thirty-two," whatever it is and you just write the versions of it and you write those very rapidly. You're doing a goal – you're doing "remembered," so you do "r/" see, "r/d." Something like that, you see. And the best you do with that piece of paper is simply put its date on it, at the top, just to identify it, because it's going to be clipped into your auditor's report, don't you see. You've got to identify that piece of paper. You want to put your pc's initial on it. That's a little more thorough. And if you want to put a number on it, that's even more thorough – that is page number something or other and you've got very proper administration.

But that in essence is 3N. And what you want to do if you want to know what 3N is, is just figure out everything that you can drop out of the lineup in order to discharge items. Eve-
Everything that can be dropped out of the lineup to discharge items. And you just drop it out of the lineup. That's all. So it's just bow, bow, bow, bow!

Now, there is still one question which is – remains unanswered and I will have to check it out this evening and I haven't checked it out yet. And that is, do you even say, "Would something or other oppose?" But I can tell you that that's only once for every pair. It would be only when you got the terminal and then you'd say, "Well, would nix absolutely – uh – whatever." Not to restimulate you all. Very funny. Mary Sue started a gag the other night that I'm afraid Scientologists will be up to for a long time to come. She said, "It's absolutely fantastical how..." [laughs] And I said, "Absolutely, absolutelyable." [laughs] You start too much of that thing, people who are standing around you who haven't been audited will start to wheeze and cough and cave in, see. [laughs] These are dynamite words, man.

But if you would just figure what you could drop out of – of the patter itself and still keep wheeling just in the interest of speed, still retaining the fact that the items must be found, they must rocket read and they must blow. Why, then you've got actually 3N. And it's amazing how fast it can go.

Now, you remember at the congress I told you one a minute was a goal, see, a good level to hit for and that it would be very fine and we could run all these things very rapidly if we had it at one a minute. Remember that? Well, actually that was fairly accurate prediction. I hadn't done it as an auditor. I had seen it closely approximated while I was being a pc. But I thought it was scaled down and was actually putting the pc in a bit of danger for a while. There was no listing involved, there was no unburdening and then I found out what was causing discomfort. Discomfort was being caused by the inaccurate line plot. And the inaccurate statement of the word. That was what it was being caused by. In other words, bypassing items, you see, and not having the exact expression of the item there. That was what was wrong. And it wasn't the speed with which the items were being found. It wasn't the absence of random listing. You see? See how that added up.

So, I've been making some tests now of this bow, bow, bat, bap, bap, bap, rap, rapid, rapid, rapid, man. And I have been hitting a minute per item and see signs now because I've just redesigned the line plot because I was doing that writing. I was writing the items at one a minute, see. So I know that one a minute is easily achieved. Because you get this mimeographed line plot, why, of course, you can – you don't have to write everything down there. Your one a minute also accounts for occasionally having to fumble. See. Something you – didn't come quite right and you fumble for it and then you get it.

And I found out a pc just comes up shining regardless of what the tone arm did, with this reservation: When the pc starts suppressing and the auditor doesn't discover that the rising tone arm is from suppression then your rocket reads tend to kind of vanish and they get very small. Now, the proper behavior of a rocket read is when the pc says the correct item you should get gee-whizzer. It should just be absolutely gorgeous, you see. Upwards to half dial, you see, or greater. And then when you call it back to the pc – by the way, you don't say that rocket reads or anything because you've already given him his item without reading it back to him. You'll discover that the pc will fumble on this one.
So you tell the pc to give you this. The pc, you know, number hundred and thirteen, something like that, pc gives you number hundred and thirteen, you look at it, mark it on your line plot and say, "I'll now read to you (the only rocket reading item on this list, or something of this sort) – forgettable-antastical" and the pc rocket reads on the thing. And you say, "That rocket read." Don't even bother to tell him that's your item, see. Just, "That rocket read." Fine. The pc's happy about it. And then you say, "Who or what would oppose (what you just got)?" you see. And the pc says it – because he's usually got his place on the line plot; you verify that's what he got – says it; you get this gorgeous rocket read then. You see. And you go through this one, two, three. But you'll notice, when the pc gives it to you, you shouldn't say it first, because it should come off a piece of paper or something like that. See? You shouldn't say it first because the pc gets fixated on you. And when the pc says it, you've got a gorgeous rocket read. When you call it back you should have a rocket read about half that size and when you call it again, if you call it again immediately afterwards, it just goes tht! See. That's the way it ought to behave.

So, you start sweating around to make this thing rocket read again and if it does rocket read again, then you've bypassed some items or something is wrong or the pc's in a big suppress or something is all muddled up here. It bothers the pc for you to call it again. It bothers the pc for you to do so. So, if you want to do so, you say, "Let me – I want to check the rocket reads," or something. That sort of invalidates the item, don't you see? Nevertheless you occasionally will call it again and you will notice that that thing does follow that behavior pattern.

Now, if it doesn't follow that behavior pattern as a rocket read, you know something is pretty awful wrong here someplace. Pc's on a big suppress, disagreement with it and that sort of thing or the pc has wandered off some place or another and isn't giving you his attention. Now, that's about the only real difficulty that you'll run into: pc starts wandering. And you'll very often will do this trick: You will say, "Do I have your attention?" There'll be, "Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh that one. Yeah well, I'd already read the next five," so forth, you know. And you say, "All right." You say, "All right now, (whatever it was) fantastical," and the pc pang! You got your rocket read.

In other words, you shouldn't first question the fact that the rudiments are all out, that the item is wrong, so forth. See? Don't take that as your first one. Just take as your first choice, the pc just didn't have his attention on you, that's all. And you'll find these things just blow, blow, blow, bang, bang, bang, bang. You just opened up all the valves and steam's leaking all over the place, and that boiler's going to be flat very shortly. That's the score of this 3N. And you'd just be amazed how fast a bank bleeds down.

Now, when you run into trouble – when you run into trouble and you can't find the next item or something like that, the first thing to do is to find out if you're in the right place, not chivy up the pc. Because you've gone from forgotten to forgetting. You've missed about three-quarters of the bank or something like that. Very often even a seasoned auditor will find himself sitting there running the wrong block of items. Pc's made a mistake, you've taken a break, pc comes back, the page is folded some other way. The pc starts giving you another block of items entirely. All of a sudden you don't have rocket reads and that sort of thing. Well, there's a usual symptom that goes along with this which you may have heard of, called
an ARC break. The usual symptom is an ARC break, but even if there isn't an ARC break, there is one that is fairly reliable, is the pc feels sick at his stomach. When pc feels sick at his stomach, item have been missed. Got it? See? Stable datum. Or a bank has been missed; a whole GPM has been missed. Even though you're getting rocket read. Pc feels sick at his stomach, you've skipped. Skipped items, skipped a bank. You've bypassed things, in other words.

If you really want a pc to feel sick, omit to find the goal "to remember" after the goal "to forget." And start running "to go away" after you've run "to forget." Give you an example: all of a sudden the pc feels very queasy. He'll go on, you'll get your rocket reads. It's not running very well, but you'll get your rocket reads and so forth. And the pc will feel sort of green; he'll feel very pale about the whole thing. I mean if he doesn't ARC break you better cross-check what you're doing.

Now, the highway you're running is one of the best marked highways anybody ever heard of. Far superior to English road marking, far superior. I know everybody thinks English road marking is pretty good. But they should see California road marking. Particularly out in the desert where the signs have fallen into the sand. La Jolla eighteen miles, Death Valley three miles, signs all rusty and filled full of twenty-two bullet holes, that's usually... But the truth of the matter is that your highway is very, very well marked.

Now, what you are doing is in essence blind flying. Blind flying. You are flying by instrument. You can learn to fly by instrument and you will find one of these fine days when you've had a lot of these things run that you won't be running much by instrument. I just had the interesting experience just a few minutes ago of checking out a pc who was having difficulty (yours by the way), who was having difficulty in getting down the line and I didn't blind fly it. See. I flew on actual perception, not of what the pc was doing but my actual perception of what goes on. See?

Now, I added this datum: pc sick at his stomach, owww. No wonder "nix forgotten" would not fire. There's a "forgotten" up the line someplace earlier. There are RIs earlier. There are some RIs, I was plotting them out last night. There's "this is not the beginning," "this is the end," "no end," "the end" and so forth. I'm getting them all plotted up for you. And Suzie went into revolt. She says, "You're being the guinea pig pc all the time and you get to look at all these things," and that sort of thing and, "I want a chance, so you – tonight I want to get finished through this bank," and she did and so forth. And she says, "I want to get back and take a look at the beginning of those vestibule implants," and that sort of thing and plot them out. And by golly we did. We got a whole hat full of them. There's not very many of them back there, but they're enough to really confuse the situation. They tell you that the end of the incident, you see, that this is the end of the incident whereas in actual fact it is the beginning of the incident. See. And we plotted those out pretty good and we got some beautiful rocket reads.

So, of course, immediately just yanking your pc into "forgotten – nix forgotten" as a pair, of course, is bypassing all the vestibule implants. But you can do it. But here's a pc all of sudden we couldn't do this with, see? You can do this without getting the pc very sick. It's all right, he can run. But not this pc. Something was wrong. Well now, the reason you haven't
found the beginning of the incident – the reason I hadn't found the beginning of the incident – it starts several months before the actual implant, see? It's not the day before as you would expect. You're captured on Exnool and immediately transported, you see, and in twenty-four hours they've got you going to heaven, see. That isn't the way it is. That isn't the way it is. Apparently you're kept around in cold storage for a while. And there's about a six-months' lag here of some kind or another. They backlog. All great insurance companies and great empires have a tendency to in-basket-out-basket themselves out of PT. Don't you see. And you've probably been in- and out-basketed out of PT, don't you see. That's about all the seriousness there is to it. So actually the incident that you're looking for is several months – probably differs. It does vary from pc to pc, you see. But it's probably several months ahead of the actual implants. And if anybody was silly enough to get implanted at the moment he was being picked up to being implanted or something like that, of course, you've got a "forgotten" or something sitting way up there. So, you have to scout that sort of thing out.

But that early sequence doesn't run like the implants. It all just runs like an engram and that's why you're learning how to run some engrams. And even though you do have "forgotten" and something or other is occurring up there, you can still run those things just like an engram, get the sequence of them, see. Get the guy to check them off. That's not the vestibule implants, they have to be run just the way you run them.

But what would they be? They'd just be somebody saying it or something like this, don't you see. Key-in of some kind. So you'd have to unsnarl that area. And then there's always the chance that you haven't got the first incident, that you've got the second series or that the pc has as many as six or seven serieses. What a tough pc. He could go back through it that many times.

See, there's always these variations. So you want to make sure you've got the first one and that you've got the first of the first one. And then you'll never have any difficulty at all. If you do run into difficulty then it's just the rule which I just told you. You haven't got the first of the first, that's all.

The funny part of it is, you can cut into these implants almost anywhere and run a bank. That's what's amusing about it. It's very hard on the pc and his body. The easiest way to run it is to find the earliest part of the incident and run it all the way on through to the first vestibule implant. Run the vestibule implant, run the first goal "to forget" don't you see. Do it all in an orderly fashion. And it's like sawing butter on a hot summer day, see. There's nothing to it. It's not hard on the pc at all. But every time you miss an item – let us say your pc has an aversion to "-able" and has suddenly decided that to make this "absolute" – and it's the only thing you can get to fire. It isn't what the pc decided, but the pc's just dead against it and something or other, and all you can get is "absolute" to fire, see. Ahhhh, boy, you're going to hit the next bank and the pc's going to be in trouble on that item, see. And he's going to have a lot of mass on that item, you see. By the time you hit the next bank after that, now the pc's got three times as much mass, don't you see. And you have much less chance of getting the right item to fire. And the next bank you hit, you're going to have much more mass. And the pc's going to feel, every time he hits that item or area, you're going to errr-creak-errr, see. That's how it gets tough. Inaccuracy equals tough running.
You want to really pile up the electronic charge on your pc up to the stars, just buy a few "absolutelies" and "perfectlies" and you can sit there and suffer for the pc. The pc keeps saying, "No. No." You know. It's all "no."

"No." You can't get "nix" to fire. Very often you can't get "nix" to fire. The pc for some strange reason has a complete aversion to "nix." And then the pc is very upset about why he has a complete – well, he has it because it's in the implant. But for some reason or other you can't straighten this out and you can only get "no" to fire. All right. Run it. See. Do your best, but only take what fires. Do your best. And know that about the fourth, fifth, sixth bank you're going to be running, everything on the terminal side is going to start getting a little black. And by this time however you will have enough charge off that the pc will have reformed his ways and will start calling it "nix" and after that why it fires as "nix." But the pc will always, thereafter, have a little bit of trouble with the "nix" and "no" and so forth. Little black mass will appear around. But this is minor difficulty. It's only major if you never correct it.

Now, you must differentiate between the ideal and the workable. And you're going to move too far toward the workable or too close to the ideal. You'll err in choosing your route. It's almost impossible to choose it absolutely right. You'll err in choosing your route. A perfect run, an absolutely perfect run all the way is attainable. It is attainable. But a workable run will get you there. I mean one is "absolutely" and the next is "perfectible" and the next is "superiorable" and one is "nix" and one is "no" and then the next one's the wrong item entirely. You just got a lock and so forth. It's very sloppy, but remember it'll get you there.

But, the more you move from the perfect, that is the ideal, toward the merely workable the more trouble your pc is going to have. Now, don't expect to run a pc without ever having any trouble. That is an ideal which is absolutely, completely unobtainable. Pc picks up the line plot for the next session, you pick up the same zone. For some peculiar reason whatsoever you run "forgetting" for half an hour without finding it out. And of course, the banks are so charged up and those root words are so charged up that anything will fire. That's the danger. And all of a sudden hhhaaaaaaahhhah. Well, if it's completely the wrong word you've got no choice but to redo it, but oh boy, that's trouble, man, that's real trouble. Because when you go over the bank the second time, you're in trouble. Any time you go over a bank a second time without the whole thing and everything before it's discharged, you're in trouble.

Now, for instance, you could do the whole first dwindling of the top oppterm wrong, but getting charge off. Finish it out to the bottom right. Then go back and pick up the first incident as an engram. Get anything that's implanted or talked about there and then moved right on through to the vestibule implants there. Get all of those. And then correct the erroneous top oppterms, dwindling. Do that right now and that would run much better.

If you do that however, you pretty well have to pass the charge down to where you are. For some reason or other, charge passes on these things. If an item is found in the wrong place, when put in the right place it will fire again. When you've gotten a wrong item, when you get the right item it will fire again. All of those are safeguards. So actually everything would fire now; the whole GPM has some small fire on it all the way. You pass that charge down just by making the pc read the answers rapidly from his own line plot. You just ask him
– you just ask him the question, "All right. Who or what would oppose that? Who or what would oppose that?" And he keeps reading you, bang, bang, bang. You're just back and forth, back and forth. You're not writing anything now. And you're just passing charge.

And you can correct all these erroneous items. It's known as passing charge down the bank. So therefore you don't want to go too far into these implants on finding RIs. Get the first one because that improves the pc's ability to confront and remember. Get the first GPM. But you really shouldn't be going much beyond that first GPM before you go back and find that beginning incident and get it all dated and scouted out and get the whole beginning of the thing figured out and everything squared around and the vestibule implants and so forth. Because that gives you only one bank to pass the charge through to the next bank. Saves time.

So, a good operating plan-good operating plan is to take "forget," blow the charge of it off, go on back, find the beginning, months before. And move that right on through, totally discharged. Just clean up all that slick. Get that real straight. Get the vestibule implant so "this is the beginning," "that is the end," the pc begins to understand all this now. There is something there to understand but not these "absoluteables." You don't care if the pc understands this or not. They're just sound waves. Who cares. Electronic beams.

You know the Germans lost World War I, if for any other reason, by always shelling the crossroads at five minutes of the hour and five minutes of the half-hour as the remaining twenty-five minutes of that half-hour you could always move traffic through the crossroads, you know. You know, they always were predictable. They had terrific predictability. As much as anything else that is what lost them the war. World War II, they had almost made an art out of unpredictability, because they'd learned their lesson. Well, fortunately the boys we're dealing with didn't learn their lesson. Well, fortunately the boys we're dealing with didn't learn their lesson, as far as this is concerned. And they are predictable. And either through the carelessness, cynicism, sloppiness or otherwise, they have consistently and continually repeated these patterns.

Not only that, they have repeated the patterns of goals. I'm not saying they are different... didn't get different goal shifts. The patterns are the same. The only thing they changed is the additional series. And the only danger you face is that you've got a second series as the only series on the pc and therefore you haven't got the line plot for it yet because I haven't been through it and mapped it out. It's different.

For instance at that band I indicated on "to have a game" where I indicated there that there might be some items there, I was actually getting the items from the second implant series. And there the root word of the goal "to eat," something like that, there's a whole band in there of "eatable." Boy, they sure loved those "ables," didn't they? And that "eatable" runs as a dwindling. But those are entirely different adjectives. The top, second, dwindling, the formation of that GPM is quite different than the formation of the first series – what we call the first series.

Now, your dating doesn't mean very much as far as I'm concerned because it all rocket reads. But there are no dates in it that I can find anyplace. And naturally it would rocket read, as heavily charged and significant an area as this would rocket read, but I just for some reason or other don't trust the dates. But go ahead and get the dates because they are indicative, they are indicative. You can use those dates to differentiate between whether you got the ear... got
the pc's earliest implant. Now, I don't care what date you found as long as it means something to the pc. Now, if you get the right date down to the hour and minute it'll blow somatics all the way. You know the right date digit by digit will just blow somatics all the way, right on down to the second. Only remember, when you're dating a second, you have to date it from a specific time of operation.

You have to date if from, for instance, 5:36 today. See. Because the time you're taking to date, you see, you got forty seconds, well, you no more than got it out of your month, you see, than it's forty-two seconds, forty-three seconds, this clock is going on. Now, your minutes go wrong. Because the second that crosses sixty on the seconds, of course, you had an additional minute. And what's weird is you can blow somatics off those minutes and seconds. That's the only point I'm making. Which is the only thing that gives me any confidence in the date at all. I know then, that the date that is changing is changing because of the advance of time. Not because it's a strip in the implant that somebody reads. So, the keynote of dating is "ago." Now, if you date as though the date is in the implant even though the pc reads you a strip – this is a very common phenomena. A thetan is always mocking something up to read back to himself. If you're dating for a series of numbers, they aren't anyplace, remember, even though the thetan has got them on a strip.

And dating is just an "over" and "under" proposition of getting the gross order of magnitude and then approximations and then dead on. It's like artillery. You... gun spotters. They fire over and they say it's over, see. Fire under and they say it's under. And then fire a little bit over and then a little bit under and then they hit dead on. And that is the way you date. You try to miss the date. You try to miss it over, you try to miss it under, see. You get so fixated you forget that in dating you are trying to miss. So you want to go over and under and over and under. A little more over, you know, so you go well over, well under, a little over, a little under, dead on.

Now, when you've got a bracket between let us say – well, let's take some finite number, five thousand and ten thousand. You want to know if it is "about," you see. You found out that it was less than twenty thousand, you see, and that it was greater than one thousand. See, that's your wide bracket. Now, let's narrow it down. And finally by this narrowing we get a difference of five thousand. We finally find it's less than ten and it's greater than five. We finally find this out with our dating. See. We could work it up to this line. And then we say, "Is it about six? Or is it approximately seven? Approximately eight thousand? You see. Approximately nine thousand?" Well, you got approximately seven thousand. See? Now, we want to know, is it greater than seven thousand or less than seven thousand, you see, because it might be six thousand nine hundred. And you find out it's slightly greater than seven thousand. Now is the time to go into your next digit. See. Now you get your hundreds. Now if you want to know – you want to know is it more than five hundred, less than five hundred, you see. Less than seven thousand five hundred. You don't have to keep repeating this other number all the time. And you finally get it.

Now, one of the things that spoils dating completely is the fact the pc all of a sudden rips the date out at you. And if you're not on the ball to write that down, you ought to be shot. Because the pc can stand being pawed at with an E-Meter just so long and he says, "Oh well, I'm a thetan, I know." And he gives you, "Whoa! It's seventeen million eight hundred and
sixty-five billion seven hundred and thirty-four thousand, seven hundred and sixty-two bang and ooooo, thirty-two days and five hours and seventeen seconds." And it all, all reads on the meter. You know. Bang, bang. You get a blowdown. He's had somatics, everything else. That's the date, man. Don't keep pawing around with it. You be on the ball to write one of those things down when he hands it to you. And you write it down. You've got it, man. That's the date! And don't discourage that. And you very often get protest from a pc if he doesn't give you the date. You say is it greater than five thousand, less than five thousand. The pc says, "Well, actually it's less than five thousand." And you say, "All right. Is it greater than five thousand? I get a read on greater than five thousand." Pc now begins to read on Invalid-date, Suppress and Fail to reveal. So, you have to keep him talking, see. You have to keep your rudiments in a bit on dating. Otherwise you get mistakes. "Have you thought of any date?" "Are you having any disagreement with that date?" You know. "Well, no not really. Actually I thought it was two hundred and thirty-four thousand, seven hundred and sixty-five was the right figure." You haven't even gotten to those yet. You can almost count on this as a mechanism for your pc as well in-session. You haven't squashed him completely.

So dating gets spoiled. The fine art of dating is always being upset by the pc's recognition of the date. But that's highly desirable, that recognition of the date because when he does give it to you it blows a stream of somatics. And zoom!

I can't find anything in these implants that resemble numbers. There are no numbers, there are no dates. Nothing like that. I can't find anything in them. But, I still question it. See. I still question it. I'm starting to accumulate a little bit of evidence now that apparently the two serieses are not just a trick sequence. See. A trick sequence, you know. It would be typical of the situation to say, "Well, this is when you were implanted at forty-three trillion. And then this" – you know, five seconds later – "is your implant at seventeen trillion." And they're quite similar. Well, I'm still prepared to find something like that. But apparently evidence is accumulating to the contrary, that they were different.

And what keeps the thetan so loused up in this – all these implants, what keeps them so fouled up from one end to the other is the fact that all of his own facsimiles have been pulled into it. Is one of the marvelous, most marvelous groupers that was ever invented and is about the only grouper of that magnitude that the thetan has anything of on the track. It is a real honest to God grouper.

Now, his own facsimiles pull in. So you send him to the top of the stairs and he's got railway stations, bus stations, escalators, department-store escalators, everything, dirty stairs, clean stairs, green stairs, pink stairs and they all are sort of a dirty gray and he can't see them and they're shifting and he puts his attention on anything and it shifts and it becomes something else, don't you see? You say, "Go to the top of the stairs," and he, sometimes, he finally gets to the stairs, he rather easily most of the time, he gets to the stairs and then if he can just keep these other stairs from coming in on him, why he's all right. He's got the stairs. And then it gets easier and other things blow off and the more charge you take off, the easier it is for him to orient it. Because it's that charge which is – makes things collapse.

Now, it doesn't matter. A thetan gets wild ideas about these implants. And it's very easy for the thetan to read far more complication and far more treachery into these implants
than actually exists. I know that's funny, because, boy, the treachery couldn't have been greater. But he can read more in than actually exists. And there is that to safeguard against as an auditor. He says, "Well, actually I was lured into this store. And I had been very active in (something or other), and the reason – and they had been out gunning for me for some time – and the reason I was implanted with a goal 'to spit' was because I had advocated the Chew Tobacco League, and so on and they wanted to get even with me and so..." That's all for the birds. And you can just don't bother to tell them about it, but just let – just work him until he gets a straight idea of what it really was all about.

And the more goals you discharge the better idea you'll have. Confront comes up mechanically, not by the amount of confronting done on the bank, but by the amount of charge removed from the bank. Confront is proportional to the amount of charge removed from the bank, not to the amount of confronting done on the bank.

So you could spend an awful long time getting the pc to confront this bank, because this of all things has interlocked charge and nothing else has interlocked charge, except the GPM itself and its charges aren't interlocked this way. They're not interlocked savagely this way.

3M2 is actually quite easy and quite pleasant compared to anything you're running here. But all of these implants lie directly across any hope of freedom or getting better. I've seen these things in one fragment or another in pcs now for many, many years and didn't really understand what this was. You can also get a better idea of their technology than it's... is true, see. You can get a better idea. You can think their technology was better than it was.

Probably it worked out this way. Some scientific whiz-bang figured out the wavelength of a thetan, see. And he figured out the wavelengths of various articulate thoughts and figured out how to pull a thetan out of his body with actual MEST-energy wavelengths. This is probably what he figured out. A high level technical society, you see. It'd make Cape Canaveral look like a child's toy pond, you know. And... but he figured this out, there was a big figure-out, made a breakthrough of some kind or another on this. Probably done from a highly mystic level. And then knew intuitively that there was something about grouping and knew that the way to get somebody confused was to tell them two things slightly out of phase, which were contradictory. And then didn't know any more than that. And you will inspect the line plot and out of your knowledge of Scientology you have a tendency to try to correct that line plot, see. "What is the proper gradient here?" Don't you see? "What would fit in here?" Don't you see? Ha. The difference is is you're now smarter than they were, see.

Similarly, knowing Scientology, you can read more plot into what they were doing than is there, see. Now, as far as their knowledge is concerned, their knowledge probably ended with this datum. They had personal experience on this, so this datum was common data. This was known by the man in the street. That when you kill a thetan, (quote) (unquote) "kill," see, he immediately goes out of his ruddy 'ead and goes on back to base and picks up another body and in a few weeks, why, you're meeting him as the machine gunner in the spaceship, see. And now, he probably has a lot of technology having been killed by you, you see. He probably knows something about it. And therefore he's twice as mad and he's very revengeful and he's very dangerous.
So when you kill an enemy – this is the problem – how do you prevent consequences when you kill one of the enemy? See, how do you prevent that consequence? And this was probably serious enough as a problem – and has been as a problem on the whole track for a very long time – that it caused them to invest enormous scientific – call it, well, brains. Yeah, let's call it brains. They invested enormous scientific brains, skill, research, finance, weaponry and so forth into solving this one problem. And that was the problem they were trying to solve. They didn't know life as a whole or the origin of the universe or anything like that. But they knew this problem. So they went ahead and solved this problem. And they also had a sequence of dramatization sort of a thing, they knew something about a gradient scale. They knew something about that. And they figured it out electronically until they could get an articulation of thought on a conceptual level. Something like that. Although I'm prepared to find that it's simpler than that.

All right now, now when they kill somebody they provided means to pick him up and capsule him and transport the capsule of all things to an implant station and put him over the jumps. Everybody when he first goes into this thinks he's walking, you know. Ha! He isn't walking. His body is charcoal way back there someplace or another. But he hasn't quite lost the illusion, don't you see, of having a body. And he's put on something like a theta trap or the capsule itself is sent through, don't you see. He's actually let out of something and is onto a pole and the pole rolls through, is really what happens. You'll see the single monorails on the visios. You'll see the monorails of the poles. And the fellow thinks that he's walking here and he's walking – he isn't walking anywhere, he's got a pole. The pole will move a few RIs and then stop, see? And wait for a few more RIs and then move again. And, so you get these funny things and it goes downstairs in the first series and through tunnels in the second series of implants.

Anyway, their technology level is quite interesting to inspect. And at first I was prone to upgrade it. But I think it is awesome in the field of weaponry and awesome in the field of knowledge of energy. I don't think it was too good in the knowledge of life. I think it is full of holes. Otherwise you wouldn't have found this duplicative sequence. See? They had the problem, however, of having to do mass implantations. So they just laid it all out on the drawing board and that was the way it was. And maybe somebody blew up these implant stations at some time or another and somebody had to lay them out again from – the plans weren't quite as complete now and they laid out a different series of RIs. That's about all that happened. They put it all below ground, they left nothing above ground. And so forth. It rather betokens the fact the place was possibly bombed at sometime or another. It was hit. This of course you know is just on top of a mountain and hasn't anything to do with what they want you to believe, a floating island in the sky. Which is what I thought it was at first.

Anyway, to give you any kind of a rundown about this, just enough – I was just giving you data. When you yourself have perceived quite a bit of this you find it much easier to pilot a pc through it. The only point I'm making with you. And your own – your activity right at the present time as an auditor is comparable to blind flying. But you have a very accurate meter and you've got an excellent line plot and you've got... that thing was really hell to come by but we've got it, see. And that's right down the line. There's a couple of little errors in it, in that original one. They're mostly typo rather than otherwise. There's someone who never – some-
thing or other ... Actually that wording contains "is." Someone who is never "...ing." That is the right wording for that. Then there's another one down a little bit lower on the opponent side. It's "importance." And it's actually "importances." And so on. Not many errors in it. But they're typographical type errors. They're not plot errors.

All right. And having that material and the fact that your pc will proceed through it willy-nilly and knowing why a pc won't proceed through it, is you've missed something, knowing the symptoms of that, why you can navigate this thing. And the navigation of it is repaid by the fact the pc's confront comes up and up and it's easier and easier to navigate. And the toughest part of it, of course, is the start of it. Always. And after you've been over the jumps and through it and been over a few of these goals and that sort of thing, why I'm afraid that your sneer level will be well up, because – so on.

I'm getting – it's kind of shocking when you first run into bits and pieces and parts of it, you know. You kind of go huhhh and your face goes all radiation burn or something like this and you "Huhhh, oh, no, no" and so forth. Well, I guess that's the way you're expected to feel. And I've been through that. You know. It's the ghastly feeling, "Oh, no, these are implants. My God, how do I tell them." You know, this kind of feeling. And, "What am I going to do now," you see. And I realized after about twenty-four hours or something like that, well, that's the way I'm supposed to feel about them. [laughs] So the devil with it. And all of a sudden realize that we've been presented with a silver platter – on the keys to the secrets of the universe. Just there. Bang. Because what'd it do? It gave us common first goals. It took away all of the scrabble at the beginning of an intensive. And in actual fact when you get good at this, when you really get rolling hot at this sort of thing, you'll be able to take a pc at the beginning of an intensive and run something like a bank a session. See. Coo! This is how far our technology has moved on up the line, you see. And you know how it is moved and you know what a difference it makes. And I'm awful glad you went through it. Otherwise you wouldn't have a good reality on what there is there to climb, see. I'm glad you went through it.

The thing is a problem, as I say, in blind flying at the present moment. But it's not the type of flying that goes into the deeper and deeper dark. It goes into the more and more light. And eventually, why, you'll be proofed against all of its shocks and twists and turns and confusions. And it's sort of it's sort of horrible auditing the thing, actually when you first start in and you haven't got the bank run and you're running it on somebody, you know, particularly that lousy bank "forget," you know. And you say the "Hhhhhh – What the hell was I saying?" you know. As an auditor, you know. But that's gone fairly rapidly too and you'll strike it occasionally on other goals.

It's almost a progress by the square. It's not a lineal, a gradient progress, you know. It's a progress that's very steep. You take a look at somebody who is only a short time ago – a short time ago has had this and that – a lot of them have been creaking around one way or this and they've run half a bank, see. Well, their viewpoint shifts on the thing. And you run a full bank on something like this. What you don't hear is what it was like before, what it was like before.

You're up against an old phenomenon I remember talking about back in 49. Trying to figure out: Why didn't anybody ever thank you for running one out – an engram. And I said,
"Well, it is negative gain. It's gone," you see? And in view of the fact that his difficulty is gone, he's no longer dwelling on it. So I called this negative gain. So he therefore is very often less appreciative than he should be, you know. You just get through making somebody a first-goal Clear or something like that and they ARC break on you. You know? And why are they ARC breaking? Well, you – you are trying to find the start of the next goal or something like that and you miss an item. And you feel like saying, "Look-a-here. What the hell is going on around here?" You know. Do this for you. You haven't done anything for them, they're... [laughs] That's gone now. On this side of stuff always collect your fee in advance.

Anyway, the... it's not true that people don't appreciate it. They'll all of a sudden take a long backwards look at this and they'll say, "Hey, you know this guy's really done a job on me," you know. Well, now one of the things – one of the things that you have to keep track of as you're going along the line is the fact that a withhold at this level or running these particular incidents is no longer good enough to clean up a session.

Now, you bring the pc's tone arm down at the beginning of session as part of 3N with pulling some missed withholds. But you straighten out the session at its end if the pc feels rough at all with either overt or O/W. Because the pc actually feels pretty bad for having chopped you up when you're trying to do things for him like that. And that's buried and that is what is wrong with a pc who stays ARC broke. He's had an ARC break. It startled him out of his wits! He didn't realize he was going to ARC break. You miss a couple of items. You get something backwards or something like that or you distract his attention when he's all worried or confused about something. And he ARC breaks, bang! And he surprises himself more than he surprises the auditor. And by the end of session he is well cognizant of that as an overt. And if you don't get an opportunity to pull the overt aspect of those ARC breaks off, you make a pc pretty confounded miserable. Because he actually knows that he's acting like a heel. And it weighs on him. I mean he tries to justify acting like a heel and all kinds of things go on along the line. Pcs inevitably ARC break, but give them an opportunity to recover from them.

The best recovery on it as a general process that we've had for a long time is general O/W, if you just got to run it as a process. But in actual fact if you just hunt and punch around on, "What have you done in the session?" you see. And, "Have you done anything in the session?" you see. "Have you tried to make anybody guilty in the session?" And all of a sudden the pc is quite relieved to get these off if the auditor isn't accusative in asking the question. And the pc straightens out then. The pc feels much better. And the pc will snap back to battery.

Invalidation of an item, invalidation of suppression and in suppressions of items and that sort of thing leaves somatics on the bank and so forth. An... whereas you'd think it would be ideal then to run mid ruds on every item that you find, nooo, I'm afraid that would hold up the parade to such an extent that it would ruin the pc. So, therefore you have to be alert to the rudiments going out. And the pc inevitably feels he is being harassed. Why does he feel he is being harassed? Because in the incident he's being harassed! And he transfers the incident mood to the auditing session. He's being confused and harassed so he thinks the auditing session is going to confuse and harass him. And there are characters around who won't be audited anywhere close to this. And you're going to run into them, you're going to run into them.
They're not going to come near this. They won't be audited on any part of this. The only thing that saddens one is just realizing the fellow with the handout to him of freedom from all this is simply choosing – shudder – to remain in the darkness forever. That's awful grim to me.

But as far as my policy is concerned: You do all you can to get them audited and when it starts to amount to time which could much better be spent on people who will be audited, at that time you forget them. You just let them go along with their goal "to forget." Savvy? Don't pull – don't pull the religious gag of "The wandered sheep is more precious," you know, "than the decent person." Don't pull that gag, see. Because it actually has caused enormous trouble and has been a terrible stumbling block for the Church and so forth. They spend oh-oh-oh-oh, any quantity of trying, you see, trying to get back this wandered sinner, you see, back into the fold. And they turn around and some wolf et up the flock, see. That's no good.

Socialism is doing the same thing. You pay any quantity of time to the indigent bum, you see, who can't work, isn't worth anything anyhow. And you know, you give them big pay, and you take care of them, you give them housing and so forth and so on. He won't work and he won't help anybody, he won't do anything for anybody. But you just spend all of your legislation, all of your finance, all of your planning and so forth, taking care of that one guy, see. And then you look around one day and the guys who are working and the guys who are carrying the load, are just worked to death and they just fall with exhaustion on the lineup. Well, that's not – that's not workable. And I'm not talking about this – whether this is decent, indecent, right or wrong, nice or not nice. I'm just saying that it isn't workable to spend too much time on somebody who won't be processed.

Now, there's one thing. You cause an ARC break through an auditing error, I'd invest quite a lot of time to straighten that out, see. But how about this guy that you're just spending time on trying to get him audited, see? Ah, at some point, give it. Person has a certain amount of choice along this line. That's my advice to you about this particular problem because you'll continuously run into this problem. You'll have somebody on staff who won't be audited, won't be audited, won't be audited. "Oh, all right, I'll do it. Aaaahhhooooo terrible, I think it's all terrible and so forth. Oh, I don't know." Oh, well. Spend some time arguing about it by all means, but don't be late for any other-body's sessions. Do you know what I mean?

When people all of a sudden realize that is your policy, they won't be quite as retreative. They won't be... have to be coaxed quite so hard. There was somebody raising the devil down in Australia the other day. He was going to sue the organization because it had run three goals on him and hadn't found all its RIs. Oh, come off of it. I've survived worse than that any day of the week. So I don't know whether it handled the situation, but I'll tell you what I did write him. I said, "You be good or we won't audit you again, ever." [laughs, laughter] Always remember you're in the driver's seat along this line as an auditor. Always remember. Down deep, a person knows.

All right. Well, now I've covered a great deal of – of ground here. I wish I had a few more hours of lecture after a few breaks and so forth to cover some more of the ground, but this is rather hard to do. I want to give you some sort of an idea of this at all and I am giving you just the bare bones of technical essentials which you'll need to carry on at this exact mo-
ment. The speculative horizon with regard to this sort of thing – let alone actual data we've had – but the speculative horizon, you see, just stretches out there. You ever been on the Pacific Ocean? You look an awful long distance on the Pacific Ocean and you'll find space, you know. The speculative horizon is like that. It's way out, man. Boy, I mean we've collided – we've collided with data which is highly debatable as to whether it will be popular or unpopular.

And I'm afraid I have to go along with the first Foundation decision I made, back in 1950 when they had that Board meeting and told me I wasn't to research on any more past lives. I don't think they ever did get that end of the building back together again. The bricks are still cracked. [laughter] And I said, "Well, psychology and other activities in the field of the mind have always had a large eye on popularity. And they would actually throw away materials which didn't agree with things. They'd throw away the things which didn't agree. And that's why they've not come up with any answers. They consult this thing of the popularity of a datum, the acceptability of a datum and have therefore compromised truth. So you either accept truth or popularity."

Now, this leaves you with only this problem; how do you present then, if you've resolved that far and got your mind settled in, how do you present the truth in its most acceptable form? [laughs] That's the problem you're left with. And that will probably require a lot of talk about. I could have lectured to you today on the probable source of the human race, the probable origin of what has been known as religion on this planet. Now, that's – that's – that's grim. That's a grim subject. That's a mighty unpopular subject. That's upsetting to one and all.

Now, we have the argument, just because there's been a false heaven with implants on it, does not mean that all heavens are false. You see, we get that immediate argument, because if we say, "heaven," somebody is going to think, "nix heaven." [laughter] Then, if we say, "Nix heaven, there is no heaven," immediately we're going to get the other – the oppterm in restim and everybody is going to say, "There's heaven," see, and so forth. And I think we should follow an impartial attitude that says it doesn't matter whether there is actually a heaven or a not-heaven, you see. We have our own views on this subject, or something like that. Now, how did you get on this planet and why and what were you before you came on this planet. We could also give a considerable talk about this, although not too much data is known on it now. I have more than a good idea of what happened and why you're here and what you were. And then, therefore, what the character of Earth has been and why its history has been this particular way. And a lot of things are falling together.

And you ever watch one of these animated cartoons where they have a – well, I don't know, there is a broken-up candy bar or something like that and it suddenly assembles itself? You know, you see all the parts come in, you know, like that? I've been looking at this huge vista, you see, of infinite numbers of pieces to the puzzle with a good alignment of this, that we were all doing on. We were doing fine with this alignment and we had these pieces and we could be absolutely sure of these, but where did it go over there and where did it go? Well, we better not pay too much attention to that. Let's get these pieces here and so forth. And what's happened to us is horrible. An animated – I mean, I picked up a piece over here that said GPM and worked out the various mechanics of the GPM as they actually exist on the whole track! That's perfectly sincere work. That isn't out of that implant, see?
And then started to move this piece into the puzzle and we all of a sudden got this cartoon assembled. Everything started racing in toward this puzzle. I could no more stop it now with a barricade. I couldn't stop it, you see. This puzzle is just sitting there assembling, see. It's going click, click, click, click, click, click! [laughter] And it's embarrassing! I'm sitting here with the most unpopular data imaginable, you see. [laughter] I feel like saying, "Hey, hey, don't you realize I got to talk about this?", you know. [laughter] Well, that's our problem. I imagine we've got this problem for some time to come. But remember something, there – just regardless of the embarrassments in this, regardless of this and that. Oh, I mean I could look around right now and realize there are even embarrassments here about this and so forth, you know. Regardless of all that, there's diamonds and jewels falling out of this of great price. And you needn't ignore those because they are very, very important. One of them – the first one you saw was, well, everybody has a common first goal. Bang! There went Lord knows how much indefinite auditing. See, it just went, just like that. All right. There are other things like that happening.

What we've got here in the field of dissemination, I don't know quite what it means yet, but it's certainly a hundred and thirty-two carat, sixty-four faceted, cut diamond, blue-white. Because nobody ever had a common denominator of dissemination before. Common denominator of dissemination.

Well, people get wilder on this subject than anybody you ever heard of I imagine that we – to the end of our lives we'll never hear the bricks stop being thrown on this subject. I imagine that it... we've started an Armageddon of sorts in the field of thought. Because this thing is going to have concatenations. This thing is extremely painful to some people and extremely exciting to other people and some people say, "Gee" you know, "Gosh" you know, "Really?" "Hey, I knew it! I knew it!" you know. And he goes off into his personal experience, "Every time the old man picked up a strap and so forth and told me I was never going to go to heaven I knew it!" [laughter] "I knew it! See? I knew there wasn't any such place. Yeah well, those Scientologists are right. You see." And some other person who has gotten a big send from religion, you see, and has actually benefited and has a... gotten peace and quiet and so forth from existence, you know and so forth. They're going to say, "Well, those people are absolute barbarians, savages and blasphemers." Don't you see.

Oh, man, I don't think the brick dust is going to settle for a long time on that one. I don't think it's anything that you could trap. I mean I don't think you could stop it. I don't think we any longer have the power of saying, "All right. This data is going to be held as confidential. We're not going to talk about that." I don't think we have the power of doing that. We could probably withhold it. We could try to withhold it. We could do something or another at considerable consequences to ourselves. I don't wish to risk anybody on this – those consequences, so the devil with it.

What does it mean? I mean I could lecture to you for a number of hours on the subject of what does it mean. It's the last few days, you see, of releases one way or the other. It's a culmination, it's the automatic assembly of this and that. Well, it sure means an awful lot; sure means an awful lot.
And to show you people can do it and that Saint Hill does turn out good graduates, you know, you've got a new Instructor now, and – stand up a moment, Ann, and say hello. [applause] Now, Ann got... we make good auditors, ACCs and Saint Hill and so forth. We sure do. I take full credit for it. And bad auditing, take no credit for it at all, I mean... But Ann walked into 3N just on the last twenty-four hours or something like this and just got the briefest of briefing and so forth and sailed in on Reg last night and ran one hundred and thirty-two RIs. Is that your first session?

*Female voice: Yes, sir.*

That's her first session, see. Pretty good, huh? So it can be done. I'm not saying, "Where have you been?" But I'm saying that's pretty good. So it can be done. So, freedom is in view. This is something that then is doable, you can do it very easily, very well. The finite end view of it is right in sight. You've got certain technology you've got to learn and so forth. But I would say that a Scientologist, did not need too much grooving up on what we're doing right this minute in 3N if Ann, as good an auditor as she is, can take a very brief, momentary briefing, "Oh, this is how you do it" and sit down and find a hundred and thirty-two RIs on a PC in her first session of running it.

And I tore through a bank here in the last few hours of auditing and straightened out a bank and got Mary Sue up to first goal and so forth. So, I'm saying "Well, now there's your..." Got her up to first-goal Clear and shining and so forth. And so, I now have done it using the exact tools that you're doing and you were using. And reality is growing on this thing. It's getting easier. It's not quite as difficult to do. It is simpler to handle various PCs with it. Your PCs are not as hard to handle with this as other things. It's not as hard on PCs.

All this thing is culminating into the fact that we've got what? Well, we were saying perfectly happily we spend oh, I don't know, quite a few hours to first-goal Clear. See? We were happy to spend that. And we counted on a few more goals and the person would be a lot better off and so forth. Man, do you know what we're looking at right this minute? We're looking at about two hundred and fifty hours to OT. That's another piece that has suddenly fallen into line.

Now, you were a pretty hot article before you ran into this – until you went to heaven. You were. You were pretty good. You knew you lived more than once. You could transfer bodies at will. You had a lot of tricks. You were rather prone to be combative. You... But actually this is... you were way up already compared to where you are now. Therefore, one returns a thetan to a wiser and better state, which is a fantastic game. You see, you'll know a lot more now, with these incidents cleaned up than you ever would have known if the incidents had never been received. And although what time you've spent since you received them, may have been hell (not a pun), you can make a better thetan. I mean the guy is better off. The guy is more experienced. He has more direction. He'll have more judgment, certainly. His experiential track has been improved and then he suddenly is able to cash in on his experiential track.

So, beings such as we are dealing with right this minute have never been seen before in this universe. So this isn't just a patch-up of the old. This is a new kickoff of one kind or another. Now, whether those guys that did this are still around, whether that empire is still
going or whether our own empire is still going, these are questions we don't know. And probably won't know for some... weeks. [laughter]

Thank you.
TV Demo: Blocking Out and Dating Incidents

An auditing demonstration given on 15 May 1963

LRH: Okay. This is a demonstration – this is a demonstration of probably the only difficult piece of auditing which you will have to do on running these implants and so forth. And it is a demonstration purely of dating and blocking out the first incident, the first engram.

The – well, you're back to 1950. But we know so much more about running engrams today than we ever did then, that actually, if you get a few very stable data, why, you'll be all right.

This is not a demonstration of engram running. This is a demonstration in blocking out the early items and exploration of the track immediately preceding the first implant. Okay.

Now, your chair is fine?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Is it all right if we audit in this room?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. And, give me a can squeeze.

All right. Bang. That's fine. Now, what I'm going to do here is just try to block out the early part of this track, if I can. Nothing very tense.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right? All right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yes.

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

PC: Yes.

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

PC: Oh, to block out the early part of the track.

LRH: All right.

PC: Get the date and work well.

LRH: Okay. Very good. All right. Now, you've just successfully completed the handling of the first GPM.

PC: Yes.

LRH: And I think that's very well. As you realize, there's undoubtedly data ahead of this.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: And let's see if we can find it, huh?

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Now, the beautiful part about this is you don't have to do very much regression and all that sort of thing because it's right there. Now you're... that's not an instructive note, I mean, as far as you're concerned.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Now, we're going to look for the point of capture. And we're simply going to date from the beginning of the goal "to forget," which you have already run. It's the top of the stairs...
PC: Uh-huh.
LRH: ...the top of the stairs in the vestibule there.
PC: Uh-huh.
LRH: I don't know if you had any visio on it or not, but that will register. It's from the top oppterm of the goal "to forget."
PC: Right.
LRH: That's the part we're dating from. We're just going earlier than that.
PC: Right.
LRH: And that we're taking as zero.
PC: Right.
LRH: And I want to know now if your first contact with these people that did the implanting was on the order of years earlier.
PC: All right. Was it on the order of months earlier?
LRH: All right. Apparently on the order of years earlier. All right. Now, is it tens of years earlier?
PC: Tens of years earlier? Would it be on the order of hundreds of years earlier than this top oppterm of the goal "to forget." Hundreds of years earlier?
LRH: Tens of years earlier? Or just single years earlier?
PC: I get a little more reaction on that. Now is it more than five years earlier?
LRH: Less than five years earlier?
PC: Well, I get no read. What did you think?
LRH: Six. Is it six years earlier?
PC: I've got - I'm getting six - comes up.
LRH: Six. Is it six years earlier?
PC: All right. We're getting a little more fall on that. Six years earlier? All right. Now, let's be a little more specific here. Apparently we're running into a little more mud than I care to have here. Let's find the capture.
PC: Right.
LRH: Let's date the capture. Now, this is the first series. Did you have two series? Two series? One series?
PC: Just one? You only had one?
LRH: Huh, is that right?
PC: Well, it started out, I believe, and then found there were four.
LRH: Four. Were there four series? Four times you went back through this?
PC: Well, I get a fall on that. Did you go back through that four times? Three times? Two times? One time?
LRH: One time? Two times? Three times? Four times? This is very equivocal here. She said – found that there were four.
PC: Uh-huh.
LRH: Right. Four complete tours through this?
PC: Yes. I'm a sucker.
LRH: Four complete tours? Huh? Four complete tours? Or four complete engrams? I mean, four complete GPMs? Four complete tours?
through? Is it four times?

Apparently. Apparently. There is some verification on this. This is pretty muddy.

PC: I'm getting a pain here.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Seems there's sure more than once anyway.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Now, referring to the first one.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: The first time, the bank you've just run. And we've got a point of capture there someplace. Right?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Is there a point of capture? A point of capture? Yes. Now, is this point of capture months before? Months before the first goal?

Years before the first goal? Months before the first goal?

Weeks before the first goal? Days before the first goal?

Ah. Days before the first goal.

PC: I'm getting to feel I'm being pinioned with the arms.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Yeah, the arms are quite...

LRH: Very good. All right. This is days before the first goal. All right. We've got that to that. That reacted. All right. Was it five days before? More than five days before? Less than five days before?

Was it more than five days before the first implant? Was this capture more than five days before the first implant? Less than five days before the first implant? More than five days? Less – was it five days?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right.

PC: Sorry. I meant to tell you.

LRH: All right. Very good. Five days before.

All right. Very good. That's fine. It's five days before. All right. That's a speedy one. All right.

Now we've got that point, have you got any impression of what might have happened there five days before?

PC: Well, something to do with my arms. I was pinioned somehow with my arms. So I was very shaky. Um – I don't get anything else. Suffocation. Um – I got a feeling of being – um – I don't think it is, but the nearest I can get to it is a sack thrown over my head and pinioned um – other ways.

LRH: All right.

PC: But it's more of a – it's not a sack, it's more of a... um – it's balloon fabric.

LRH: Oh, yes.

PC: It's silver balloon fabric sty.

LRH: Right. Right. All right.

PC: Um – had me – had – me arms are pinioned. Funny getting this arms business.

LRH: All right. Now, just two minutes before that, where were you standing.

PC: I was going to say on a mountain.

LRH: All right. Good. Go ahead and say it.

PC: On a mountain.

LRH: All right. That's got a little
bit of a fall on it. Okay. And what happened?

PC: Pains across me shoulders.

LRH: Ah, yes.

PC: Um – I'm sorry, I've lost where I'm supposed to be.

LRH: All right. Well, that's all right. That's all right. Let's go to seven days before the capture. Seven days before the capture.

PC: Tenseness went off.

LRH: Yes.

PC: Um...

LRH: You have any somatics there?

PC: No. No, they – it was a sort of relief. I seem to have lost somatics. There's a slight suggestion of somatics in the back again now.

LRH: Oh, there is a slight suggestion in the back.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. Very good. I've got that. Now, let's just move back a little bit further.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Let's go back a year before the first implant – before capture. A year before the first oppterm. A year before the first oppterm.

PC: Now I've got a picture that I've had before. It's never been run. It's come up in auditing and it – it again is in a mount... a mountainous country and it seems to be in um – a what do you call it? It's not exactly a valley, it's a hollow in the mountains. And there's – um – the mountain towers up behind it, but there are high hills or rocks in front.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And um – I think there's a woman there.

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. You've seen this before?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Well, good enough. Anything else you notice about that?

PC: Well, the woman seems to be my boss for some reason or other.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: And um, she's wearing the sort of clothing that is not... um – um – more Grecian type.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Dark haired.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Young, attractive.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Powerful.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, your somatic: do you have any electronic somatics at all?

PC: No electronic.

LRH: The same of a year before. You sure then? How's that one that you just mentioned? That's gone at this point?

PC: No, I've got uh – uh – something across the – a tightness across the stomach now.

LRH: All right. Very good. That's all we want to know.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. Let's go two years before the top oppterm. Two years before the top oppterm.

PC: That turns on the shoulder – across the shoulders immediately.

LRH: All right. And what do you
see there at two years?

PC: Um – don't really see it. But I seem to know there's a – um – chariot type of thing. It's the wheels particularly, like the wheels of a gun carriage. Uh – I'm afraid that's all I can tell you.

LRH: All right. That's fine. That's fine. That's all fine. Now, let's take it at three years now, three years before this top oppterm. Three years before this top oppterm. Now, what do you – what do you... what can you tell me there?

PC: Um – same scene. Same area. Not – not the same scene, the same area it seems. Um – old man. Not sure whether it's me or not.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: But rather um – unkempt uh – and not primitively dressed.

LRH: Right.

PC: It c... it could be Father Time or something.

LRH: Oh, yes. All right. Okay.

PC: Don't know what's amusing about it. I want to laugh.

LRH: Oh, all right. Now, is that all of that?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Good. Do you have a somatic there?

PC: No.

LRH: No. Let's inspect that very closely there...

PC: All I've got is a feeling of brightness uh – above my eyes – in front there.

LRH: What do you mean brightness?

PC: A bright light. Brightness above my eyes. It's – it's...

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let's find a point there – let's go to five years before the top oppterm. Five years. You've got something?

PC: Don't get a thing.

LRH: Well is it just...

PC: Just black. Not – not exactly black. I would say hazy.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Misty.

LRH: Very good. Now, let's take it to ten years before that top oppterm. Ten years before the top oppterm, now.

PC: Now, all I get now is a quivering in the eyelids. The eyelids seem to be quivering.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now let's take it one century – one hundred years – before the first – top oppterm.

PC: I'm out in space – doing nothing.

LRH: Thataboy.

PC: Feeling about just out in space and there's planets around and so on. Nothing very distinct, but that's the...

LRH: All right. Do you have a somatic there doing nothing in space?

PC: No. When you asked me if I get it – when – I'm not aware of a somatic until you asked me.

LRH: That's all right.

PC: Then I seem to get this across the shoulders again. It's not – nothing very bad, but I'm just aware particularly just right across the shoulder there.

LRH: All right. That's okay. That's just what I'm looking for.

PC: Okay.
LRH: All right. Is that present in the hundred year earlier?

PC: No – it's – now I'm getting more as if I'm – you asked me about electronics, I'm getting more as if I'm being electric shocked, you know. I could easily turn on this shaking with the body.

LRH: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Therefore at a hundred years there you do have an electronic sensation?

PC: Yes. Yes, definitely.

LRH: Very good. Let's take it two hun...

PC: Now, I'm getting a somatic down there as well.

LRH: All right. We'll find this.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Two hundred years before the top oppterm? Two hundred years before the top oppterm of the first implant? Two hundred years? What have you got?

PC: I was just aware of the somatic now across the shoulders without you asking me for it. Um – there's nothing at all. Blank.

LRH: That area's blank and shoulders lashed up. All right. That's fine. What's – what have you got there?

PC: Well, it's just – I've got this, um – I mean this is even where I am...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ...this terrible feeling of puzzlement, of bewilderment.

LRH: Yes.

PC: That's – that's present.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Can't make it out.

LRH: That's all right. All right. Let's go three hundred years before the top oppterm. Three hundred years. What do you got?

PC: I'm not puzzled.

LRH: Good.

PC: And um – seem to be in – as if I've been blinded with light. And it's like the afterglow of when one's been blinded by light. If you – you know if you get a bright light flashed in your eyes and you shut them you can still see a bright glow. Or at least I can.

LRH: Um-hm, uh-hm.

PC: And this is the feeling I'm getting here. Now it's just darkened up slightly.

LRH: All right. That's excellent. Tell me anything more about three-hundred-year point there?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Let's go to four hundred years. Four hundred years before the top oppterm. What do we find?

PC: Um – a feeling of going back. A feeling about my eyelids being vibrating again. And uh – sort of um – they're not actually halos, but uh – something going away from me in the form like dwindling halos and they're gradually going away.

LRH: Uh-hm.

PC: Dark. It's like um – it was purple. Var... various colors and so on like, uh, auras people have.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Things like that. Not very distinct.

LRH: All right. Do you have a somatic there at four hundred years?

PC: No somatic there.

LRH: No somatic?
PC: No.
LRH: But you see these electronic...
PC: Yes.
LRH: ...things departing?
PC: Uh-hum. Yes.
LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Now, you make any guesses here of what this might be in relationship to what?
PC: Well, the guess is that I've – I had a feeling I've just come out of a body or something – um – and am a bit bemused by it all and a bit lost.
LRH: Uh-huh.
PC: Uh – it's an area, I would say, of unconsciousness, if anything. Or uh – be – conscious unconsciousness is the best way I can describe it. As if one was aware when one was unconscious, this is what one would be aware of.
LRH: Oh, I see.
PC: Ah, this is double Dutch maybe but it's er – it's so shadowy and vague, you see, there's nothing to look at, nothing to do, no sensation, nothing to feel. But yet one is aware...
LRH: Uh-huh.
PC: Uh – it's an area, I would say, of unconsciousness, if anything. Or uh – be – conscious unconsciousness is the best way I can describe it. As if one was aware when one was unconscious, this is what one would be aware of.
LRH: Um, very big. Very, very big.
PC: These bicycle wheels are – I called them – they're half the size of a man, but they look very small in relationship to this whole thing. It's like um – the plane appears to be pitched up like the Dakotas that's, you know, pitched up a lot and they've got – the tail comes down rather low and the front is propped up. I can't see the rear of it though.
LRH: All right. Very good. What's your relationship to this plane? Who are you?
PC: I'm a mechanic.
LRH: All right. All right, do you have any somatics?
PC: When you asked – when you asked me, at that point I got a pain in the back of the neck.
LRH: Okay.
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PC: Yes, it's military. It's the – I don't know why I know this, but it's the color of military stuff. It's grayish.

LRH: Uh-huh. Oh, very good. Now we're getting some pay dirt. You've got some pain in the back of your neck there though.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. Now, let's take a crack at this at two thousand years before the first implant.

PC: Somatic in the right ear immediately.

LRH: All right.

PC: Um – I'm in the air now. This is air and there seem to be – I can't locate... Hm – I've got, um, a view of craft in the air and they're shaped like um – delta – delta craft. That's right.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: Delta craft. They're a long way away. I'm – and I'm – plane I'm in is in part of this formation. I'm having trouble with my eyes, I can't see. I want to screw up um ... Somatics around the eyes.

LRH: All right.

PC: Something to do with difficulty in seeing here.

LRH: Um-hm.

PC: I ought to be able to see and can't, is what I get. And I'm sort of trying hard to find – see or find out something. But I've got this – I'm forward in a plane. Um – and over on the – don't know – on the right ...

LRH: Yes.

PC: ...um, there's this other delta-like plane. It's a long way away. I don't see why I'm so worried about that. That's all I've got there.

LRH: All right. Fine. Fine. Take it half an hour later.

PC: Still watching. Still watching that plane.

LRH: All right. Then take it two hours earlier than you first squinted your eyes at it there.

PC: We're pointed at the sun. Sun's blinding us.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: We're being uh – being out-maneuvered. Out-maneuvered and um – I don't know what – and somehow we've got directed into the sun. And this is nothing to... a sun or the sun – and it's got us confused.

LRH: Um.

PC: Um – the other plane isn't there.

LRH: All right. That's fine. Okay.

PC: No. Just this uh – feeling of bright light in me eyes.

LRH: All right. Otherwise no electronic sensations?

PC: No.

LRH: Very good. Very good. Now, we found a point here where we have no electronic sensations. Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: Now, move forward toward present time to the first heavy electronic sensation from that point. There we go! Good.

Good. Now what – now move just before that was received. All right. What have you got to say?

PC: I was unconscious.
LRH: All right. Okay. Now is this – I'm going to date this "earlier than the implant." Okay?

PC: Right.

LRH: Is this on the order – is this more than a thousand years before the implant began? Yes.

Is it greater than 1500 years before the implant began? Yes.

Is it greater than 1800 years? Yes.

Is it two thousand years? No.

Is it greater than 1900 years before the implant? Yes.

PC: 54.

LRH: 1954? 1954 years?

PC: Um.

LRH: Is that what you got?

PC: Um.

LRH: All right. That's it. That's 1954 years before implant. Okay? Very good. Now, go just – go to about 1900 – no, go to 1955 years before the implant.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Got that? Now, what're you doing there? There you got it.

PC: I've got a pain in my head.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Um – it's right on the crown of my head. It goes, oh, like a shape of a skull cap...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ...pain, type of pain.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Um – something's trying to show up. Uh – it's...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ...well, it's like the end of a sparkler. You know those fireworks...

LRH: Attaboy.

PC: ...we had with sparklers.

LRH: Attaboy.

PC: Um, I just sense that there.

LRH: Good. Good. Good. Let's take it at 1955 and a half years before the implant. 1955 and a half years. Anything going on there?

PC: Only...

LRH: All black?

PC: ...a jerking – just uh – want to jerk my head.

LRH: All right. Now...

PC: Um...

LRH: What?

PC: Trying to work out – I feel I'm doing it. It's... I'm watching something.

LRH: Okay.

PC: It is uh – something that is taking my attention and I – yes, it's – I'm watching something moving across the – the horizon or something.

LRH: That's it. All right. Fine. Now, uh...

PC: Getting rather hot.

LRH: All right. Let's move back to the first moment you are aware that there is something to look for at 1955.

PC: Well, this seems to be an old story of mine. But it's come up again very strong that I've been blinded and I can't see.

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. All right. Let's move it to 1957 years before the implant.

PC: Getting hotter.

LRH: Yeah, that's it. Any visio
PC: Something's trying to peek through, um, um, this sparkling thing again. Um, oh, and getting somatics across me – bottom of me shoulder blades.

LRH: All right.

PC: And um – this that I'm looking at is um – is about an inch long and is glowing, white hot, and um – has, uh – I seem to have got rid of something, I don't know what...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ...and uh – has little sparks – rays coming off of it, not very big. Um.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Quite geometrically arranged, but they're not – um – they're not stationary, do you see? They're coming off – it's like you'd see the fields of magnet – field of magnetism or something like that.

LRH: Right. Right. All right.

PC: I've got this pain across the chest.


That's – you're right where you're supposed to be.

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. 1955 and a half years. All right. That's a very important date. 1955 and a half years. All right. Now, let's move back to 1956 years before the top oppterm.

PC: I'm just being messed up.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Um – I've got a head somatic now.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And I've got – this halo's going away again.

LRH: Right.

PC: And somebody's out to confuse me, mister!

LRH: Yes, sir. All right.

PC: And uh – what they've done is they've got me in something and I can't see out. And I'm being moved around and I can't do anything about it. I'm just moved around. There's nothing to look at and it's pretty – well, I get fed up with this.

LRH: Hm, hm.

PC: Um – nothing to do, nothing to – nobody to speak to, nothing to say, nothing to look at.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Um – feeling of getting pains though. They give you that to make sure you know you're there.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And a flushed feeling in my face. But I haven't got a face. I've got a flush feeling in what...

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. Now, let's move it to 1956 years before the top oppterm of the first implant.

PC: I'm sorry I didn't hear what you said.

LRH: All right. Move to 1956 years before the top oppterm of the first implant.

PC: Uh-huh. Now I'm getting the impression of um – a capsule. Ah, it doesn't seem to be very big. It seems to be the size of – I don't know if you know the sweet we call the licorice comfit – but it's about an inch long and it's got uh – it's got a base. It's more like an acorn base to it –
it's longer, you see, it's just like the licorice comfit. And it's got this base to it like an acorn has before it's... um – comes off the tree and then we make little pipe shells out of them.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And it's – um – seems to be upside down, it's at that angle and uh – yes, it's glowing. Um – it's a milky color – milky color, but the cap – the uh – base of it is, uh – darker color. It's not glowing there.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: Now there's some – they're fooling me again with this. Or somebody is. Because they – it's changed its color; it goes red. And I'm getting the feeling of uh – a flashing feeling as if it's uh – me eyes lids are going on, you know, I'm getting this flashing feeling as if it's um – like the light coming out of a movie camera that has a – movie projector that hasn't got a film in it.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Don't like that.

LRH: I got it. All right. Very good. Now, obviously here something has happened between two thousand years and 1956 years. There's something in this – this forty-four-year period.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Have you got any inkling of that? That's not a good question, but I mean just – just offhand. Can you tell me anything?

PC: Well I'm a little bit uh – they – I'm – I've had me time mucked up here. Could you just tell me where I'm supposed to be there, then?

LRH: All right. That's fine. I'll give you – I'll put you right there. Let's move to 1958 years before the top oppterm of the first implant.

PC: Well, now I'm getting some uh – idea of some scenery.

LRH: All right.

PC: Uh – uh – it's um – a land of milk and honey is what I want to say. And that's not suggestion because – not something suggested to me, it's uh – it's that sort of land; it's very light and milk creamy. And this damn capsule seems mixed up in this picture somewhere.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Um – the – this is rock formation but it – rock formation, but it's rather beautiful. It's more like um – opal color, a pale opal color, and it looks as good a quality. Um – and it's uh – it's almost dazzling. But very attractive, very, very beautiful. Um – this is a – this is a scene from somewhere. This is what you see and – oh, well this is – this is something – I know, this is something like an aerodrome.

LRH: Oh, yes.

PC: And this – I think it was a case of perspective with this acorn thing. This is a – this is some form; I've never seen anything the likes of this. This acorn thing or capsule thing is some form of spacecraft or something. And um – I – this place I'm in is like – I've got me back looking out the back to this. But I imagine it's a rather an enormous pillared terrace to this aerodrome and this thing is stuck out over on the right there.

LRH: Mm. All right. Let's move back 1958 years before the top oppterm plus three hours. 1958 years.

PC: Now I'm inside.

LRH: Attaboy.

PC: Um – get the impression of – they don't make aerodromes like this –
bloody silly. That black marble – marble -
they must have had a lot of this material to
use up. You see? I mean, we have to – oh,
dear, it seems out of place. It's all... There's
nobody there though.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** It's an empty hall. Um –
more recently I've seen – Empire State
Building decor.

**LRH:** Oh, yeah.

**PC:** And all very lush, but no –
very aesthetic, I think, is the word ...

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** ...but no um – utility pur-
pose to it. And yet it must be. It seems to
be counters, but they're not counters. You
know what I mean, you know, table count-
ers.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** Or it's lit through the –
through the walls or something or the
counters there.

It's going a bit hazy now.

**LRH:** All right. That's all right.
That's fine. Did you invalidate something
there? You suppress something?

**PC:** I did. I was going to say it
was lit through the floor and that would
have made me a liar because I'd said ear-
lier it was a black floor.

**LRH:** A-ha.

**PC:** And uh – so – yes, all right.
Now, I was trying to get an explanation of
that. And then I – then it went ...

**LRH:** All right. Do you have a

somatic there as you're looking at that?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Attaboy. Now we're getting
somewhere. All right. Now move to – it's
going to be a little bit forward here – move
to 1958 years, two hours.

**PC:** Well, I seem to be sitting in
the porch of this place. Um – pillars
around me, looking out across a very vast
expanse. Nothing there though.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** Everything is deserted. I'm
the only person around here.

**LRH:** Uh-huh.

**PC:** I'm a – well, you know, I
feel – I've got the feeling that – all right,
everybody else has died and uh – this is all
mine now. And um – so what? I mean, it's
no good to you.

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** Uh – I'm just sitting there a
bit disconsolate about it all. I'm using a lot
of words I don't usually use, by the way.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** "Disconsolate" isn't a word I
normally use.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Now
we're going to move forward from that
point there, one hour.

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** What do you see there?

**PC:** Still sitting there, man.

**LRH:** Still sitting there.

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** Okay. Now...

**PC:** There's nothing to do!

**LRH:** 1958 years and one half
hour from the top oppterm.
PC: Well, I want to say there's an explosion.

LRH: Yes.

PC: And then – and then I think that's silly to say that.

LRH: All right. That's fine.

PC: But I don't – get an impression of it.

LRH: You get an impression of it. Now what's the exact moment of that explosion there? Was that – has it just happened or...

PC: Uh...

LRH: Is it happening?

PC: No. It w... No, I can tell you it was just – how did I know that? It was just about to happen when I said I got the impression of the explosion. Oh, the explosion's a long way – not a long way, but some way away. And I'm – when you said that I was aware of the explosion, it the – hadn't reached me. Do you see what I mean? No it...

LRH: That's it.

PC: ...blast or something.

LRH: That's it. Now you got that point there?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now, move to 1958 years and one-half hour – that's where you are, is that right?

PC: Right.

LRH: Now move to 1958 years and one hour before the top oppterm.

PC: Well, I'm still sitting there.

LRH: All right. There's nothing happened there?

PC: No.

LRH: Right?

PC: No.

LRH: Okay. Well, what – what's visible from where you are there?

PC: Well, I'm just sitting in this porch. And there's pillars around me. And I'm just sitting there minding me own business, doing no harm to anybody, I assure you, and um – looking out over this – what could be – well it would be an enormous aerodrome. Enormous!

LRH: Mm.

PC: There – there's practically – I mean if you can – it's like the – perfectly smooth land, no – hardly any inundations in it at all; it just goes almost – oh, I see, is a mist. It the – there's a limitation on how far you can see, so I can't see any horizon or limit. It goes off into mist. There's something hidden there.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let's call the moment you are sitting there on the porch just "that moment on the porch." Okay?

PC: Right. Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, rapidly move through – rapidly move through the next six hours.

PC: Well, very quickly I got the impression of a crack, bang, crash, wallow and I'm tied up. I've got this um – feeling in me arms being pinioned again. And I'm...

LRH: That's a boy.

PC: ...I'm tied up.

LRH: All right. All right. Now, just let me check something here. Has – at that moment that you have there now...

PC: Yes.

LRH: ...has this ever happened be-
PC: Not that I know of.

LRH: No, I did – let me check it once more on the meter. Has it ever happened before? No, it's dead. All right. That's fine. Now, return to that moment on the porch.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, this is just for scouting purposes – I want you to rapidly scan through the next three days. Just go ahead now, rapidly scan through the next three days and tell me where you arrive.

PC: Somatic in the chest or rather lower down there. Darkness. Uh – can't see, um. Well, I'm unconscious. There's been um... oh, I – there's this tying up business somehow or other – I can get that.

LRH: All right. OK.

PC: I get the feeling I've been tied up.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And um – I just realized what – just had a little cognition on the unconsciousness here is – that this is – this is running – I know I'm running a period of unconsciousness. But yet I'm aware. Do you follow me?

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: This is a – quite a look for me.

LRH: All right.

PC: But I – in those three days I'm unconscious.

LRH: All right.

PC: There's nothing going on and there's nothing to see. They've – I'm bottled up.

LRH: All right. That's okay.

PC: Or, you know – that's all I can tell you.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Now move back to that moment on the porch.

PC: Right. That's fine.

LRH: All right. You got that now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now...

PC: I've got something extra there now.

LRH: What have you got?

PC: There's a – you know, they had some funny machinery in those days – there is – there's a big plane out on this aerodrome. It is an aerodrome. And it's got four fuselages.

LRH: Uh-hm.

PC: Four. And they're not – it's like – I don't know what the propulsion is. It's not jets, but they're – it's in the shape of that delta I was telling you and these four enormous fuselages, one or two on each – in the center – and they sort of uh – raked back.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Well, that's out there.

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, just move rapidly through the next two hours.

PC: Well, I'm – I'm backing off something here.

LRH: Uh-hm.

PC: Um – there's an explosion or something happens out there. The plane is there and something happens out there that's an explosion of some sort.

LRH: All right.

PC: Which – there's a pretty big
bang, man.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: It's a pretty big explosion. I'm getting the feeling now of stuff going up in the air, a shower, a real shower of this stuff coming up.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Um – I was going to say, I don't know, I got hit on the head with a – yes. I got on – hit on the head with something, it was shrapnel, I should think. It was what I – we call shrapnel.

LRH: Yes. Yes. Yes.

PC: Bloody funny, you know, the other day I hit my head in precisely the same spot. Um – sorry I've flipped out for a minute.

LRH: Oh, that's perfectly all right. Move back to that moment on the porch.

PC: Right.

LRH: Got that now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Very good. How are you doing there on that porch?

PC: That's all right.

LRH: Well, fine. Now, move forward to the first thought that is launched into this. Is there a thought launched into this someplace? Is – anybody say anything?

PC: "You can't see."

LRH: Oh, is that so? All right. Now, let's move forward to the moment when that thought is launched there. Where's that thought coming from?

PC: Well, I... you asked me, I'll tell you. It's come from a bit of this – this – from this explosion stuff.

LRH: That's interesting, isn't it?

PC: This whack on the head is – is a thought.

LRH: Um-hm. Um-hm. Are you say... what – what do ...


LRH: Now, what did you say the thought was?

PC: "You can't see."

LRH: That's right. Now is there a contradictory thought to that?

PC: There's a flash of bright light. I can see a bright light.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Very good. Is there any other contradictory thought there?

PC: Uh – "This isn't true."

LRH: All right.

PC: "You don't know what you're doing."

LRH: Right.

PC: Um – "You can't think."

LRH: All right. Any contradictory thoughts to those?

PC: "You know!" uh – it's a vicious one, that one.

LRH: All right.

PC: Um – "You don't know where you are. You know where you are." Um – "I'll get you."

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: I get suggested "You're free to do as you choose."

LRH: Yes. Yes. All right. Any other thoughts you can pick up there, just go ahead and give them to me.

PC: Um – "Waste not, want not."
LRH: All right.

PC: Um – "Be careful. Be very careful." Um – "be..." – well, it's "Have a go."

LRH: Oh, yes.

PC: Which, I don't know, it – it's contrary to "be careful." You know, "be careful" and then "Oh come on, have a go." You know?

LRH: All right.

PC: Bright lights and darkness.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Uh – "Don't believe it. It's true. " Um – there's something around here I can't get. "Well, there's something around here I can't get." All right.

PC: Um – "You've got it there."

LRH: Um-hm.

PC: Uh – well there – no, it's "There it is."

All right.

PC: "There it is."

LRH: Uh-huh. Any contradictory thought to it in any way?

PC: I thought that – that con... seemed to contradict the one I gave before.

LRH: Oh, yes. All right.

PC: Getting a bit of soma... I'm feeling easier and lighter. Um – aware of an itching on me neck.

LRH: All right.

PC: Um – I don't get any other thoughts at all now.

LRH: All right. That's all right. That's fine. Move back to that moment on the porch.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. How's that now?

PC: Well, we've got the aero-plane there.

LRH: Right.

PC: And that's fine.

LRH: All right. Now, is it all right with you to move a couple of days earlier than this?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Move a couple of days earlier than this.

PC: Well, we're inside this building and it's marble and so on. And it's counters. It seems – I think there's some – there are some people around. This seems like a very busy – uh, wait a minute. I'm getting a lo-o-o-ong tunnel showing up and – and it's kind – it's shaped with arches that come up like that.

LRH: Uhhm.

PC: And this goes a long way. I don't think there's – nothing significant about it at all; it's just the architecture of the place. Probably runs around. It's um – it's a passageway around the perimeter of this building. Uh – goes on here? This just seems like an air terminal.

LRH: All right.

PC: Very lush.

LRH: Um-hm. What are you in this place?

PC: Was going to say a janitor.

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: Seems that – that seems to me that I seem to be – I was going to say I feel I – janitor gives it a very good word for it, yes. Look after the place and keep it clean or part of it or something.

LRH: All right. Fine. All right. Is that perfectly comfortable where you are there?
PC: Yep.

LRH: Is it all right if we park it there for the moment?

PC: Yep.

LRH: All right. Very good. Anything else you want to say about your identity or whereabouts of this or anything?

PC: Well, I don't think I really am a janitor.

LRH: All right.

PC: This - this - I don't belong here, really. I'm an interloper of some sort.

LRH: I see.

PC: I mean, it could be a spy or something of that nature, but I don't - I wouldn't swear to that. But it's that sort of thing. I don't really belong here.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And it's strange to me. And it's like - yet I'm spying out the land, I want to say. But it's um, you know...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: It's not really - I don't really belong to me. I may be wearing janitor's stuff or got the appearance of a janitor, but that's perhaps an easy thing to do.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, this seems to be very good. Now, move forward to present time. Okay.?

PC: All right. Uh-huh.

LRH: All right. How are you doing.?

PC: Fine.

LRH: All right. Very good. I think we have something resembling our basic incident here.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: What do you think about it?

PC: Well, it's all very confusing.

LRH: Yes, isn't it.

PC: Very confusing.

LRH: Let me give the exact start of the blast to your auditor. And that's 1958 years and one hour. We got an orientation there. That's good. I'm glad for that. All right. How do you feel about it?

PC: I feel fine.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, is it all right with you if we end the body of the session there?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. End of the body of the session. Have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: Well, I've worked hard.

LRH: All right.

PC: Think we've done all we set out to do. Haven't we?

LRH: Get the date.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Yes. Block out the early part of the track.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. That's fine. Any gains you care to mention?

PC: Well, I've certainly experienced going back a long, long way. I was certainly experiencing that.

LRH: Um.

PC: And um - you know that's very, very interesting experience and the - so on.

LRH: All right. Very good. Anything else you care to say there?

PC: No. I think that's it, then.

LRH: All right. Now, let's squeeze
those cans.

Ooooh. Squeeze the cans again. Oh, man, that's wild. Let's see, what was it? Touch that or...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Touch that. All right. Is it all right with with you if I run a little bit of Havingness?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Okay. Put the cans down on the table. All right. Touch that corner.

Thank you. Touch the top of the microphone.

Thank you. Touch the top of that can.

Thank you. Touch the cord.

All right. Good enough. Touch your tie.

Thank you. Touch that corner.

Thank you. Touch the back of the E-Meter.

All right. Pick up the cans.

All right. Squeeze the cans.

That's improving, but we've got to go on a bit further. Okay?

PC: All right.

LRH: Put them down, please. Touch the base of the microphone.

All right. Touch your watch.

All right. Touch that chain.

All right. Touch the top of your pocket.

Right. Touch these two upper points of your lapels.

Thank you. Touch that corner of the table.

All right. Touch that corner of the table.

All right. Touch the two cans simultaneously.

Thank you. Now, how are you feeling?

PC: I feel all right.

LRH: Is there anything you haven't told me that you care to tell me?

PC: No, um – sometimes wondered whether I was dubbing in and was fighting against dubbing in while I was doing it.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: But I don't think I was.

LRH: All right. Good, good. All right. Touch that shoulder.

Thank you. Touch that shoulder.

Thank you. Touch that top of the table here.

All right. Pick up the cans and let's see if we're winning here.

Yes, we're winning nicely. All right. Squeeze the cans.

All right. And one little bit more and we will be able to do it. Put the cans down.

All right. Touch that – touch that sleeve.

All right. Thank you. Touch that sleeve.

PC: All right.

LRH: Thank you. All right. Touch the button of your jacket.

All right. Touch the knot of your tie.

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: Thank you. Touch the lapels of your collar.
Thank you. Touch your two ears.

All right. Thank you. With your right hand, touch your left hand.

Thank you. With your left hand, touch your right hand.

Thank you. All right. Touch the table.

Okay. Pick up the cans.

Now, we're getting here. Squeeze the cans. That's all. That's it. All right, that was the last command.

**PC:** Good.

**LRH:** Very good. Now is there anything that you would care to ask or say before I end this session?

**PC:** No – well yes, thank you for the – for the session. I've enjoyed it.

**LRH:** All right. You're quite welcome. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

**PC:** Yes.

**LRH:** Okay. End of session.

**PC:** Thank you. Thank you very much.
Thank you.

All right, this is what?

*Audience: 16th May.*

Huh?

*Audience: 16 May.*

Sixteen May? Sixteen May AD 13. Thank you. I got to get some backflow, you know? Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture on the subject of – as it develops. [laughs, laughter]

Ah, I've been scouting around and trying to keep a quarter of an inch ahead of you, and that's difficult. But you pretty well got this taped. It's very funny, you know, sometimes we develop a big piece of technology or something of the sort, and all the record of the development is there and there's no summation. I very often never make a summation at the time it becomes passé, see? It's superseded in the course of development by a new development, don't you see? And therefore, concentration and economy of research time – if we had the – both the time and the resources of, oh, I don't know, the Stamp Salvage Collection Department of the Bureau of Infernal Ravening of the US government – if we just had that appropriation, you see, we might be able to do it a little more broadly. But it's always up to me to make a summation.

And it was with great astonishment that I found out that we had never made a summation of engram running! Of all of the key things to leave a summation missing on! There were tremendous things learned about engram running and – over a long period of time – and it was never summated. And I was quite interested last night – before session, I was trying to get a start on a bulletin which summated engram running – and I was quite interested how easily it was summated. There's no wonder you're a bit confused about engram running, because it changed over a period of many years. There were many types of engram running, there were many things done at one time in engram running which were found unnecessary in other times. Various mechanics and improvements came and went. And out of all of this, actually, a very simple method of engram running exists.

There's not many laws of engram running. I'm not going to give this lecture on the subject of how simple it is to run an engram, because the summation of it is a very precise activity. I'm going down the line and giving the various terms and laws and so forth. And one of the things I discovered on the thing, that I think you'll find very interesting, is we have never changed a basic tenet of auditing.
That is, you've never successfully audited anything but the time track. There is nothing to audit but the time track. And there is no grand key to the release of things but the time track, and it is a time track.

Probably people think of engrams as something stowed in the pc's wits like cordwood, you know? They're just stowed there, and then there's over in this department, you see, in this file cabinet, there's a big bunch of stuff over there. There's some round cylinders of some kind or another and those are valences. Then down in the basement someplace else, why, we have something else stowed there – machinery. And then locks. Locks: that belongs to an entirely separate division; has nothing to do with anything. And secondaries: well, they're sort of stowed out in the woodshed. You know, and that they're pieces and bits of things and that they're not related and so forth.

Actually, they're simply different phenomena of the time track. And in trying to summate the thing, I made that little discovery. And it seems to be terribly elementary but it might serve to orient you pretty well on what you are doing. It is a time track. It is the continuous record of time of the individual since the first moment he began to experience, straight on through till now; an uninterrupted 3D, fifty-two perception movie. And things happen to that movie, and it gets grouped and becomes unavailable to the pc. Becomes unavailable to the pc for various reasons: his inability to confront and the fact that the track itself can get grouped. Like you took a can of motion-picture film and it's all stretched out there, and so you just start taking it and crumpling it up in your hand in big wads, and so forth. And various things can happen to this consecutive record of experience. Various things happen to it. And all that auditing ever does is straighten it out and make it available and as-is it. Now I think that gives you a simplification of outlook.

I was quite surprised. I was sitting there and suddenly it dawned on me I could make a very simple statement of exactly what we were auditing, what all these things were. As you go along on this track, you get a moment of pain and unconsciousness. All right, that's just another record. It's consecutive with the next moment which is perhaps not of pain and unconsciousness.

Chains, they don't exist in separate slots and compartments, they're just sections of the film which happen to be interrelated. A guy is hit over the head with a hammer, therefore every incident of hitting people over the head with a hammer and being hit over the head with a hammer and being hit over – what – well, just being hit over the head with a hammer makes a chain that is a related series of experiences. And they interrelate in the association of the individual and actually tend to pull this time track down on top of one another. So you've got a whole group – a grouper there, so the track actually gets looped at this point. And then you've got the basic time the individual was hit over the head with a hammer, you've got the basic time the individual was – hit somebody over the head with a hammer, and then you've got all the times that he saw a hammer, see? Or thought somebody was going to get hit with a hammer, or something like that. Those constitute the locks, and they pack down on top of this thing, see?

You eventually get a solid wad there that looks like a piece of black God-'elp-us, and there it is, and the pc of course does not have that experience available. So when the experience becomes unavailable to him, it has a command value over him. He does not know what
it is, and when he comes near it, it has a tendency to operate as a command level. A hammer is telling him what to do, in other words.

And there's only two classes of things involved in this time track – only two classes of things – and one is – you might call the mechanical things, which is matter, energy, space and time, see, and their interrelationships and so forth, see? There's the matter, energy, space and time which is this track, you see? And then there's the significance. So the time track is basically composed of matter, energy, space, time and thought, and that's all the time track is composed of.

Now, people who can't confront any part of their track – and one of the reason the psychologist can't even deal with this thing at all – I'm not berating the psychologist. We'd train him if we could. We'll have to, one of these days. He has a bad record with us. We don't just have a bad record with him; he has a very bad record with us. He can't learn and he goes off into wild departures and so forth. We've had quite sincere psychologists studying at the Academies. I mean, it's not just a brush-off.

And one of those blokes that I know of over in the States, I don't know, I think he was there for about six months and he hadn't finished the Comm Course. That's right. First week, he was terribly interested, terribly interested. He went away and I'm sure it did him some good. We couldn't make a Scientologist out of him, and we just sort of dusted it off and forgot about it – too hard to do. Too many good people around that you could make Scientologists out of, you know, you could train how to audit. There was no real point in breaking our necks with this.

Well, this actually doesn't establish any rancor on my part at all. If a bunch of psychologists and so forth wanted to be set up for the training course, I would put them through a training course. But I would just make sure that it was commensurate with our experience with psychologists, which is to say, ten-year course, something like this. [laughter] I wouldn't miss! I wouldn't miss. They'd be happy, we'd be happy and everything would be happy.

I'd just as soon process a psychiatrist, process a psychologist; it's all the same. But remember that this bird did not make discoveries of the time track or this particular area, the very woof and warp of which the mind is made, simply because he conceives it all to consist of only thought. See, his confront is down to a point where he thinks the brain contains thought.

Now, this is kind of silly. It's like walking down the street and saying there's nothing on this street but opinions. Street is all full of opinions, and if you just get all these opinions on this street, you're all set. Whereas it is no opinion that is pushing the pc's face in. It's somebody's fist. Well, maybe the fist might have been pushed, you see, on the time track because of somebody's opinion, but the fact of the matter is it's not an opinion that's pushing his face in, it's a fist.

The time track, therefore – I'm just making this point here very strongly because you'll come up against it – is not imaginary. It should not be treated as an imaginary thing.

Is a deck of cards imaginary? No. What is real? Well, what is real has mass and weight and so forth, and so does a time track. You're into vague philosophic mutterings when you
start saying, "What is reality?" What is reality? Oh, my! Boy, you could put on your long white robe and walk all over Greece from one end to the other making a good living almost in any century by just continuing to ask this question in a somewhat deliberative frame of mind, you know? "What is reality?" You know? If you put enough, if you put enough schmaltz in it, you know – [laughter] would have had it.

Well, we have a pretty good idea of what reality is, but it does not really form too much of our technology – descriptions of reality. And we take the shortcut to it and we say reality is what is – you know, what is. Then we shortcut the idea of, well, is it because we're thinking it is or is it because we're not thinking it is? You know, just bypass all that garbage pail full of reasons not to look at reality. Just recognize that it's a not-confront. However it got here, it is! See, it just is. And it's sort of a – do more philosophers out of a living, this sort of a – of a direct approach. I mean, you can't make a living saying, you know, "Reality is."

Well, you say, "Yes, yes, but who made it?" Well, that's not germane. See, the point we're interested in, immediately, is where we are and what we are looking at. You see, that's the main point.

Now, the secondary point is where did it come from, and a tertiary point is what's going to happen to it? But these are all not main points. The main point is we're here and we're looking at it, see? And what we are here before and looking at, Scientologically – just to cut the Gordian knot – is. See, it just is. There isn't any discussion, then, of whether the pc is imagining that he is looking at a brick wall or is he looking at a brick wall? Well, it is. You see? Now, what is it the product of? Well, in the physical universe a brick wall is the product of a bricklayer, a brick maker, the economics of the society – let's take it back step by step – a clay bank, which is part of the planet, which was made and put here. And then we get to a divergence of opinion: Was it put here religiously or by the Galactic Construction Company, you see? But that's actually all the importance it has. It is here. Well, what put it here?

Well, we have another peculiarity as we go along. We – there are some peculiar things which make a Scientologist a Scientologist. And you all fall into this category. You probably don't think of these things very much, but you know that what is, is and – as far as you're concerned – and where it came from is a slightly different question, and that you don't necessarily have to go into these fantastic ramifications, you see? And we also sort of amongst ourselves have agreed that nothing is holy. By which I mean, nothing is proof against being inquired into. That's a very healthy state of mind, man! Because that does not Q-and-A with the unavailability of sections of the time track, don't you see?

And when people have said, "Well, there are certain things you mustn't inquire into," they're just doing a Q and A on the unavailability of existence or is-ness. See, they've just done a Q and A with it.

Now, recognizing all those things, we see then that the time track has remained undiscovered, undescribed, forms absolutely no part whatsoever of modern mental studies, forms no part of the materials of psychiatry, and so forth.

Now, we must ask why. And it's because the thing has tricks of unavailability and the beings who are working in this field do not have a confront sufficient to look past that unavailability. So you have to be just a little bit tougher to be a Scientologist, and that's the way
it is. These guys weren't quite tough enough. They took something – the time track – consisting of matter, energy, space and time, and thought, and said it was all thought. And this of course leaves everything inexplicable. See?

People think they are living in a house.

Well, the bird who is saying this: "These people think they live in a house. Therefore, they are utterly mad because there is no house."

And then people have gone around and made him feel the walls, you know, and said, "Look, there is a house here, you know?"

"Oh, no, no, there's no house."

Do you recognize that's the lockout as far as this research line has gone. Now, what's the reason for that? Well, the time track has a great many tricks by which it becomes unavailable. And the first of these tricks is that "there is nothing in a mind but thought." And recognize that, as that is a trick of debarment. If there's nothing in the mind but thought, anybody who says he's looking at a brick building (in the mind) of course isn't looking at a brick building; it must therefore be imaginary; so therefore he is living in the field of illusion or delusion; so therefore he must be slightly mad.

Now, this line of thought is very productive for appropriations, because I think sixteen billion dollars has just been appropriated in the United States with which to erect some experimental stations – by which they mean, by the way, research and development sections. That means they're going to train some attendants there; that's what they mean by this, that's all. I've read the bills, actually. That's not just a crack; that's what they mean by it.

It's all on this basis: "Well, insane people must be mad because they say they are seeing things." Well of course, this compounds the insanity. Because then the person who is supposed to be treating the insanity says, "No, you are not seeing these things." So he makes the track less available.

So the direction of sanity lies in the capability – the capability – of confronting the time track and the present time environment. And for any individual, for any one individual, existence consists of the physical universe present time – the physical universe present time and everything that is in it at this exact, precise, present time instant – and the time track, which consists of everything that has been. And that is the total is-ness as far as this thing called reality is concerned, see?

Now, you can speculate on what the time track has been, by reason of the state it's in now, but that actually is not an is-ness, you see? What condition is it in? Furthermore, you go around England, you'll see mounds of dirt – furrows on a hillside. You'll see mounds of mossy, overgrown whatnot. You look a little bit closer and you'll see that it's some old fortification. Be a Roman camp or a medieval castle that has long since gone to dust and the socialists, you see? And there it is.

Well, it's a lot of fun, you see? It's a lot of fun to add some significance to this thing, you know, and say, "What has it been?" See? But that is not its is-ness. Now, it's perfectly all right to stand as lo... as a matter of fact it's a wonderful game to stand and look at this pile of
stone and say, "What has it been?" I know I've done some of the most learned, marvelous – absolutely astonished myself by the brilliance with which I could reconstruct out of a single mound of stone the tremendous civilization which went before, you see? And the power of the fellows who erected it, and so forth. I remember one particular time I was so overwhelmed by my own brilliance and learnedness in this particular direction that I hardly heard the farmer at all when he said, "Well, yes, that's the silo we built last year. It fell down." [laughter, laughs]

Now, that is a suppositional reality, see. Tremendously subject to error, but not outlawed for that reason. But recognize its is-ness, which is just suppositional is-ness. It's the is-ness of suppositional is-ness.

Now, every once in a while on the track you've met some fellow in a conical hat who was saying, "Abracadabra, hocus-pocus, if you just gaze into the pot here, I will tell you the future!" Oh, that's great. That's great. Quite a game in itself. It's probably a lot of complexities. But it's suppositional; all futures are suppositional. The odd part of it is that if they – if they're suppositional enough, they come true.

I remember with some shame telling a fortune at a party to some people – I used to tell lots of fortunes. It's very funny, you know. You look at somebody's facsimiles. This is very funny, you know? And you pull a wise face, you know, and you can take a look at the facsimiles and saying, "I see you living in a house which is very close to a railroad track, you see, and there are some tall trees there – some very tall, slender trees – and it's right there at the corner of the roads. And let me see now, let me see, now, don – don – don't – don't interrupt me. It's Acacia Manor. Yes. I see you living at this house."

"Well, that's fantastic! We just went out to look at such a house, today. In fact, we're going to buy it."

Of course, the character wasn't going to buy it till you said he was going to live in it, you know? [laughter, laughs] And as a party trick, one time, I told a couple I saw them both being unfaithful and separating – you know, just dealing the cards out – and they both obediently did. And I felt very ashamed of myself. [laughter, laughs]

The future is always enforceable from altitude and authority, and so forth. You get somebody like Toynbee. He can predict the future, he says, you know? He's got some formula that nobody knows but Toynbee, and he can predict some sort of a future out into the future, and he can tell by that that this, that and the other thing is going to happen. Of course, he's actually found a trick method of making a postulate stick, you see? He's making a postulate stick by saying, "That is the way it is going to be because I can read the future." See, that's just a trick method of making a postulate stick. But it doesn't escape the fact that it's a suppositional reality.

So if you break existence down into is-ness and potential is-ness, you can probably break down this potential into several categories and you could probably make quite an interesting German graph out of this thing, you know? You could extrapolate it out, cover the whole wall before you got through. And you could break this down into numbers, types, categories, subclasses, and then subclasses of subclasses, and then subclasses of subclasses of subclasses of subclasses. Pretty soon nobody would know what you're talking about. So I prefer to leave it at that, you see? There's is-ness and there's suppositional is-ness.
Now, the time track often gives people the feeling that the "was" can return. And they think if they run back just a few hours, years, millennia down the track, they will once more find themselves standing up at the battle of Bennington and getting their head shot off or something of the sort, you see? And this makes them very nervous about going back.

Well, I once saw a line of redcoats and a line of militia standing up, exchanging shells, and for about, oh, I don't know, it must have been the space of a minute or so, they were total 3D in a much greater reality than the physical universe had had to me recently, you see? I mean man, that was solid! That was solid, you know? And I expected these guys... And for a moment, I thought I had returned back down the time track, on the physical universe time track, and found it all there yesterday, don't you see? I didn't realize I was going down my own time track. And good heavens, man! You could smell the mildew in the wigs, you know? And it was – it was all marvelous. And you know, I was all ready to duck from the next volley. Probably it's there so solidly because I didn't duck from the next volley.

But next thing you know, just looking at it, the is-ness of it turned out to be what it was, which was simply the is-ness of my own time track. And at that moment, it fitted itself into perspective. It was an exaggeratedly solid piece of my own time track. More solid and more real because of the awareness jammed into the moment of time, don't you see, than otherwise.

Now, you could mock yourself up futures and so forth. You can do all sorts of things, but again, what you're mocking up is suppositional.

Now, there's one more class that you have to take something of a look at; it's "what is created." And it's this whole business of creating that really tends to rock people, because you see it's half real and half suppositional. And it's the borderline between the two.

Now, it almost depends on the person who says he is going to create something. Well, somebody says he's going to build a building, you know this fellow does build buildings and so forth, well, then you – it's very close to reality, his statement that he is going to build a building. See, it's quite close to reality, because you know he will... build the building. In fact, you can already see the cornerstone, you know, that sort of thing. That's a good reality.

And some guy down in the loony bin, why, he says he's going to plant ten thousand acres of forest, you see? Well, that's hardly even a suppositional reality. You know darn well he's never even going to look at a tree, much less plant a forest. So you know that thing is never going to exist. And it won't ever exist.

And so this matter of suppositional reality and creation come together. But remember that a creation is just a suppositional reality until the moment it is created. At the moment it is created, for whatever period it may endure, it is. See? So it is an is-ness; anything created is an is-ness for whatever period it endures.

Now, all of this is quite pristine pure, from whether it is good for people, bad for people, nice to do, not nice to do, or anything else. These again are adjudications of what is. And that's the opinion of what is, but that's part of the thought of reality.

Now, thought is not separate from reality. Thought is woven solidly into reality and thought is part of the is-ness of reality. For instance, BBC – ITV down here – finally begin-
ning dimly to learn their lessons on programing. And they've conducted, I think it was, a ten-million-dollar-pound test. They went to vast expense to find out who viewed television and what programs they liked. They went into great expense: They built a small studio, they bought a television set (I imagine even paid for it) and hired some children and bought some candy and comic books and got some furniture and put it in there, and then drilled some spy-holes in the wall and turned on canned programs, you see, so the children could watch the programs or talk to each other or eat the candy or read the comic books. And they very carefully noted – I think there's – oh, probably two or three thousand pounds of the appropriation must have been just paper to carry the notes of the reactions of the children at various points of the programs, and so forth. And they finally learned – the final lesson was (and this is why they're going to continue it: they've learned something) – they learned that little children do not like to look at older children's programs and that older children do not like to look at little children's programs. [laughter] And so it was pretty brilliant. And that's why they take your favorite program off every Saturday night, you see, and throw it away. [laughter] See, they've got a long way to go. They've got a long way to go.

Police pull this trick all the time. Every once in a while – around Washington one time, we were doing Union Station – this walk-about process – and were going down to the airport, and so forth, and run it on airplanes and all that sort of thing. We were doing this for quite a while. We found out at the end of about a week that the "Federal Boys Institute" and the Narcotics Division and Interstate Commerce, and so forth, detectives had been hanging back in the wings and behind sofas and chairs and back of pillars – squadrons of these fellows, you know, had just been haunting every Scientologist and his preclear, and so forth. And at the end of the week, why, they finally grabbed one and they had already determined that they were not a new airline that was smuggling dope. I don't know how they determined that. I guess they saw they didn't have any airplanes in their pockets or something.

It never occurred to them to ask anybody. This is the point I'm making, you see? It never occurred to them to establish an is-ness on a situation or to ask anybody, because they couldn't, for some reason or other, view the thought in the is-ness. See? So they're way up around the bend; they can't even view the thought in the is-ness. So don't think that it just goes to a point where people can only view the thought in the is-ness; you can get further than that, where people can't even view the thought in the is-ness, you see, and can't even ask for what thought there is in the is-ness.

Now, there are certain opinions abroad in the world today with which we may or may not agree, but they happen to be part of the is-ness of this world. Now, whether they could be changed, that again is not part of the is-ness. They are. These thoughts are.

Now, the ironmonger who weaves this sign with the curlicues, and so forth, has had a thought when he wove that set of curlicues on this sign, you see? He had a thought when he did it. And you get back and you take a look at this and you're actually looking at iron set in space, you're see it – perceiving it by energy reflected, don't you see, and there is a time that you're looking at it in, you see, and you look at it for a certain period of time – and all of this is-ness goes together. But most people overlook the fact, the curlicues are – the curlicues are in actual fact an expression of thought which is part of the physical universe. So there's a great deal of thought woven into the physical universe that is part of its is-ness. Doesn't have
to be written up, "go here," "go there," "this is a bear," but certainly either the bear making himself a bear, or somebody else making a bear, is expressing the thought of a bear. See, he's using matter, energy, space and time to express the thought of. So that thought is expressed by the formation of matter, energy, space and time, and if we look this over, we'll see that the thought is an integral part of nearly all physical universe put-together. To some degree – to some degree – thought is a part of the physical universe and is part of its is-ness.

So we say the physical universe, then, consists of matter, energy, space, time and thought. And the time track consists of matter, energy, space, time and thought. And just as your broadest classifications, you have now made the simplest statement that can be made concerning a time track or the physical universe. That is the simplest statement that can be made.

Now, we can complicate it; we can complicate it tremendously. We can get the suppositional is-nesses, we can get the befores and afters, you see, we can get the purposes, you see, the additive utilities, and of all things, the aesthetics.

Now, we really go mad when we get into aesthetics, you see? But the devil whispered, "Is it art?" you see? And that devil is always standing alongside the shoulder of every artist or anybody engaged in an artistic pursuit. You see, the little girl doing her sampler, see, and so on, saying, "I think that looks nice. That really looks nice. And I'm going to make it so-and-so, and it's going to look nice." And she gets to look at it, "Yeah, but is it artistic?" you know? "Is it art?"

You see the concert pianist beating his fingertips off at the concert, and you very often are utterly astonished afterwards to find out that he does not consider that this is art. He could do much better or he has done much better or he will do much better. But is he doing better right now? Well, you seldom find that he is ever doing better right now. He's always on some suppositional kick.

Well, the degree that an individual is on a suppositional kick measures directly his confrontingness – his ability to confront. The amount of suppositional is-ness that is added to actual is-ness measures directly the individual's ability to confront.

Now, that's a very involved and complicated statement, because it's almost too broad to embrace. This fellow goes down and he takes a look at this watercolor – down at the art gallery – he takes a look at this watercolor and he says, "He should have..." Well, that "should have" has measured the amount of not-confront he is doing at the – of the watercolor. See? It's quite interesting.

Therefore, you get into this in the area of critical and you speak of people as being high-criticals. "This fellow has a high critical," you say, you know? A very critical pc. Common term amongst auditors: critical pc. Well, it's the degree that he is into suppositional and not into is-ness that is critical. He's not confronting to the degree that he is critical.

You say, "What's happening?"

"Well, it sort of looks here that it might have been..." (that's quite acceptable – all these things are quite acceptable and quite ordinary in auditing) "...but, it sort of looks here – I – there's – I don't know. There's some kind of a wreck out here. I think there has been a wreck." It's quite ordinary to have him then find out that it's not even an airplane in front of him but a building. See, he has said – he's given you the suppositional, see? He hasn't given you the is-ness of it. Well now, the time track straightens out and erases in direct ratio to the amount of is-ness confronted by the pc. And that's how sane and capable somebody gets. It's measured directly by that: the amount of is-ness the individual is capable of confronting.

And he's having as hard a time as he is moving from is-ness to suppositional. Now, in view of the fact that his track is in terrible condition, you have two things at work – you have the pc's own feelings of incompetence and you get the unrecognizableness of the track. And these two things come into combination to make a cat's breakfast.

See, the pc is sure that if he confronts it, something horrible is going to happen. He's sure of this. You know, so he "h-o-u-l-e-aahh" you know, he "auheeaeh-w-w. I don't know whether I want to be processed or not." You see it in the extremity of, the pc doesn't want to report for his session. See, that's merely an expression of, he's moved over into suppositional, to that great degree. See, he supposes that it's not confrontable. He supposes that the auditor is not going to be able to do anything for it. He supposes the auditor won't be able to handle it. He supposes this, he supposes that, you see? Well, all the time he's supposing, he's not confronting.

Now, the pc's come downscale and sort of given up on the idea of being able to confront very much anyhow over a long, long period of time. You can more or less measure this and call it state of morale because it's quite volatile. It will shift with great rapidity.

A thetan's state, you see, is actually not pinned mechanically by anything. It's just where he is and what he is doing, don't you see? It's not really pinned mechanically by anything. You see, he's not made less of a thetan or more of a thetan. But when you surround him as intimately as the time track with a tremendous amount of threat, suppositional unconfonfrontability, he is continuously enforced into a state of low morale. He doesn't think he can do anything. As a matter of fact, he can't! It's part of the is-ness of the situation.

See, he knows what'll happen. He's surrounded by jack-in-the-boxes to a point where he's touched this one time and it's knocked him flat and he's touched that and it's ruined something and he's touched something else and it's blown him down. And his attention is still terribly fixed on something else and he knows he mustn't take his attention off of that. And then he knows also that if he doesn't take his attention off of it, he's going to go to pieces, you see? And then he's forgotten that he has his attention on it.

He's in a frightful state. But you get his feeling of degradation – because of his capability, you see, what he feels it is – but then you've got the actual state of the bank, which is 'orrible! It looks like a bunch of mad theater managers have rushed in and grabbed all of the motion pictures that have ever been shown, you see, and mixed them up with a stick and set fire to them, see? And a thetan standing in the middle of this debris – you see, it hasn't even got a bright flame left in it, you know? And there he is in the middle of this debris and he
knows that if he moves or sparks or does anything, something horrible will occur. And every bit of this has retained in full its command value over him.

Just the fact he's standing in the middle of it, is enough to depress him. But at the same time, it's all the old tin cans he's got. It has value. It's all his knowingness, it's his record files. He's like somebody who has become totally dependent on the record department and then the record department has been bombed. He can't even find out his own name, rank and serial number, don't you see, without the record department.

Well, that dependency and the reason that came about is also included in the record department, so he can't even find that, you see? It's all there and he's gone into a terrible state with regard to all this. It's booby-trapped. It jumps apart. If he puts a beam on it, he sticks.

And he sort of feels funny because there's a hand that vaguely shows out from underneath a black plate and he doesn't know whose hand it was; he doesn't know where it's from; he doesn't know when it happened… [sighs] But he knows he'd better keep an eye on it. [laughter]

And we've used other methods to approach this problem of the time track. Amongst those other methods were exteriorization. "Try not to be three feet back of your head." I don't know how many taxi drivers went out of their heads and their cabs climbed the curb in New York when they pulled that gag over the air, you know? That was pulled over the air and was done quite successfully. "Try not to be three feet back of your head" – over the radio.

And it's all very well and the odd part of it is, the thetan is free. You'll have some fantastic experiences, but you can get a synthetic state – a temporary, momentary state of a thetan which approximates his actual state if he didn't have a bank – by exteriorization. I've exteriorized people – they've lost their stammer, their lumbosis, everything else. The only person I had trouble with when I exteriorized him, it didn't cure his cough. And then we found out he was coughing. Didn't have any chest to cough with, but there he was out there, fifty, sixty feet from the body, coughing.

But that state doesn't last – doesn't last, because the individual is in a state of low morale at the time you do it. And even though you get him away from the bank, you've just taken somebody away from the central control office and made him leave all of his files behind and he sort of thinks that those files can be straightened out and he definitely knows that he must have them in order to know anything and he goes along just so far and then he'll jump or get scared or something will happen, he'll snap back into his head. You can do this to an individual two or three times and then he won't come out anymore. He's very suspicious about it.

Everybody, however, can be made to exteriorize. But you've exteriorized them out of the bank to a marked degree, but of course the bank follows them. You can exteriorize somebody out of a body and then exteriorize him out of his bank. See, just tell him to be three feet back of the mass that he's associated with. "Be three feet back of your head. All right, you've got a black mass there? Oh, all right, that's fine. Be three feet back of the black mass."

The individual gets a foretaste of what it is like not to be pushed in on all sides by these black masses and things, see? But it's a momentary foretaste, because he'll take his at-
attention off what he thinks he should hold his attention on, he'll collapse back into the bank, the bank collapses back into the body and now, he says he doesn't want that experience again. Actually what it does is restimulate dying. This is more or less what he does at death. But he takes the bank with him at death.

Now, the only possessions a thetan has consist of this bank. He really doesn't own anything else at a moment of death on this planet due to the laws of inheritance and other mechanisms. Various times on the track a thetan has tried very hard to straighten this up – when you died, you didn't lose everything, see? And it has been more often true on the track that you didn't lose everything than it has been that you did. But – so a thetan is actually conditioned into this and he considers it a considerable deprivation. So he very – makes very sure he keeps that bank very close to him, because it's the only possession he knows he can hold onto. Yet it's in terrible state and he doesn't want it in that kind of state. It's really no use to him, but he hopes it will be of use to him, and he couldn't get away from it anyhow.

Well, the approach of exteriorization is frankly a failure. You can do remarkable things exteriorizing people, but it is a failure. You better know something about exteriorization; it'll always help out an old buddy who's just been knocked down by a freight train or something of the sort, and there he lays gasping his last. Well, tell him to be three feet back of his head, you know, and go on his way.

Various exteriorizations: Some guy is in perfectly good shape and he's just accidentally fallen off the bridge and drowned. And they're working on him with Pulmators and he doesn't start breathing again. If you happen to be around and he hasn't been dead very long – he doesn't smell yet – just say to him "Hey!" [whistles] "There's nothing wrong with the body, pick it up!" All of a sudden the chest... [pants] [laughter] It's quite remarkable. It's part of the mechanics of existence.

But as far as a solid processing mechanism, it doesn't exist as practical processing. It's more of, this is a piece of the is-ness of existence. Thetans do this kind of thing; you can do this kind of things with thetans. And once upon a time, every time you lost a body on Erxes, you went and picked up a new one on – at home base, you know? You're always going back and picking up your body – picking up a new body. You didn't necessarily lose your identity. You'd be surprised the research... the searching security regulations which sometimes would be stressed home on somebody picking up a new body. You didn't want enemy troops in there picking up one of your own uniform bodies. And the security: "What's your name? Oh? You know Joe? What's the name of the bar at Yakkung crossroads? What's the name of the bar? What's the name of the bartender?" You say you come from there, "What's the name of the bartender? What's his favorite joke?" "Ah! Have this man shot!" [laughter, laughs]

In fact it's quite unusual – and one of the reasons why you rebel against it and people are very anxious and willing to be processed – it is very, very unusual for a person to totally forget his identity just by reason of death, and you haven't been doing it very long. You don't lose your whole identity and everything you've ever been just because you kicked the bucket. So the way it's going now, thought is passing out of everything, and the identity passes out and the thetan not only loses his physical universe possessions by reason of death but he also
loses his identity by reason of death. And he doesn't like this. He thinks this is a can't-have-
no-have proposition. He is not in favor of this at all.

And therefore, he tends to pull even more tightly on the time track. You see, you've
denied him a new record, so he's grabbed this record, see?

Well, every time somebody wanted to get even with him on the whole track, some-
body booby-trapped the record; somebody threw a bomb into the file room. That was the way
it was done.

You go down here to the loony bin and you can find people around there and they're
screaming about being jumped by demons and there's a great bird that comes every night and
perches on the bottom of the bed and pecks at him. Psychiatrist strokes his beard: "This man's
insane."

"Why is he insane?"

"He sees a bird."

That's the end of it. If he sees, he's insane. Now what kind of a record... approach is
this? This is just a further denial of record, isn't it? That's the way you really make them spin.
"Oh, you got a bird that comes and sees you every night? Ah-ha. Good."

Scientologist would have an entirely different approach. He'd probably tell his buddy,
"Christ, what dub-in, you know?" [laughter] So he says to the guy, "Yeah, yeah? What kind
of a bird is it?" And he finds out more about this bird. He's liable to find a honey of a series of
incidents of some kind or another. But the trouble is, if you approach them from that bird,
you're liable to go straight into one of the doggonedest, awfullest messes of raarrr that any-
body had anything to do with. You've pulled him right into the middle of it. He'll eventually
collide with this bird in processing. It's not necessarily the start of his processing, however.
And you certainly don't invalidate the bird. That's the last thing you better do, because what-
ever it is, it is. He saw it, so it is.

Now, we don't care whether other people agree that it is, or they don't agree that it is.
That's all whether or not we agree to reality, which is another method of making a quick buck
walking up and down the land with a conical hat. That's philosophic balderdash.

I mean, the more – the more you can keep off of these wild byroads, you see? "Well, is
reality really something that everybody agrees to? It isn't, because there are people around
who don't necessarily agree to the reality. So therefore, it couldn't be that it really isn't real."
Well, that's just a method of making it unreal for somebody else, isn't it?

Reality is a miracle that it is mutual in the physical universe. That's the miracle. It's
fantastic that it is a mutual reality. And that is the biggest proof of its is-ness: its mutual real-
ity.

Now, the funny part of it is, banks have a mutuality. They are not necessarily all dif-
f erent. Because the tricks that have been used to wreck the file room have not been very
many. And those that were really capable of messing up the film and bending all the reels up
and bashing the cans in had to be pretty heroic. It really took some doing. It really took some
doing. And the technology which you have, I don't care whether you're listing for items, run-
ning valences, doing an assist – I don't care what you're doing – you're handling the time track, or a piece or a portion of the time track. And you have never escaped this fact. Because it is the only tried and true approach to sanity and to recovered ability, is straighten out the guy's time track.

We have approached it in many ways; we have tried to find out who is mocking up this time track. Well, obviously the thetan is mocking it up. But that's again a suppositional reality. We can use mock-up processing; we can take over the automaticity of the creation of this track. The thing wrong with it is, is he can't find out about it, and it really gives him no opportunity to confront it. The confront factor is dropped to a marked degree by this create approach.

You say, well, let's take over the automaticity of his creation of the bank, all of a sudden he hasn't got a bank, therefore he's Clear. Well, that's a very good theory. There's nothing wrong with it at all. All I can say is that after many years of hard tries, why, we have never been able to make it satisfactorily and uniformly work. As far as I'm concerned, it's a locked road – barriered. The trick that barriers it is that when you get the individual to create, he very often strikes the button – and oddly enough, there is a goal "to create" in this GPM we're handling – and he'll hit buttons like that, and all of a sudden he goes into – the bank goes into obsessive create and it practically crushes the individual. Everything beefs up, gets hard, uh-rrr-aurghh! And it happens so often and so frequently that Creative Processing had limited usages. It was useful, but its usages are limited and it does not result in Clears who will stay Clear and we're interested in that.

So it all comes back to the fact that those processes which effectively handle, straighten out the time track, put something there to confront – that is to say untangle it enough so that it can be confronted – raise the morale… Remember, this is – this is an adjunct to this; it isn't enough just to straighten up the track. You've got a pc there, too, you know, and if you lower his morale too much while straightening up his track, why, track doesn't straighten up. You understand? Because you're actually not raising the thetan's confront at the same time. That's for… our processing has got to be rather delicate.

And the only thing we get into is just this: his suppositional is-ness is so great because his confront is so low in this particular zone or area. After all, look how low it must be. All the "great savants" of the field of the mind never even suspected this track, except Freud. And he said that the body contained some sort of a record or blueprint of its immediate past. Freud did say this: the body contained some such thing. I consider it very interesting. He never went ahead and explored it. And he went into the suppositional reality that it made everybody barbarians and very vicious people to have this. What his conclusions are I'm not entitled to say, because I have not studied his conclusions because they again are a suppositional reality. I can only tell you that he did, however, remark that there was such a thing.

And back about 1914, 15, there was some chap back there who remarked on the fact that there was such a thing as an engram – that a moment of unconsciousness was recorded all the way through. It's a very small portion of a book, printed back then. I heard about it about 51, something like that.
Guys trace on this and they get the hell out of there. They don't want anything more to do with this, see? They trip over some corner of this thing, and then they say, well, *da-da-da...* It's the two-dimensional worm trying to describe a three-dimension. And the third dimension, it's *um-wah-mm.* Everything's flat! We know that! And yet here's this pole. Occasionally they'll say, "Well, we... you run into something if you go across that particular side of the two-dimensional plate. You bump your head." And most of them say, "Well, it's impossible to bump your head, because there are only two dimensions." And then they say, "Well, then there's nothing there." It doesn't occur to most of them to say there might be three dimensions. In such a way, why, that is-ness gets blocked out and barred out.

We should examine how it does, because it's a very simple answer. How does the existence of the time track get completely wiped away? Why do the great savants never remark on this particular piece of property which can be found in every and any human being, and the handling of which is the only road that we can discover, or that ever has been discovered, which straightens the person out? What is this? Why is it?

It's the same reason that you sometimes have trouble in an auditing session. These things are in two divisions. There are two things here. One is the suppositional reality of the pc sometimes presses him forward – of course, we're... I'm now not talking about the reasons he can't see the track; that's pretty obvious, the unavailabilities and the tricks of it, and so on. No, I'm talking about the pc who is sitting in front of you – his suppositional reality is very low but very great. You see, it supposes; his "I guesses" about the track are terribly thin. And if you don't develop those things along a very smooth line and very smoothly – you know, he supposes he has a black mass in front of his face, you see? He doesn't see the black mass. Actually, all you've got to do – not make the track more solid for him, but just keep going around in the area and take what the pc says, you see, and keep working with it and this thing will start to unravel and the pc will come up and you'll find less and less supposition. He says after a while, "There *is* a black mass in front of my face." Don't you see?

Well, the principal barrier that you get if you're inexperienced in this line is that you suppose, if the pc is so vague, that you can't get anything. You take it that the pc doesn't know what's there, then you won't be able to find out what's there. You don't recognize that he is just so far down on suppositional is-ness that he is not approaching is-ness. Whatever the tricks of auditing are and how you audit engrams, it is the process of familiarization – gradient scale. You've got to raise the morale of the pc with regard to it and raise the available thing to confront. And familiarization with it and running it, and so forth, tends to unravel the track and stretch it out and make it available to him and his morale comes up at the same time and you get to an is-ness. And you don't recognize that it's all a gradient – all a gradient from can't to can. See, it's just a gradient. Pc says, "Oh, I don't know anything about this. I never heard of such balderdash. Ron says there's an incident here of some kind or another and I never heard of such a thing." It's horrible for him to say such a thing.

Very shortly afterwards, he starts to look. After all, he's been given a little piece of data, something to look at and he looks – by golly it's there, you know? And he says, "Hey! You know? Ha-ha!" You know, it makes him feel better. He can see it and it is there to be seen. He looks at it a little bit more, there's more there to be seen now, you see? And then he
feels better about seeing and there's now more to be seen because you've gone over and developed the track.

You see, it's at once a problem of getting a viewer and a stack of pictures together. You see, you've got to get the viewer so he can see the pictures. You see, that's your Auditor's Code and morale of a pc and all that sort of thing, and coaxing him along and giving him the right orders, you see – that's for the pc. And then you go over the technology of arranging the pictures. And the way you arrange them is just stroke them. That's all. Just stroke them enough times and stroke the right picture and you say, "There, that's a nice picture. Yeah, that's a nice picture. Yeah, get that one all fixed." All of a sudden the pc says, "My God, there's my bird!"

You say, "Yeah? What do you know!"

"Yeah," he says, "yeah, that's familiar, that bird. There he is. Tsk, tsk. That's pretty good. Let's find out some more about this," see?

Well, if you've done it smoothly, then the pc's morale is up so he can look, and if you've handled the bank right, why, that's been rubbed up so that it can be looked at. It's this gradient approach – it's barred out by the fact that it's terribly simple; there really isn't anything very involved about it. And that's one of the things that makes me impatient in teaching people how to run engram, is they always want to know the command with which you run an engram. I don't know! Give me a command for petting a cat, I mean… [laughs] All the rules of auditing have to be obeyed, and so forth, and it gets to look pretty complicated after a while, but it isn't complicated. You're running a Touch Assist on a picture.

Of course, your pc can't touch the picture and feels that you won't let him touch the picture – he's going to have an awful hard time touching it. And then if you don't give him the right picture to touch, of course he can't touch that. And one of the big boons you have in technology is, I've been finding out what pictures can be touched, which then produce a tremendous resurge and start untangling this track, by finding out what are the principal things – two things found out: What are the principal things that have the track snarled? And which of them can be touched? See, there's two problems there. You see, what is snarled and what do you touch to unsnarl it? See, those are two distinctly different problems.

The auditor tends to Q-and-A to some slight degree with the fact that an engram contains pain (and he doesn't want to inflict pain on the pc, of course) and contains unconsciousness (and of course, you can't see anything when you're unconscious). So all the great savants of all history have simply Qed-and-Aed with the pain of the engram and on the time track and unconsciousness. And they've simply remained unconscious of it – unwilling to approach its pain and of Qing-and-Aing with its unconsciousness. And that's why they have never said, since time immemorial, every being has a time track. It's just as – just as elementary a piece of nonsense as that. They say, "Well, you can't see it and you can't do anything with it and there's really only thought in the head anyway." And there's lots of ways they approach this thing, but they're actually just doing a Q and A. The thing is unavailable to the being, so the savant supposes it is unavailable to him, don't you see? He doesn't want to have anything to do with that pain, so he leaves it alone, and because there's unconsciousness in it, he remains unconscious of it. And I'm afraid the problem is no more complicated than that.
But the auditor mustn't fall for this, see? In the first place, I don't think a thetan can go unconscious. I don't think there is a level at which you could say absolute unconsciousness takes place. It's quite interesting. You run somebody through an engram where he knew he was unconscious all the way through the engram and he doesn't remember what happened in the incident. Well, that doesn't mean he was unconscious in the incident. Just means he can't remember what happened in the incident. He might have been conscious all the way through. And you start running this thing through as an engram and all of a sudden he finds out during those moments of unconsciousness he was conscious of things going on. The only real tragedy of life, I suppose, is that absolute unconsciousness and absolute unknowingness are unobtainable.

Well, the auditor must realize that there is no slightest portion of that time track that isn't available. And he should go into no "I-don't-know-anything-about-it" simply because the thetan he's auditing, of course, doesn't know anything about it. This is the expected state. He'd be a Clear if he knew all about it! Well, you – then you're saying, "Well, I can't audit him because he doesn't know anything about it." You're saying, "Well, when he gets to be Clear, I'll give him a session." [laughs] It's all by gradients.

There's a great deal of technical information about this. There's reasons he can't view the track and the reasons the track is unavailable to him are very mechanical. I don't think you would be very excited about viewing a door that every time you walked up to the door it crashed open and broke your nose. I think after a while you would get out of the habit of walking up to this door. And after a while you would say, "That door doesn't even exist. I'm not even going to go in that part of the room." Because the violence that is contained on the time track cannot be, again, underestimated. Boy, it's there! It's there. It's violent. And you can hit portions of the time track that'll kick a pc right out of his head if you forced him into them. Bow! It's a sledgehammer proposition.

Let's take a second-series-goal GPM and let's force the pc into the top oppterm and then keep hammering and pounding the pc from the top oppterm down with the wrong pattern. Give you the shudders yet?

What makes it gruesome? It isn't that the auditor is pushing the pc; he's not doing anything to the pc that's very bad. What's doing the pushing is the bank. It's solid and tough at that point. Well, the magic of it is, is if you get the earliest moment of the earliest GPM, it runs like hot butter. It runs like nothing. Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow.

Do you realize there's just as much charge on it as there was the later one? See, as a bank, there's just as much charge on that bank as there was on the later bank. I consider this quite interesting. You can't run the later one, you can run the earlier one. Why? When you're running the later one you're trying to run that and all the banks that come before it. The pc can confront one bank, you're asking him to confront twenty. You're asking him to stomp right into the charge of twenty banks. He can't do it, so he gets a big lose. So if he says, "Look," he

---

13 Editor's note: refers to the Helatrobus implant or "Heaven implant" which according to the findings LRH made a short time before this lecture was given in two series.
says, "I can't confront the bank. Look, the bank is too tough for me." Therefore, it's important not to give him loses early on.

There's various approaches of this kind. This is all technical know-how. This know-how is very simple know-how. It's not very difficult know-how. You go into too much suppositional and you have trouble. But I'll tell you that an auditor has success in auditing if he has a good idea of the mechanics of engrams and the time track, if he kind of knows what this is all about. The next thing you know, why, he's in there sailing. Somebody else keeps asking for a rote command. They say, "Give me a rote command. Do you say, 'The somatic strip will return [snaps fingers]' or do you say, '[snaps fingers] The somatic strip will return,' or do you say, [snaps fingers twice]? Just exactly how do you say this?" I'll show you a person that doesn't know the mechanics of what he's handling.

Somebody gives a double command. This is the most serious thing in engram running, it confuses the living daylights out of the pc. It's almost impossible not to give a false command at one time or another because you're right on there. And to give a wrong command, you find out about it before the pc has a chance to get snarled up with it, that's the only sin, is not to catch it.

For instance, the demonstration which you had, I told the pc to go to the point where the pc was, just one time? It confused him. Well, that's not very serious. I immediately remedied the thing and he got it all straightened out and there we went and see, we were on our way. What if I'd said to him, "Go to the beginning of the incident when you go to the end of the incident because the beginning of the incident is the place where we don't start," and then gotten provoked with him because he didn't execute the auditing command? Well, I certainly wouldn't have known very much about the bank to do something like that.

But you wouldn't make a mistake like this – this is a gross error: You say to the pc, "Go to the beginning of the incident where the birds are." He doesn't know the mechanics and behavior of an engram, see? Well, what's wrong with the command? It seems like a perfectly innocent command. You see, this is a mistake almost anybody would make. Yeah, but the beginning of the incident was where the birds are. That was the beginning of the incident a half an hour ago. So the auditor thinks that while he handles an engram nothing happens. See, he thinks nothing ever changes. Well, why is he auditing the pc if he's never going to get any change, see? Well, he thinks nothing is ever going to change. So he thinks the birds are going to be the beginning of this incident from here on out. Well, the birds are never the beginning of the incident, even the second time.

So you say, "Go to the beginning of the incident," and you suddenly make this command, "Go to the beginning of the incident where the birds are. Go to the birds. Go to the beginning of the incident." And you ask the pc, "What's the matter? What's the matter with you?"

"What – what do you want me to do? Do you want me to go to the beginning of the incident or go to where the birds are?"

And the pc is all fogged up and he can't give you the data very good and he just neglected to tell you that there is an incident the day before the birds arrived, when there was an edict that you mustn't shoot any birds issued. And he's just discovered this and may even have
mentioned it, but you didn't get its time. And you didn't realize that was the day before. That is now the beginning of the incident.

So you've told him to go twenty-four hours deep in the incident while going to the beginning of the incident, don't you see? And he gets very, very confused. You got things like through and to. You wouldn't think that through and to would make this much difference. You say, "Move to the moment of the birds. All right, now move to the period three days later." And you say, "All right, now what happened as you went through the engram?"

The pc says, "What engram? Moved… What – what are you talking about?"

"What happened as you went through the engram?"

"I didn't go through the engram."

"Well now, all right, you didn't follow the auditing command. Ha-ha! [laughter] Guess I'll clobber him," see?

The bank follows the hop-hop-jump, you-think-you're-there-and-you're-there system of the thetan, see? You moved to the end. Well all right, you're at the end, see? You're at the beginning, you're at the end; there's nothing in between. So when you're scouting, you always use to and when you're running an engram, you always use through. It's little, simple points like this.

Actually, to some degree, it is my fault for not having made these things as brilliantly and shiningly clear as I might have, some time or another. But as I say, the subject was never summated. I frankly didn't ever think we'd need it again – just per se running an engram.

Now, I found out that it makes it tremendously easier to run the bank and that on a very few pcs you will be unable to run the bank unless you get an early engramic incident out of the road.

And I also found out that if you can run the overt engram that relates to these GPMs just as an engram, that a fantastic amount of charge will come off the implants themselves, naturally, and therefore they run like – very much like hot butter.

I had a little bulletin for you. Found a datum here you might be interested in. That particular outfit was down toward the center of this particular galaxy and was founded at 52 trillion, 863 billion, 10 million, 654 thousand, 79 years, and I can't give you a much closer than that, because when places get founded is – more or less becomes part of their lies. But it was founded a that time, and it was destroyed on the date 38 million – 38 trillion, 932 billion, 690 million, 862, 933 years ago, by the 79th wing of the 43rd battle squadron of the galactic fleet.

It was not the – part of the galaxy. It was a wildcat activity sitting there. They used to drag Magellanic clouds out of the center hub of the galaxy, let them follow the lines of force and just let them come over a system. Then when they got around to it, they'd send planes in with speakers, and so forth, and give the place the business. But the place very often was totally caved in for thousands of years by these Magellanic radioactive clouds which would just engulf the particular system. You got the idea? I just give you that in brief, just as a matter of interest, because I don't think – I've now got good data on the dates – these dates we're getting...
are accurate. I have now compared them up the track and squared them around. These are the dates.

Now, you're not likely to find any implant earlier than or even near 52 trillion and you're certainly not going to find an implant closer to present time than 38.9 trillion. And if you find any other kind of an implant, you're probably looking at a different kind of implant or somebody dramatizing it someplace else, so it'll be a subgrade proposition.

So that is the span and period of these particular things. I gave you this second date, 38 trillion, because actually that was quite a battle group that went in to clean up this particular activity. You might have been part of it. Makes a very lovely overt engram that keyed you in like crazy.

But that was not part of the galactic government. They were a bunch of guys that had the dream of everybody in the universe being good. And they are the people who used the Ice Cube. And you've all run into the Ice Cube. We often wondered who was the author of this sort of thing. Well, the Ice Cube was used by these people; I don't say that they authored it. And therefore, you get all this beach scenery and so forth, for people on this planet that came up through the Ice Cube, see, as well as other methods.

But I just thought I'd give you those dates because they are of some small interest, and that isn't going on now. There is something going on now or you wouldn't be here and you wouldn't have governments on this planet the way you have them, as lousy as this. But that's a horse of another hue and has nothing very much aberrative connected with it in comparison to the magnitude and so forth. This is the one that really keyed in the people's time track.

But there's one thing that I'd like to point out to you. In finding the original incident on the thing, a basic on a chain is the basic on a chain. See, it's not what I say it is or what you say it is or we hope it is, see? The basic on the chain, then, that you're looking for very often may sail back into God-'elp-us. And I found a basic on this chain last night which was of great interest to me. It was simply an assassination attempt of a radioactive bomb thrown in a carriage. That's the basic implant chain. See, you move the pc – the rule – you move the pc back before, back before, back before, to where he doesn't have any somatics, heh-heh-heh-heh, to what didn't have any part of these people at all, but that one got keyed in. That became basic on the chain. Got the idea?

If you're lucky, it'll simply be the first time they saw these Magellanic clouds come in over the planet and somebody made an unsuccessful attempt to pick them up or something like this. Something of that sort. And you run that, you get the pc ahead of this and he's got no somatics. All right, you run him into it and you find your first incident. Don't be surprised if your first incident expands earlier, don't you see? But if you run into it, you get your first incident out of the road, the rest of it runs relatively easily. But don't be too amazed if the first incident is actually not on the same chain but has become terribly interlocked with the chain and you can't do anything else until you do it.

I believe somebody was running that last night. And he finally got to some kind of an incident that didn't apparently have any relationship to this at all. Apparently had no – nothing to do with it. See? But it was some sort of a beam or blast in the face that left the fellow with
a hanging somatic of some kind or another that then connected up into the implant chain and away we go, see?

Well, the good news I have for you is just that these guys aren't around. But the point I'm really making is that your individual address to the problem of engram running, if it's giving you any trouble at all – the blame is partially that I never made a summation of engram running, and the only difficulties you're having is just lack of appreciation of exactly what it is you're handling. It is not a matter of the rote command; it's a matter of understanding exactly what is this thing called a time track, exactly what are you handling in the individual and exactly what keeps you from handling it and permits you to handle it. And you get that taped, why, all of this becomes very, very easy.

Don't blame yourself too hard. Along about 1958, 59 or something, I should have sat down and said, "Well, let's see, what's everything we know about engram running?" Well, I didn't bother to do so, because I didn't think we'd ever be running them again.

It's with great delight now that I find out we know far more about engram running than has ever been published, just by basis of summation, actually summatable in a very few pages.

Okay? Thank you very much.
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Thank you. People of Earth, we come in peace. [laughter] We bring a plowshare, not a sword.

But we won't use any clouds to spread the message. Oh, I see you characters haven't been really up to the front of the track yet. All those Helatrobus Implants of course came out of clouds originally, you know.

And this is the 21st of Mayo, AD 13, Galactic ye... well that's beside the point.

You don't look to me like you've been making the progress you ought to; you just don't look to me like you've been making the progress. But possibly if you'd taken a retread in the Keokuk Central Office, maybe you would have made better progress.

An interesting problem has presented itself, and so forth: Every once in a while an industrious D of T will treat an HPA like some body in a co-audit, you know, and give them all the latest tapes and materials and just overwhelm them but good, you see, and never teach them how to audit. And would you like to be handling the material you are handling without knowing how to audit? Be rough, wouldn't it? Well, the degree that we don't make good auditors and the degree that we can't give Saint Hill training to as many as possible, we are actually holding back Scientology.

You're in just a little bit of a breathing space right at the present instant. This is just a little bit of a breathing space.

I was playing tag with the atomic war and the enthusiasm with which certain misguided degraders wish to launch off the bomb and all of this sort of thing, actually stood across our track rather hard and it caused a tremendous acceleration in research which ordinarily would have been plotted out across a much longer space of time and gives us something of an emergency characteristic on this, because we've still got to beat this line. We've still got to beat this, and these characters don't know what they're doing. I can imagine them now, you know, saying – saying, "Well, to be happy or not to be happy. You know, I – I don't know.

I can see Kennedy walking around now. "Well, is it really the beginning of heaven or the end of heaven?" You see, and so on. He's going over and see the Pope. And there's the Pope sitting there, and so forth, and he's got an electronic that is cutting his guts out, you know, and he's saying, "Bless you, my uhh – son, bless you, my son." You know? A wild...
game going on and these are the characters who are telling you whether or not you can launch a bomb or not launch a bomb. You see?

So there's no good sense involved in any of this and it's sort of in the cards and we're winning, we're winning hands down. Now, our technological advance at this particular time is sweeping on much faster than I can give you all of the fine bits of, so that I can give you the technology and the way you arrive at the technology.

And this is the best that I can do. Now we've long talked about Clears and so forth, and that's fine. There is nothing wrong with that, and there are Clears and so forth. And we can make Clears by our own definition and as far as the public is concerned, why, this is a very interesting advance. And as Peter once told me, he says, "Man," he says, "but I need this" he says, "to interest people out in the public. Don't go knocking out this grade of Clear." See?

Well, he's perfectly right, see, perfectly right. But in actual fact the state of Clear is not only attainable but is being attained today here and there without any – hardly any remark at all.

Now, for instance, in the last eight and a half hours of auditing I've found three goals and run three banks on a pc. Three complete GPMs. Well, this is a – this is rather a dizzy rate of speed. Don't you see? All right. Now, you haven't got any time to celebrate. That's what's wrong with that. [laughter] You're achieving these things and there's no chance to – to state to the pc, "Now you have to break out the champagne," you see, because it usually happens in the middle of session; by the middle of the next session, or the end of the session he's already gone beyond it. You're achieving these various points.

Now, if you're achieving this now, you might be quite interested in the fact that states of beingness undreamed of before exist immediately before you. They're in your very immediate future. Before Christmas, probably, if you keep your nose to the grindstone and keep your case going. You're – you're right there.

Now, the technological win is tremendous and there are only about five percent of the cases you're going to run into that are going to give you a bit of a thetan ache because they don't have what I choose to call now, because it was the nation or small government that did these things – Helatrobus – not to be confused with Helatrobe. Helatrobe is the Galactic Confederation. It's Helatrobus. Call these things the Helatrobus Implants for lack of a better designation because 43 trillion isn't accurate for all cases, don't you see, and that sort of thing. You can't give it by a time date and there is no reason to keep calling it by a time date. Let's call it by something that was less well known, but that we can identify. Call them the Helatrobus Implants and it tells you these are the implants which begin with the electronic clouds over planets and – and the dichotomy, plus and minus, and so forth, and sweep on through in a certain series. And people have been through them once, twice, three, four times and they have – we have the patterns of the first series very accurately. We'll shortly have the patterns of the second series.

All that makes very easy auditing. We even have a technique that handles this now: 3N, which has just been released and that's the same pattern that you've been using, speeded up a bit. And there's even a shortened version of that which you will need very soon.
You need this – you'll go right on needing this from here on out with a pc. You'll need what's called 3N, but 3N has to be shortened after a pc has gone for three or four banks because the pc's running too fast. And for instance, I've gotten a pc up to a point of the RI blows on statement. This pc has been very carefully textbook audited and is now blowing on statement.

There's no – you call it back and it doesn't even flick, so you have to say, "That rocket read." See, "It – that rocket read." But why? Because, well, it rocket read when they said it, but you haven't even got a tail on the rocket read a lot of the time. You've got the accelerated start. But instead of a tail on it, you've got a blowdown. See, the thing doesn't have a chance to do a complete rocket read; it disintegrates.

It does an accelerated beginning; goes like mad, the tone arm moves down, pc says, "Fine." You read the thing back and it's quiet as a mouse. You can't get a tick out of this thing. You haven't even opposed it yet and you can't even get a tick out of it.

All right. Well that, of course – after a while when a pc's doing this, it's a waste of time to read the RI back to him, so you get 3N-2 which is an abbreviated form of 3N, just like 3N is an abbreviated form of 3M-2, don't you see? But you won't be using 3M-2 on these implants because the other is too easy.

Now, what can you cut out? Well, I just leave it up to you. What can you cut out? Because your job – let me tell you this very straight from the shoulder – your job is to make sure that the charge is blown out of that RI and that is your job as an auditor.

And let me – let me put a bug in your ear right now, don't you let any pc talk you out, with ARC breaks or anything else, out of getting that charge off. You understand? Because the pc will natter, the pc will yap, the pc will this and will that about your reading it a second time, how you're cross-checking or doing anything like that. Because you can do these things without losing too much speed, but the pc starts suppressing his cognitions in order to make speed, you see. Suppressing this, suppressing that and all of a sudden you've got a little fluky RR that goes *flick-pow*, and you see it stop. It's – it's a choked down. Pc's suppressing almost as fast as he's giving it to you. And you say the pc is very nattery and the pc is this way and that way, and therefore you mustn't go in and clean that up. Well, you've been defeated as an auditor the moment you make that conclusion. You got it?

Let the pc yap because your payoff – your payoff comes in the next two or three GPMs and if you've done that well in the first that you're running, then your blows through the second are easier, the third, the fourth GPM, and you're just flying by enunciation and recognition. You understand?

And you'll be running maybe a GPM every forty-five minutes of auditing time. You got that now?

Now, all you have to do is get a "Nelson eye" on the E-Meter – a Britishism. He put the telescope to his blind eye. They told him to withdraw, you see, and he said he didn't see anything. There is where your danger lies because this thing chokes; you didn't get a nice RR. You say, "Well, I'll let it go, because the pc is running so well and this pc gets so nattery and ARC breaky every time I stop him," and reason, reason, reason, reason, reason.
Now you're – just made tremendous quantities of work for yourself. Every time you strike that item again in the next bank you're going to find out that you didn't clear the charge of it in this bank. Not only are the next few RIs going to be impeded but that item in the next bank comparably is going to be badly impeded and you are going to stack the case up. You hear me?

Now ARC breaks won't stack the case up, but unblown RIs will. And it's your job as an auditor to get that charge off. And that's your job, and don't let any pc talk you out of it. See, you've got two choices on running these days. You've got two choices that you can make, and one of them is wrong. And that is have the pc always happy and cheerful and the other is have the charge gone. And you just forget about that first choice. Because how anybody could run the Helatrobus Implants and be happy and cheerful, I don't know.

Oddly enough, after a while they will be happy and cheerful but only if you get the charge off early on, so nag them all you want to.

Now, you can nag them to a point where the charge won't blow. See where your judgment lies? You can get them so upset and so enturbulated and so jumped up that the charge won't blow. You've gone the wrong direction, don't you see? But then that was a necessary thing. You're making mistakes then in order to do this.

You get yourself a good clean RR that's disintegrating at the end and it's blowing. It's obviously going. This RR is going to be gone and you read it back and you read it back and then you say, "Well, it didn't RR again."

And you read it back. And you say, "Are you doing anything? Thinking about anything? It didn't read. I'll read it again, 'Wantably fantastic.' It didn't read that time. What's the matter?"

And next thing you know the pc is saying, "What's hap – ? Whaaawhi – where am I going?" you see. Well, you made a mistake.

The place to really get skilled is to recognize the quality of RRs. Now some HPA thinks, "Well, I'm doing pretty good; I've learned what an RR is." You take off from there. You get pretty good and learn what a choked RR is and what a disintegrating RR is, and then you'll be in business.

You get some RRs; you could actually see the pc suppress them as they happen. For a moment there you can see that RR stop. And you can say to the pc, "What happened?"

Pc says, "Well, it wasn't much, I – well, I just had a little cognition." For interest of speed of run, they start suppressing their cognitions. Almost fatal. Don't you see? And you say, "That's fine. Thank you," call the item again and by golly there'll be the full RR. See? You have to learn to interpret an RR. There is nothing anybody can do to help you really, beyond you finding out what one is. These wide, loose disintegrating RRs speed rapidly at the beginning. If you don't get the instant spurt at the beginning, you'll never see it as an RR because it hasn't got any RR on the end. It's disintegrated already. You see an RR as it goes over, has a hook tail, and many an auditor gets so educated into recognizing an RR by its hooked tail that when he gets to a disintegrating RR he sees no hooked tail but he missed the spurt beginning.
Now of course, the meter is already in motion at the time that the auditor starts to interpret it. You see, he's used to having his attention caught by the fact that the thing is moving. He gets his attention... so he says, "If it – needle starts moving then I should look at it and see if it's an RR." Well, of course then he only sees the end of it and it looks like a fall. Ah, but it had a spurt beginning. He's looked at a disintegrated RR. The thing has disintegrated before it's gone. See, that thing has blown. It's blown completely. There's nothing – no smoke left on it.

You call this thing again and it doesn't fire at all. And you say, "Well, I must have the wrong item. Let's random list for forty-five minutes." Oh, hell's bells, you could run a whole bank in forty-five minutes. It's nonsense, you see? Why? That's because the auditor doesn't have his attention on the meter to catch the beginning spurt.

See, an RR is characterized by a spurted accelerated beginning which is... gives it its name. It looks like something taking off – you know, like being shot – shot away from its start. It's a spurting beginning. It goes *psshh*, see. And then its other characteristic is a curled end. After it gets passed over here, it go *khihh!* And an RR is always characterized by these two things. Beginning goes *psshh*, and the end go *slhhp*. All right, the disintegrating RR doesn't go *slhhp*, it only goes *psshht*.

All right, so if you have to have your attention caught by the meter already being in motion, you miss the beginning spurt so you don't know if you've got an RR or a fall. Then you'll see an RR start off beautifully. You can gauge the speed of an RR, of how far it will run, by just watching it. You can get used to that. And it starts off beautifully, it goes *psshht*, and it – it didn't go anywhere. That's a choked RR. And there's a suppress, or a cognition suppressed, or the pc has done something there. Pc has suddenly wondered if it was "covitiviwi-wibibly" or something, see – halfway through having said it. Something has happened here. And that RR isn't blown and it won't blow until you ask the pc what happened and get rid of that suppress and then the pc says, "Well," the pc says, "Well, I was so-and-so, and so-and-so, and I thought it might be because there's two here on the sheet and so forth, and I thought it might be and therefore so-and-so."

And you say, "All right. Now, I'm going to say the item again. 'Inevitable catsfish,' 'inevitable catsfish.' All right. That rocket read." And it will. It rocket read beautifully. Where was the charge? The charge is insisted on. You must realize that these RIs don't have any more charge on them than you see on the meter. Just mark that down. This meter is not indicating the presence of charge. The rocket read doesn't tell you that there is some charge someplace. Just do a total associate. See? The rocket read is the charge. All the charge that is going to come off of that thing is seen in and has velocity in that rocket read. That is the charge. Now, you could be very pedantic and say, "Well, actually the thetan in the facsimile is subjected to certain impulses which causes him to impulsify and the 7.5 volt or 9 volt current which is being passed through the corporeal resistance chamber known as a human body is therefore modulated and monitored by the various circuits which are approached from the right-hand electrode and which terminate in the left-hand electrode, and there's a magnetic influence so that you get a visual response in the ohmmeter" – oh – damn-iter.
Some poor dear in Scientology every once in a while tells me, "Huh, but you talk so much about electricity, I – heh-heh – I don't know anything about these things." I always shake them by the hand and say, "That makes two of us." [laughs] Other people pretend they know something about it, see? Well, this is an interesting piece of magic you've got here in an E-Meter. That's for sure. This is an interesting piece of magic and isn't it interesting that it doesn't exist elsewhere on the whole track.

Oh, recording devices, and detective devices and thisas and thatas and the other thing all exist on the whole track. And there's all kinds of things and my old pals in certain sections of this universe – well, in the Galactic Confederacy particularly – would be absolutely horrified if I said, "Well, we developed a meter we don't have here," because their pride is that they have all the equipment that was all... has ever existed or that will ever be developed, and they know every electronic activity that has ever existed or will ever exist anywhere.

And that ends their modesty on the subject, see. And you say, "Well, here's a box of tricks that does something that none of our meters do." It wouldn't be a popular statement but it'd be a true one. It's quite remarkable that it does it. So let's not worry why it does it. Let's not worry at all why it does it. Let's worry much more succinctly about the information it gives the auditor. And the information it gives the auditor is: There is something there, there is nothing there, or what is there is beyond the pc's reality. It gives us there is something there that will be real to the pc. And that's all fine. We know all that.

But let's take the next step that this thing is charged and is discharging. Now you've customarily, in the past, read this on your tone arm. Well, you don't read these Helatrobus Implants on your tone arm. We don't care whether the tone arm moves or not. Just skip it out in 3N. That's too much bother. Because you do a bank or two and the tone arm starts moving down no matter how high the thing has been stuck, and all the charge that was on the original bank you were doing is coming off, it's coming off on the needle. But you'll also see the needle action reflect over onto the tone arm. So that is all the charge there is on an RI.

Don't imagine that sleeping beneath the surface is a slumbering volcano that something else can trigger. No, sir. There is no such thing. When you read one of these things and it goes pssheww and then you read it again, ordinarily early on in a case you only get half the RR or thereabouts and when you read it again you get a fzzt, very tiny RR, about a quarter of an inch, and when you read it again it goes thi, tick. That's early on in a case. Well, what happened to the rest of the RR? You've got to recognize that something happened to this RR, otherwise you'll be nagging the pc to find out what happened to the RR. Well, the RR evaporated! That's what happened to it.

Now, you've got to tell the difference between an RR that evaporated and an RR that was choked to death because they look different on the meter. And you just have to get your eye educated to be able to tell the difference. And it's pretty hard to do and it's not a hundred percent precision. I had to study in a meter, I don't know, hour or two or three, and certainly something on the order of about five or six hours of auditing, paying attention to just this one thing until I finally got the subtle nuances of difference between them. So it's a case where experience is a very good thing to have.
Well, we can make some very good general statements. You can see the back break on one of these things, too. Although what that means is just no more choke, see? And then you'll run into this one: The thing fell when he said it and then you had him give you another version, "coveting-a-tivably" and something, and "erradicably catfish" and "wingabingably catfish," and all of a sudden you'll see this fantastic rocket read on something that has nothing to do with the price of oranges, you see? And you say, "Give me the original item again," and you get a gorgeous rocket read. In other words, you had a rocket read sitting on top of it.

Something in his own existence had pressed down on this thing and had transferred the read from the RI to this other thing. In other words, it ate up the rocket read. And the rocket read was encysted and this one was therefore, wasn't on your plot. That's always what happens when you can't get a plot item to read. It isn't that the plot item isn't there; electronics were broken down that way. The Helatrobus boys really ought to get the manufacturer's seal of approval and the service seal of approval because I have been looking in vain to have one of their damn squawk boxes not fire. It's obvious with that many squawk boxes and electronic implant boxes in any existing series that — well, it is obvious that their repairmen weren't all that good because they're on cables and so forth. Particularly those strung outside. Those that are on the last implant of the first series, that were just there open to the weather.

Oh, I consider it very remarkable that they stay in operation. I keep looking for a hole to occur in the line plot. Don't you see? I've had my eye open on this now for the last two or three thousand items, you know. Everything working. "Wantably, fantastically, catfishably" and pow — it's working. There it reads.

So I just dropped it out of the line that there's something wrong with the electronic implant equipment as the pc went by. See, I dropped that out. The reason I bring that up, that might occur to some of you.

"Well, I guess that box wasn't working that day," see? Well, it's always possible that that is true, but I haven't found it to be true. They always worked. They should get the manufacturer's seal of approval and so forth. Their production boys and their service unit should have gotten the leather medal pinned on with a blanket pin very deep. [laughs]

But the point I am making here is that there's something wrong with the way the pc has approached this thing and as your pc gets to flying on down the line, you less and less will have trouble with this.

The point I'm trying to make to you: You do your job well at first and your job gets easier. And you do a lousy job at first and your job will not get easier, and it might even get harder.

Now, the point where you make speed is to do your originals and earlies right and then you'll make more and more speed, more and more speed, more and more speed. It goes faster and faster and faster and faster and faster. And don't pull colossal blunders like letting your pc miss an item which remains fully charged even though he hit it, you know. You couldn't get any rocket read so just went on by it and then find your pc leaping into the second series. The source of all skips is a missed RI and there's two ways to miss one. Just not have it at all or not discharge it.
In other words, a skip – flying into another bank, flying elsewhere, bouncing off the track, not being there in the incident anymore – is caused by missing an RI, either by not calling it at all – we go from "covetably" to "inevitably" or something of the sort and we don't get the "nix" in, see; or we call it, it didn't fire, we don't get the charge off of it and simply go on.

The next action the pc is liable to do is skip. You skip something, so he Qs-and-As and he may go into the identical or the similar implant of the second series. And you suddenly find yourself running the second implant series. And you wonder, what's all this? The pc is being torn to ribbons, nothing is RRing right, the thing is – the words aren't right and all of a sudden he says, "Impassably and insurmountably, inevitably catfish." And you say, "That isn't in the line plot." It's in the second series – not those words are in the second series; I haven't got the second series plot. I've got some of it though. And you say, "Where did all this come from? What happened? What happened? What happened?" Well, a good way to do that is to get your pc oriented early as to his surroundings. Have him close his eyes and take a look.

He doesn't want to look very much. When you first start to run it he will tell you it's terribly unreal, and he can't see very much. And after you have done a bank or two his reality on visio will be getting greater and greater and better and better. And it's usable by the auditor.

Now, pcs go up steps and down steps in the first implants and they don't always just go down. They sometimes also go up because that's more confusing. They don't turn around in the middle of a set of steps and go the other way but they'll start a bank and it'll go backwards to the last bank – so forth. So this is all very confusing. But you get a pc – so don't tell him you always go downstairs because sometimes they go up, see? And sometimes the opp terms are on the right and sometimes they're on the left which also makes it interesting and sometimes a pc is sitting there with a line plot and says, "This line plot ought to be printed in reverse, you know." Well, you can say it's printed right for at least half of the GPMs. Because it is. About half of them, it is reversed. See?

Now, as the pc goes along you can actually – and you can overdo this – you can make him put too much attention on and work him into it, and yap at him and nag him, and so forth, but it helps you out and you say, "Take – take a look there, what do you see?"

And he says, "Well, I see a flight of steps."

And you say, "Well, are any of them gray?"

"Yeah," he says, "there's one down there that's gray."

That's an RI you didn't get.

"Are any of those steps black?"

"Yeah, well there's one over here that's black and the rest of them closer to me are white."

Brother, something's wrong here. Something's missed, see. Oh, that's pretty crude repair. I myself don't use it. But I like to hear a pc tell me, "Those steps are all white now." Oh, that's very nice, that's very nice. That tells you you haven't got a speck of charge left behind
you because those charge – those steps were black as ink the first time you went over them, see. But RI by RI they turn white, see? Interesting isn't it? You can even orient the pc.

This is real trickery. I mean, these guys really set it up well. This is real trickery on a part of an auditor. Tricky, sneaky. Before you list for the next goal, have the pc close his eyes and tell you what he sees. Find the next goal and its top oppterm. Then have the pc close his eyes and tell you if he's in the same locale that he was in before, because if he's in a different locale you've missed a whole bank. Tricky, huh? You get what I mean?

These banks usually end at the top or bottoms of stairs. You've just gotten the last item, you see.

He closes his eyes. "All right. Where are you?"

"Well, I'm on this landing."

"All right. You got that? Oh, you're on the landing. That's fine. All right." Now we're going to get the next goal and we get the next goal and as soon as we've got it and then we've got its – the top oppterm of it, we have the pc close his eyes again and we say, "Now where are you?" "Well," he says, "I'm in the same place, but just one step down." "That's fine." Tricky. That's using the scenery to confirm the fact you don't skip anything.

You'll find out the pc has never had any visio. These implants are marvelous to run because the pc has never had any visio, has never seen anything, has never heard anything, has no sonic, has no visio, has no tactile, no kinesthetic, nothing; and he's been in this state ever since anybody has ever tried to run an engram on him. Now, this has been the bane of everybody's existence. You run him halfway through a bank or a quarter of the way through the first bank, and all of a sudden he's got dim visio. You run him all the way through a couple of banks and boy, he's got visio. You run him through three banks and he's got kinesthesia. You can hear these crazy – he can get one of these crazy theta poles wobbling. He can feel it wobble. See, and he'll come up to full sonic on this. Quite remarkable.

We've sweated for years, all kinds of trickery to turn on the perceptics of a pc. Well, it's in the Helatrobus Implants right on the button. You run them, you got it.

Well, you can use the scenery of the implant to orient the pc and tell whether or not you've missed items. In fact there's a lot of trickery involved in this. See? As far as the auditor is concerned, he can get pretty slippery. Now, I don't ask you to get this slippery, but on certain flights of stairs, apparently, there are electric switches on the walls that tell you what goal the next bank is turned to. That's pretty good, isn't it? It's not in English, but the pc understood the language when he went through. Parel told him, "Well, I know it's undoubtedly the right goal because it's marked up there on the wall." The way you turn over the switch over to the goal, "to be happy." Apparently this shifted all the relays and everything that was going on in the squawk boxes by just shifting one lever.

I like to think that one of the operators accidentally threw the activation switch one day while setting up one of the series of goals. I like to think that happened. Anyhow – because actually the controls were on the landings and stairs. Pretty tricky.
Now, all of this is very good news and it's very good news from several quarters. One, the Helatrobus Implants are incredible. It's unbelievable. Man in the street can run them, however. You just find "to forget" on the top opperms and just go along with your 3N patter. Give him the thing. You don't have to write it all out for him. You shouldn't write somebody's whole bank out for him. He should have to think it out that much to keep him in the incident. You understand?

You can give him the number and so forth, and you just tell him how to do this. He maybe even have had to go home and read his dictionary and study to find out what "-ably" was, and so forth. But he doesn't know anything more about it than that. And he'll run this thing, and he'll run just about so long, and all of a sudden he'll start telling you that this was a long time ago. And that this was this, and this was that and he'll really start holding forth on the subject.

In other words, it runs as gently as that. It requires no education. But the incredibility of it keeps it from being believed or usurped and used for evil purposes until we can control it. You'd be surprised the degree that we use incredulity as a protective security mechanism in Scientology. Just never forget that. Because it's a marvelous one, it's a marvelous one.

"Oh, that Scientology, it's balderdash! Those people believe – that cult believes..." and so forth. I very often feel like just patting those horses' heads just very smoothly and nicely and neatly and saying, "Good show, brother, good show. Thank you." Because they're operating as a security screen far more effective than any security screen any of us could devise.

You realize that the psychiatrist has just now found birth and prenatals. He's been chewing away on birth and prenatals for some time now and he'll eventually graduate up to it, but what's to stop some Russian from putting these – one of these banks on a tape recorder and playing it off to somebody? What's to stop them? They don't think they'll go nuts. The only thing that will stop them is because, "Well, those Scientologists, they have some ridiculous beliefs." And that actually will protect us right up, straight up to the point when we don't need any protection, which point will happen suddenly. So don't always revile this type of an attitude. Recognize that it has its uses. It wasn't designed that way but it does have its uses.

You realize that we might very well be under the gun of some government or we might be here, we might be there. We might be... Or there might be barbed wire around Saint Hill here until you couldn't get a mouse through or an English rabbit. You know, guards all over the place. "Hup 2, 3, 4. Blah-blah-rahah-grrr-grrr" – all this stuff – "I'll just show... halt where you are – hush, hush," see? Can you imagine what that would do to you? Supposing – I just heard today that somebody more or less didn't talk to the public about implants. You know, guards all over the place. "Hup 2, 3, 4. Blah-blah-rahah-grrr-grrr" – all this stuff – "I'll just show... halt where you are – hush, hush," see? Can you imagine what that would do to you? Supposing – I just heard today that somebody more or less didn't talk to the public about implants. Well, all right. The factor of incredulity tends to slow them down a little bit. They're afraid somebody will get in their faces. But remember this, they're putting themselves on a withhold. I almost classified the line plots. Then I said, "No, I won't put anybody on that much of a withhold on this stuff, because it's too tough. It would be too tough on them." We'll just continue to depend upon incredulity.

Now, that factor doesn't keep you from auditing a pc, however. You don't have to tell the pc anything. Ian is auditing a pc in here that never heard from nothing and she ran down through the bank "to forget" gorgeously. Feels fine. Feels wonderful. Doesn't even know
where she is. Didn't know at the time, so what's the difference? You don't have to totally educate the pc except maybe in word endings or something like that in order to run them cold.

Take the milkman out here, sit him down, get "to forget" to fire, get "forgotten," get "nix forgotten." He says, "What's this 'nix'?'"

"Well, that's just what you say at this stage." [laughter] And you say, "All right. Now give me number 3 there on the paper I gave you. You have to fill in the 'forgotten' after it."

And he says, "What's that mean?"

"Well, that's – doesn't matter what it means. Say it." All right. That's fine. That rocket reads beautifully, and so forth. There we go on 3N. Just roll it. See? Keep rolling it.

This guy goes on and he says these things, says, "sss – ssss – ssss." He ends up at the other end of the line.

You say, "Now, we have to find what the next goal is," you know.

"Goal?"

"Yes, yes. Now, who or what would 'to forget' oppose? Just keep telling me."

"Oh well, you want it that way." And he goes on and he gives it to you, whatever it is – "remember," and so on.

You say, "That fires. That's – that's it."

He says, "You know, I've got a feeling that is it." [laughter] Take him right on down. I don't think you could run him halfway through the first implant but what he says, "Now, wait a minute now. This happened a long time ago. Now, I know you're going to argue with me, but it's sort of like this; I get an idea I was living on this planet, see? And that's funny because, you know..."

So you see, that incredulity might deny you some pcs and may give you some catcalls but it doesn't actually keep you from auditing anyone. You understand?

You don't have to sell them on whole track before you audit them on whole track now because they're sitting right there, man. They're right there. They've been there ever since. And it flies. And your job as an auditor is just to do a technically perfect job on the thing. The only rough spot in auditing all these is auditing a goal you have that you haven't had run, that is about to be run on you. Things tend to go kind of solid. But fortunately, there was quite a lot of variation in these goal patterns and you don't follow that.

It would be quite strange to have three banks simultaneous between auditor and pc. That's a lucky break, isn't it? They change the thing often enough to keep it from being too restimulative while auditing. All right.

This, then, gives the auditor a little bit of pause. The only place you really run into this is "to forget." Therefore, one of the first duties an auditor has is to get the bank "to forget" run out very cleanly indeed and he'll feel fine because the second bank doesn't much restimulate while you are auditing the thing. I've audited one of these recently on a bank that wasn't run out, and I felt like I was getting me 'ead knocked off, and knew what it was and knew why.
And it was uncomfortable. But that was remediable because the bank, to be restimulative to that degree, must be very ripe and ready to be run almost at once anyway, don't you see?

So it's coming straight up and it will be run. That's the only liability there is to this stuff.

Now, the fact that they can all be audited out very rapidly gives you no alibi whatsoever not to get them audited out. You haven't got any excuse at all not to audit them out. Now, the only excuse you – pardon me, you do have one excuse not to audit them out: if you don't have them.

Now, how many people have got these? Well it's the wildest kind of a guess, but I think we're up to about 5 percent don't. Don't have the Helatrobus Implants or it's over their heads. It's a very small percentage. And we've certainly moved up in percentage because everybody under the sun, moon and stars we've been grabbing hold of have got these, but we do have our 5 percent. Used to be a far, far greater percentage, don't you see, so we've closed it down to that degree.

Now, what do you do with that 5 percent? You are going to have a certain amount of trouble with some of the 95 percent because they’ve only got the second implant, see, or something like that. I could anticipate running into some trouble of that character, but that isn't any trouble because they audit just like the first implant, except they have a different pattern. Until you get that pattern in your hands, just dog it off somehow or another and do the job.

What about this remaining 5 percent? What can you do for those fellows? They fall into two categories based on the mechanics of the time track. They fall into categories that do have the implants but cannot approach them and those that don't have and so they aren't there to be approached. There's no implants to be run.

That is to say, there's implants on the case, but they are not the Helatrobus Implants. And that fellow to some slight degree is slightly out of luck, because he's got implants that are just as vicious as the Helatrobus Implants one way or the other but they aren't the same pattern; they don't have patterns of that character; you can't handle them in the same way and he's under that much liability and so forth. That's sort of bad luck. Bad luck.

Well, how did this fellow escape them? Well, he didn't escape them by being tough and hairy-chested, you know, and not being picked up and all that sort of thing. No, he escaped them because he's from another galaxy. He ain't not native to this 'ere galaxy. You may find somebody who is native to this galaxy who never went through it. He was in so lousy a condition they ignored him, or something of the sort. [laughter, laughs] I think you'll find that very rare, if it exists at all.

Now we have to take up the possibility – not the possibility, we have to look at the factor. We have to look at the factor of the fact that this is a rim system that we are in right now. This is Sun 12 and it is a rim, tiny, microscopic, terribly insignificant little bunch of space dust. Not to do it down particularly but compared to other systems, galaxies, confederations and that sort of things and other possessions of confederations and so forth, this is noth-
ing. That's why it's left alone. But it stands pretty well alone. It's peculiarly isolated. This is also true of most of the stars out in this end of this wheel.

You know the galaxy is a big wheel and the galaxy has a hub and it has a rim and we are very close to the rim. You look down into the southern horizon, you notice the stars in the southern hemisphere look terribly big and terribly bright. Well, it isn't that they are so much terribly bigger than other stars. That's just the end of the galaxy that you are looking at. That's the end. There's just that many between us and no more this galaxy, see?

It's very close, and people wishing to get rid of troublesome characters, captives, anybody you can think of... You know, around city dumps, you know, they always have trouble around cities because people start using certain areas of the city for dumps, you know? And they take – use it as a dumping ground for the ice cube and for other thing: unwanted beings, unwanted people, unwanted personnel.

Like you overthrow the old regime, you see, and you throw them through a good, stiff implant that mixes them up so they can't tell north from west and you throw them into an ice cube capsule of some kind or another. And what do you do with them? Well, the primary threat to a system is the strength of a thetan. That's the primary threat in the view of some very aberrated character. He thinks the main danger in the planet, or main danger in the system or the galaxy, or so forth, is a free thetan.

The possibility also that a person in – who is acting as a doll, or something like that, can exteriorize from where he is and go home, pick up another body and come back and raise the devil with him.

In other words, these people are – have o verts so they try to protect themselves from the vengeance of a free thetan and they compound the possibility and the potentiality of this particular universe as a trap, and they make these people very thoroughly trapped. Well, they dump them. They dump them pretty well far from home. They try to – don't even try to – they don't dump them close in, they dump them way out.

Well, Helatrobus threw any people that it implanted as far as possible. Oh, some of them were – wandered back, and some of them stayed around, and some of them didn't get badly affected and reported back and that sort of thing, but they also dumped people pretty far out.

So this particular system got dumping, and the Marcab Confederacy and some of the other stars around here just got a terrific concentration of people being dumped from the Center of the hub, you know. They don't want to go over to the next galaxy, so they just take it out to the edge of the city, you know.

All right. And this is close enough to other galaxies that ambitious characters over there trying to get rid of people out of their galaxies and systems, and so forth, would also use these rim stars. Now you get down toward the Center of this galaxy and the possibility of finding somebody without the Helatrobus Implants, of finding any foreign implant system, will probably be totally negligible. Probably nonextant, you see?

But out here you got a mixed bag and we don't know what they did in the next galaxy. See?
Now, science fiction writers following the cue of some chap, I've forgotten his name
now, Einstein, Beinstein, something like that, who said that $MC^2$ over $C$ wouldn't go,
man, and that the speed of light could not be excessive. And actually I was looking up some
speed tables the other day, and a trillion light years per day is not full throttle on a space
wagon. So there's traffic between galaxies and there's traffic between islands of galaxies and
other islands of galaxies. Interesting.

Has a lot – you say, well, this is science fiction. No. No, no. No. The only part of sci-
ence fiction there are, is the mistakes the science fiction writers have made while writing
about their own past. They've made a lot of errors there.

The truth of the case is that it's – it has a lot to do with you as an auditor, suddenly.
Not that you have to embrace science fiction, but you have to look at this possibility. You've
got to face up to the is-ness of the thing. Man's greatest trouble in solving his own problems,
see, he didn't have enough on the ball to face up to the is-ness of existence. And the reasons
for that are very plain, short, succinctly stated. That case which evinces the greatest unreality
about things is that case most subject to bank solidification in an effort to remember.

That's a technical statement I just made and has a lot to do with your engram running.
It's directly proportional. His effort to remember increases the solidity of his bank, which is
painful to him, which then brings about his statement concerning unreality.

See, that's proportional. The amount of unreality evinced by a case, then, is propor-
tional to the amount of solidity caused in his time track by his efforts to remember. If his bank
goes solid every time he tries to remember something this becomes painful, so then he count-
ers this by saying it is unreal.

This fellow that tells you, "I don't believe in past lives" is saying, "My time track goes
solid when I try to remember." And it has an awful lot to do with you as an auditor, because
that case that evinces great unreality must be given very gentle handling and you cannot run
an engram on that case. Not only – you must not run an engram on that case, because the bank
will go solid.

Now, you could take almost anybody here and run them through an engram once. Let's
take a late-on-the-chain engram. We could run them through the engram once. We'd get away
with it. We can run them through twice; we can get away with it. This is not a basic on a
chain, see? We run it three times, it starts to get kind of solid. And we run it four times and by
golly that's getting awful solid. And we run that engram five times and $rrahrrrv$. It's getting
tough, man. And we run it six times, we'll just freeze him in it. It takes three to ten days for
the thing to key out and go soft again – which it will do.

Now, that's true of anybody here. I'm talking about something late on a chain, you un-
derstand?

Those engrams have always given us trouble. They've always been sticky, and it even
says in Book One, don't run 'em. You have to brush them off enough sometimes. You can
always take a case through them once, you know, to get back early. By the time you've taken
them through two, three times you wish you hadn't. The bank's going solid.
Well now, this case of tremendous unreality goes solid on one pass. You practically can't examine the bank. It's practically as much as your life's worth to even date this character. If you could perfectly and accurately date without any flaw in your auditing, yes, it would soften up the bank, but if you're clumsy in dating and you date this fellow without any great reality anyhow, the little errors you make will throw him off enough to beef up the bank and he gets a greater unreality than before.

There is a coordination between unreality and solidity which is reversed. The greater solidity, the more unreality the person will advertise. Even though the engram gets very real to him when it gets solid, general bank solidification and so forth brings about unreality. Why is this? Because the basic mechanism of the time track has the liability of making the thetan go solid. How does a thetan cease to be Clear and start going solid? How does he become solid? Probably by making a time track in the first place, of course. And the more this track is jammed, and the less he has to do with it, of course the less is as-ised about it.

Well, that's just general time track. Now, what about implants? Why do we specialize in implants? It's because an implant is the product of an ARC break plus solidification. If you wanted to run old ARC Break Straightwire – "Recall an ARC break. Recall an ARC break" – you would find the guy sitting eventually 3-D in an implant. This guy sees a theta trap. That's a warning to him that he's not wanted around here, and it causes an ARC break. And all these traps and such devices and so forth and betrayals are basically ARC breaks.

Now, the method a thetan uses to handle an ARC break is to bring about an unreality, which he usually does with a "not-is," don't you see? And it becomes the common denominator of the bank then to have an unreal bank because if it gets real it hurts too much. So your effort to persuade him that this is real, that he is looking at, of course does him a tremendous disservice because it hurts like the mischief. The only safeguard he has against being caught in a solid bank, you see, and being upset by a solid bank, is by saying it is not real and not permitting you to find anything real on it. Now, that type of case is going to give you some trouble, because you will try to prove to the case the reality of what you're doing. And because what you are doing is real, you can do that very easily and it just results in a total overwhelm of the case. You can all too easily prove that what you are doing is real.

So when somebody starts telling you about how unreal it all is, if you're running the Helatrobus Implants you go right on running them, man, because that will do the most for him that can be done, you see. The most that can be done for the case is get those implants run – real or unreal. But you can't find those implants and he says it's terribly unreal and all is unreal and everything is unreal and you can't find "forgotten" and "nix forgotten" and so forth, and you just can't get any place like this, brother, you watch it!

One of two things is true. You either have your paws on somebody who is not a native of this universe – I mean this galaxy. He's a native of an adjoining – adjoining galaxy, and you don't know the pattern of his implants; or you've got on your hands somebody who has been so implanted so often that just the thought of five minutes ago gives him a headache. Why does it give him a headache? Because he thinks of five minutes ago and the action of remembering causes solidification of the bank which causes pressure to come in and he got a headache.
So his only protection against this is to make you unreal and not-is it. His last weapon on the bank is to not-is and in the absence of his not-is he damn near dies. You see? What do you do with him? Well, this is not... I haven't time to give you all the data on some of the material I've been unearthing with regard to this, but I've been developing quite a bit of little odds and ends of technology concerning the time track and its automatic nature and its state of manufacture and that sort of thing.

I just realized just this afternoon that we have a straightwire process that does an awful lot for this case. We're making him remember and the track is going less solid. I'll be developing quite a few... I'll tell you just to – not to leave you on the hook.

There is an involuntary intention. I've discovered an involuntary intention. You have involuntary muscles and you've got habit patterns and training patterns and all this sort of nonsense. Well, add to – up that in a thetan to an involuntary intention. He wants to open the door and so he just bluh opens the door, see. See, he involuntarily opens the door. In other words, he just opens the door.

My father used to answer telephones this way. Plunk. You know. And Telephone rings; plunk, you know. Telephone appears, you know, off the hook, and so forth. Actually you've intended it up there. You got the idea? It's been intended into a new position. Well, that's an involuntary intention, and apparently it's the same mechanism that increa... creates the time track. It's an involuntary create. You see?

So that's an involuntary intention and it belongs to this set of thetan muscles – if you'll forgive me – which operate without intention, without knowing intention, but have a sub-awareness intention. And a thetan can do this. He doesn't have to have a bank, machinery or anything else. He just simply can do it. Well, that forms the time track.

Now, solidification of the track is caused by combat of the postulate "be solid." You see? Everybody wants you to be solid. You don't want to be solid. That makes enough fight right there to solidify something. Well, it goes worse than that. The solidification mechanism is composited by remembering, naturally, and you as an auditor are actually handling, when you handle the time track, the involuntary intention of the thetan. That's what the time track is: It's an involuntary intention to create. It just responds automatically. And you say go here, go there, do this, do that. And he has pictures. Where do pictures come from? Well, they come from this involuntary intention. You're just handling that mechanism.

Well, you can handle that mechanism, directly. You can handle the mechanism directly. And if you could get a case unbailed enough – this is actually the plot – you get a case unbailed enough and go early enough on the time track, and you can actually snip the whole track, see. It just rolls up like it's just nowhere now. See.

It's the existence of the time track that makes memory impossible. But it is the obsession to remember which makes the time track – involuntary intention – take place in the first place, see?

So any goal like "to remember" raises hell with solidification. Or any implant that louses up – and they all do – a thetan's memory or sense of time, result in the solidification of the time track by taking over the involuntary create that brings about the time track. See that?
So you say, "What – " you say to the pc, "What instinctive action has been regretted?"
I don't care what fancy wording – just as long as it adds up to that sense. In other words, what
involuntary action have you engaged in which you then choked off and made an enemy out
of? See? What instinctive action was regretted? What instinctive action have you disliked?
You know, anything you wanted to go at it, you've got a straightwire process, which actually
runs implants. It runs them at the rate of a snail racing madly alongside of the quarter horse of
doing the Helatrobus Implants, but you nevertheless – there is a door open.

In other words, the door is not slammed tight in these fellows' faces, even if they are
not native to this uni... this particular galaxy and even if their sense of reality is so great that
all this could happen. And I'll develop a few of those processes and oddly enough I don't think
the patterns are innumerable.

I think possibly maybe five or six different case patterns. Maybe more than that, but if
you come up against one of them as an auditor, and you decide the only thing you can do is
just run engram after engram after engram. Watch it man, because you're going to get a solidifi-
cation of the track and you're going to get that pc in trouble. So don't go in for this engram
after engram after engram, you see. Hit them lightly with a feather. Now, if you are lucky
enough to be able to get a basic like 350 trillion years ago and it's an overt and it's basic on a
ch... oh, you're in man. You can handle that, because of course that will erase, and so forth.
But how about this fellow who is very unreal? You going to get a 350 trillion incident when
he can't get breakfast? You're sure not, you see.

In other words, it's all done with the feather. You run into the case that hasn't got the
Helatrobus Implants, you handle with a feather, huh? Don't go charging and barging around.
Open that case up gently and I'll try to give you some straightwire processes and things like
this, that gradually, gradually pet the shadow of the cat.

Okay? Well, there's a lot of stuff turning up on this, that and the other thing – It's all
very interesting. It mostly comes under the heading of phenomena and data and that sort of
thing. And I've recently been understand... been studying the power, activities and habits of
an Operating Thetan, just from an intellectual basis but with some view of reality, which I
really haven't had on this too well before. I find we have here a fairly complex being and a
very, very formidable one. His ethical level and that sort of thing, deteriorating, was what got
him into trouble in the first place. So when you put him back together again, of course, his
ethical level will have to be put back together again, too. Otherwise, he'd just get into trouble
and get everybody else in trouble.

But the point I'm making here is that the state of OT is so far above anything we have
ever dreamed of, that I say our breakthrough – our breakthrough along this line is tremendous.
So tremendous that we had better start getting our house in order. Not to protect ourselves
from OTs, that isn't the point. But it means that a political breakthrough is – puh.

You have any trouble eating breakfast? See, we would be shooting mice with an ele-
phant gun, don't you see? And we're not about to attack anybody or do anything bad like that.
But we might have a few heart-to-heart talks.

So actually, I have had to be plotting up in front of us a bit politically about where did
we go and how do we relate to, and I find some very interesting data. Probably some of you
have past connections of one kind or another when you suddenly say, "Huh, I wonder how I forgot that?" You probably have to go take care of these things. But the basic thing is that this planet is peculiarly susceptible to be a rehabilitation base and so forth at this part of the universe, and I think that can be sold to even most of the confederations. I don't think we have to sell it to much of anybody else; I don't think they'll be in a position to argue. They've only got atom bombs. We've got OTs.

Okay. Thank you very much.
TV DEMO: ENGRAM RUNNING – HELATROBUS IMPLANT GOAL

An auditing demonstration given on 22 May 1963

This is the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 22 May 1963.

This is a demonstration of item running off of the line plot of the Helatrobus Implants. And I'm giving you this demonstration so that you'll know what to do with these various types RRs.

Now, in view of the fact that this demonstration will be taped and on this tape there are no rocket reads – will be seen on the tape, you can take it from me that if I called a rocket read and I said, "That rocket read," I had a great big rocket read. If I went on, all the charge was gone off of that; it wouldn't bang again if you hit it with a club. And these are no choked rocket reads or otherwise. But I'm sure that I may run into some of these and you'll see me handle these.

I'm running a goal here – it's one of the GPM series. This one happens to be the goal "to be serious." And it's the fourth goal in the lineup on this particular pc. The goals change their pattern after the goal "to remember."

Now the thing for you to watch on this thing is the speed and the carefulness and the width of the RR. These are quite important. If you don't get the charge off of that case, that case is never going to run well. But, if you carefully get the charge off early on running GPMs, the case will very shortly begin to fly. And the way to get a case to fly is to handle it easily at the beginning.

Now, this is the easy series in that this case has already been well audited and well handled and is at the present moment flying through these GPMs.

Later on in a week or so, I'll do you one on a difficult pc and I'll show you how to get a case going in that. But right now I want to show you the pattern and show you how this is handled. All right.

LRH: Okay, your chair's all right? Now, is it all right to audit in this room?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Okay?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Anything you care to change?
PC: No, it's all right.
LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Very good. All right, your havingness is okay. Your tone arm is sitting at 3.0. Put in the reality factor here – although this is a TV demonstration, I
don't want you to do anything different than you would do in an ordinary session.

PC: Mmmm. All right. Very good.

LRH: All right. You don't have to make me any trouble so I can show them.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. And I'm just going to go on down this bank "to be serious" and you're the gainer by having a few RRs - a few more RIs found.

PC: Hmm-hm. All right.

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

PC: Yes.

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

PC: Hmm-hm.

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

PC: To find as many RIs as possible.

LRH: All right.

PC: To run some charge off the bank.

LRH: All right.

PC: To work well.

LRH: Okay. Is that all?

PC: Hmm-hm.

LRH: All right. Very good. We got 5:13. Your tone arm is at 3.0. All right. Now, if you remember, in your last session you had "to be serious" and we had found that and I had confirmed it by finding the top opp term "seriousness" and the lineup coming down.

PC: Hmm-hm.
LRH: Mm? All right.

PC: Sort of getting used to the room a bit.

LRH: All right.

PC: We don't normally audit in here.

LRH: No. Okay. Any thought like you might louse up your case or anything like that?

PC: Oh no. Uh-uh.

LRH: All right. In this session has anything been decided? In this session has anything been invalidated? Yes, what's been invalidated?

PC: Well, I don't know which one you ran into trouble on. I suppose – it was one of the items – that's, perfectly seriousness?

LRH: Yes.

PC: Oh.

LRH: That's right.

PC: All right.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: In this session has anything been invalidated? All right. That's clean. Okay. Now, I'll read to you this item: Perfectably seriousness. All right. On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been invalidated? On this item is there anything you failed to reveal? Yes, what?

PC: Oh, well I thought uh – yes, I did. Actually, this was, sort of before the session. I thought well uh – it was a shame that this was one of my more ghastly goals. You know. Serious – to be serious. If it had been the other one, it would have been more pleasing, you know?

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: And so uh – I sort of to that degree maybe have suppressed "to be serious," the goal, you know and uh – I thought it would better if I'd run "to be happy," the other one that I had.

LRH: Oh, oh – all right. Okay. All right. Anything else on that? There's something.

PC: No, I don't think so.

LRH: All right. Anything else you failed to reveal? There is a failed to reveal here.

PC: I don't like these cans and they're sticky. Other people have held them in their hands and they are all gooey.

LRH: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry I didn't bring your cans down. Okay, is there anything else you failed to reveal? All right. That's clean. All right. I'm going to read to you item number four again to make sure this is discharged: Nix absolutely seriousness. All right. That's clean as a wolf's tooth. And now I'm going to read to you the only item I have on this list: Perfectably seriousness. All right. That rocket read very nicely. Okay. And who or what would oppose perfectly seriousness?

PC: Nix perfectly seriousness.

LRH: Very good. I'll read to you the only item I have on this list: Nix perfectly seriousness. All right. Now did you have some thought on that? Some suppress? Yes?

PC: I don't know. I really thought what a ridiculous thing that, you know, um – perfectly seriousness – as if seriousness could be perfected. You know?

LRH: Oh, all right.
PC: That's what I thought – how weird.

LRH: Okay. I'll read you that item again. Nix perfectly serious. All right. Doesn't seem to be anything much left on that. Is there anything else however? Any other difficulty? Yes, what is it?

PC: No, I just was wondering if you were getting nice RRs. You know.

LRH: All right. Anything else? You have any cognitions? Anything like that?

PC: Nah.

LRH: All right. You did have a cognition?

PC: No, I just – it's just uh – um – well, I couldn't imagine someone going around trying to be perfectly serious. You know?

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Even if they were dramatizing, it would be terribly difficult to do.

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay. Thank you. I'll read you this item again: Nix perfectly serious. All right. The item is clean.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: And who or what would nix perfectly serious oppose?

PC: Superiorably serious.

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll read you the only item on this list: Nix superi-orably serious. All right. That rocket read. And who or what would nix superiorably serious oppose?

PC: Incomparably serious.

LRH: Very good. Now, what did you get suppressed there?

PC: I invalidated it as I was saying it – incomparably serious.

LRH: Yes. All right. Anything else?

PC: No, I don't think so.

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll read you this item again. Incomparably serious. All right. That rocket read. And who or what would oppose incomparably serious?

PC: Nix incomparably serious.

LRH: Very good. Similar difficulty there?

PC: No. No, I looked – as I was saying it, I looked down to the next one. I'm sorry.

LRH: All right. All right. I'll read you this item now. Nix incomparably serious. All right. The item is uncharged.
PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: And who or what would nix incomparably seriousness oppose?

PC: Fascinateably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Very good. And that got suppressed in the process of looking down?

PC: Oh, did it? Well, tha... that's another one that has the two there you see? So I thought – immediately I looked at it and I thought well, fascinatingably, you know, seriousness? Or is it fascinatably seriousness?

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. Let me read to you this item: Fascinatably seriousness. All right. That rocket read. And who or what would oppose fascinatably seriousness?

PC: Nix fascinatably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. All right. You'll begin to think I'm nagging you shortly. Because what did you run into there? I didn't get a good rocket read.

PC: Didn't get a good rocket read? Mm. I hoped I would say it all right.

LRH: Oh, I see. Is that getting in – sort of in your road on...

PC: Well I did think, well, it's being recorded and I should say these items properly, you know. So I mustn't stumble – allow my tongue to stumble, you see?

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll read to you this item: Nix fascinatably seriousness. All right. That rocket read beautifully. All right. And who or what would nix fascinatably seriousness oppose?

PC: Highly acceptably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Give me that one again, would you please?

PC: Mm-hm. Actually I sort of thought of my mother there, you know? Anyway – highly acceptably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. I will read you this item: Highly acceptably seriousness. All right. Anything suppressed there? All right. Well, that item rocket read and that one's fine.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Who or what would oppose highly acceptably seriousness?

PC: Well, nix highly acceptably seriousness.

LRH: That's right. That was discharged. Now, who or what would nix highly acceptably seriousness oppose?

PC: Recommendably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, on this item has anything been suppressed?

PC: Well, I suppressed it in that I didn't know – I didn't think we had gotten the other one.

LRH: Oh, all right. Anything else on that? Okay. All right?

PC: No. That's fine.

LRH: All right. Recommendably seriousness. All right. Now that item has been clobbered.

PC: Well, I had some variations pop up. Recommendably seriousness and recommendably seriously as you, you know. – um – I always seem to have trouble with this one, don't I?

LRH: Yes.

PC: Yeah. Well, recommendably
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LRH: All right. That rocket read and I'll read to you the only item on this list: Recommendably seriousness. All right. That had a beautiful rocket read. And who or what would oppose recommendably seriousness?

PC: Nix recommendably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. I'll read you this item. Nix recommendably seriousness. All right. Nothing's been suppressed there?

PC: No, it didn't.

LRH: Well, it rocket read beautifully.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: I'll read it again: Nix recommendably seriousness. No, that's discharged. Very good. Now, who or what would nix recommendably seriousness oppose?

PC: Acceptably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. I'll read you this item. Acceptably seriousness. All right. That has rocket read. And who or what would oppose acceptably seriousness?

PC: Nix acceptably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. Now what was choked about that?

PC: Well, I thought that is very true because a lot of people, you know – things are not really acceptably serious. You know, if you're at a ball you shouldn't be serious. And if you're at a movie that is supposed to be, you know, a comedy – you shouldn't be serious.

LRH: All right.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Got it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now, I'll read you this item again: Nix acceptably seriousness. All right. There is more on this.

PC: Well, no one is very acceptably serious to me!

LRH: There we go.

PC: You know.

LRH: There we are.

PC: It's just that I can't particularly abide people who are so fantastically serious.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know? And normally, when I get into situations where I'm supposed to be acceptably serious, you see, why, I've normally found them most amusing in a sort of a – um – I'm – I guess I'm dramatizing the terminal side more than I am the oppterm side.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Because I'm always not very acceptably serious...

LRH: All right.

PC: ...about anything.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right. I'll read you the only item on this list: Nix acceptably seriousness. All right. I got a prior read that time – what happened?

PC: Well, I thought, well, that's gone.

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. Read it again: Nix acceptably seriousness. All right. Very flat. That rocket read.

And who or what would nix accepta-
bly seriousness oppose?

**PC:** Engrossably serious...ness.

**LRH:** All right. Give me that again.

**PC:** Engrossably seriousness.

**LRH:** What's the matter?

**PC:** I thought I – I actually – I found myself saying "engrossably serious," you know?

**LRH:** Oh yes. All right. On that item has anything been suppressed? On that item has anything been invalidated? All right. Anything you failed to reveal on it? Yes, what did you fail to reveal?

**PC:** Oh, well, I thought that's an amusing one and I thought that um – um – uh – you know, a lot of people do get engrossedly involved in their seriousness. [laughs]

**LRH:** All right. All right. Now I'm going to read you this item: Engrossably seriousness. All right. That's undoubtedly discharged. I'll read it again however: Engrossably seriousness. There's still some more on that.

**PC:** Still some more on that? Well, I think about people being serious about the mating habits of moths and this sort of thing, you know. They're certainly getting engrossed into these sort of things and I can't quite understand it, but they certainly do and um – oh, people get involved in even uh – sort of stamp collecting and I think that's sort of a rather ridiculous activity, but they certainly are engrossed in it. I have a protest on that – I mean people being engrossably serious about things.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** Okay. I'll read you this item: Engrossably seriousness. All right. That rocket read. And who or what would oppose engrossably seriousness?

**PC:** Nix engrossably seriousness.

**LRH:** Very good. Sort of a choked RR.

**PC:** Well, I think I've been sort of waiting to say nix engrossably seriousness. You see?

**LRH:** I see, right. That read.

**PC:** Because I've been protesting the other one.

**LRH:** Oh, all right.

**PC:** Um.

**LRH:** Good. I'll read this item now: Nix engrossably seriousness. All right. That's discharged. Thank you. And who or what would nix engrossably seriousness oppose?

**PC:** Vitalably seriousness.

**LRH:** Very good. Now what...

**PC:** I said vital-a-b-l-y seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Let me read you this item: Vitalably seriousness. All right. Now, what uh – what have you got on that?

**PC:** Well, that's the one that I always sort of mispronounce. I always say "vitably."

**LRH:** Mm.

**PC:** You see and – and you can't distinguish the "I" in it. Although I think, I think I'm saying the "I," always.

**LRH:** Mm.

**PC:** So, no, it's vitalably seriousness.

**LRH:** That rocket read. Very good.
All right. Let me read to you this item: Vitalably seriousness. All right. You had something else on your mind.

PC: Yes, I thought nix vitalably seriousness.

LRH: All right.

PC: Sorry.

LRH: Let me read you this item here: Vitalably seriousness. All right. That's discharged. And who or what would oppose vitalably seriousness?

PC: Nix vitalably seriousness.

LRH: All right. That's already banged. Any suppression on it?

PC: No, except I've sort of been sitting here. I feel like I'm – I'm under compulsion on the – on the terminal side here. This is one of the goals that uh – is – that uh – I'm all for the terminal side and all against the oppterm side.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Whereas in some others, like, I'm all for the oppterm side and not for the terminal side.

LRH: Okay.

PC: So I just was waiting to say it. You know.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item: Nix vitalably seriousness. All right. It's discharged. And who or what would nix vitalably seriousness oppose?

PC: Eagerably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. What happened there?

PC: I've sort of been waiting to say it, you know?

LRH: All right.

PC: Eagerably seriousness.

LRH: Okay. Any other suppression? Yes?


LRH: Hm?

PC: It's awful stuffy.

LRH: All right. Anything else? Yes.

PC: No. I just did notice that it was terribly stuffy in the room.

LRH: Yeah, well all right. Anything about that particularly? Any withhold?

PC: No, just withholding that uh – I do feel hot.

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me read you this item: Eagerably seriousness. All right. That has rocket read. And who or what would oppose eagerably seriousness?

PC: Nix eagerably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, what happened there? There?

PC: I began to feel a bit tired.

LRH: Hm?

PC: And it is hot.

LRH: All right.

PC: Or else I'm feeling hot.

LRH: All right. Let me get a change in this room here. Okay?

PC: Mm.

LRH: Oh, hell. Somebody has gratuitously boomed this up to six. Feel better?

PC: Phew! Better. Yes. Thank you.

LRH: All right.

PC: Phew! I was beginning to feel like I couldn't breathe or something. Mm.
That's much better.

**LRH:** All right. Any suppression on that? Anything else about that? Yes.

**PC:** I thought – I looked around and I thought well, maybe it's the enclosed section of the room and then I thought well maybe the heat's coming from the television set over there. I didn't see the stove.

**LRH:** Well, all right.

**PC:** I thought well, I've never seen a television set get so hot like this.

**LRH:** All right. Anything else about this?

**PC:** No. I think that's all.

**LRH:** You have something to say?

**PC:** No, not on this. Of course, the television is electronics, isn't it? Mmmm.

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** Beaming out at me over there.

**LRH:** All right. Anything else you care to say on this?

**PC:** No.

**LRH:** Okay. Let me read you this last item: Nix eagerly serious. All right. All right, on this item has anything been suppressed? Yes?

**PC:** Well, I suppose it was sort of suppressed while we were, you know, fixing the stove and the room.

**LRH:** All right. On this item has anything been suppressed? Yes? There.

**PC:** Well, nix eagerly... seriousness.

**LRH:** Mm.

**PC:** I never quite got it – the chance to really say, well, that's it. You know.

**LRH:** Oh, all right. Okay. On this item has anything been suppressed? All right. In this session has anything been suppressed? There's something here.

**PC:** I'm just wondering what all the trouble is about, a little bit.

**LRH:** All right. I'm sorry.

**PC:** Has the item rocket read or not?

**LRH:** The item has rocket read.

**PC:** Oh. Well, all right.

**LRH:** I'll read you this item now: Nix eagerly serious. All right. That item is discharged. Okay?

**PC:** Mm-hm.

**LRH:** Okay. Now, who or what would nix eagerly serious oppose?

**PC:** Enthusiastically serious.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Anything wrong with that item?

**PC:** Didn't look at it until after I'd said it.

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** Didn't look at it until after I'd said it.

**LRH:** All right. I'll read you this item: Enthusiastically serious. All right. On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been invalidated? All right. In this session, has anything been protested? Yes. I have a read.

**PC:** Well – well, we're sort of having to spend so much time...

**LRH:** Yeah.

**PC:** ...doing things.
LRH: All right. In this session has anything been protested?

PC: The heat of the auditing environment, I thought.

LRH: Mm?

PC: The heat of the auditing environment.

LRH: Oh, all right. In this – is that all right now, by the way?

PC: Yes, it's fine. Thank you.

LRH: All right. In this session has anything been protested? Yes. Still another protest. That is to say, there is another protest. There.

PC: Well, I suppose it's just not my auditing room, where I'm normally audited, do you see. And um – I'm very – uh – I like my environments, you see, that I've become accustomed to.

LRH: All right.

PC: And uh – this is uh – not my auditing room.

LRH: All right. Very good. Got it.

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item again: Enthusiasticably seriousness. All right. What did you think of?

PC: I wondered if it rocket... read...

LRH: All right.

PC: ...or had rocket read.

LRH: I've seen it rocket read.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Enthusiasticably seriousness. Enthusiasticably seriousness. All right. It's not now reading. Very good. It has rocket read. That was your item. All right. And who or what would oppose enthusiastically seriousness?

PC: Nix enthusiastically seriousness.

LRH: Very good. And I'll read you this item: Nix enthusiastically seriously. All right. That has rocket read. And who or what would nix enthusiastically seriously oppose?

PC: Enjoyably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. Now, what's going on here?

PC: I invalidated it as I said it. I thought, "Oh, who would ever enjoy being serious?"

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll read you this item: Enjoyably seriousness. All right. I haven't seen a rocket read at all on this one. Why don't you give me enjoyingly.


LRH: All right.

PC: And just plain old enjoyably seriousness.

LRH: All right. That rocket read. All right. I'll read you this item: Enjoyably seriousness. All right. That has rocket read. And who or what would oppose enjoyably seriousness?

PC: Nix enjoyably seriousness.

LRH: All right. Now what's the trouble with that one?

PC: I thought well, at last – ahh, that's... right.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know. Nix enjoyably se-
LRH: Very good. And I'll read you this item: Nix... nix enjoyably seriousness. All right. Now what – has something else happened here?

PC: Well, I suppose what it is, is that it seems like uh... Let me tell you this – um – it seems to a degree that I don't know a bit what is happening, you see. Like I don't know did it RR or didn't it RR. Is it a choked RR or what. I'm sort of – feel like I'm missing out maybe a bit. I don't know what's wrong.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Mm-hm. Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item again: Nix enjoyably seriousness. All right. That RR'd when you said it, you see.

PC: Mm-hm. Mm-hm.

LRH: And however it's a choked – this is choked down on this. It isn't behaving too well. And you're understandably a bit upset on the demonstration and so forth.

PC: Mm-hm. Mm-hm.

LRH: You don't ordinarily run like this. And, however, we're making it.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Take a look at your visio there. Let's see what you can see... What was that?

PC: Oh! I – I'm confused. I don't know whether I'm going up or down the steps.

LRH: Oh yes?

PC: Hm-hm. At the present moment. But it seems like – um – it seems like I'm going down. Because I've got the white. It's turned white back of me. It's all black in front of me.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Hmm.

LRH: All right. Any muddy areas in that black back of you? What were you going to say?

PC: I'm going back – I'm going down the stairs...

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: ...backwards.

LRH: All right.

PC: All right. Now I've got myself located.

LRH: Okay. Are there any areas of gray in that white?

PC: Yeah, just right here on uh – nix enjoyably seriousness.

LRH: All right. And what's wrong right there on that one?

PC: I don't know.

LRH: All right. Has it been suppressed? Yes.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What's the suppression?

PC: Well, I guess I didn't know whether I was going up or down in this one until right there, maybe.

LRH: All right.

PC: And I sort of got myself oriented – I'm going down the stairs backwards now.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Hm.
LRH: Okay. Let me read you this item: Nix enjoyably seriousness. All right. That has rocket read. I've got to check, however, one little thing here. On that item has anything been suppressed? No. On that item has anything been invalidated? No. All right. Nix enjoyably seriousness. What was that?

PC: Nix enjoyably seriousness! It went white.

LRH: All right. It fired.

PC: Yeah. It went white!

LRH: It went white.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Just like that? All right. Thank you. All right. Who or what would nix enjoyably seriousness oppose?

PC: Pleasurably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. I'll read you this item: Pleasurably seriousness. Now, is there something wrong with that item? I'm sorry to have to chivy you up and I shouldn't use the word wrong. But is there anything at odds with that item? Has it been suppressed?

PC: Well, one can't very much have pleasurably – be pleasurably serious. Can one? You know.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Oh, I guess one can, sometimes.

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: No, that's all.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item: Pleasurably seriousness. All right. That rocket read. There's still a choke down on it. [a ticking noise starts] Got any clue as to... Oh, are you being distracted by the environment again?

PC: Yeah. I was wondering what that is.

LRH: It's nothing.

PC: It's a pipe.

LRH: Yeah. Anything else about that?

PC: No, that's all.

LRH: All right. What else?

PC: And then I looked at your – saw your watch and I thought well, you've only got a short while more to go here and...

LRH: All right.

PC: That's all.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item again: Pleasurably seriousness. All right. That rocket read. And who or what would oppose pleasurably seriousness?

PC: Nix pleasurably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. All right. We're having the same trouble with that one?

PC: Well, nix pleasurably seriousness.

LRH: All right.

PC: Not pleasurably seriousness. No pleasurably seriousness?

LRH: Ah, it's all right. I just wondered if anything was suppressed on it, and so forth. Okay. I'll give you this item: Nix pleasurably seriousness. All right. On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been invalidated? Yes. You're having a bad time?
PC: Mm.

LRH: Upsetting you. I appreciate it is rough – auditing in this environment.

PC: Mm. No, I guess I just wondered if – what the trouble was on it, or something, I guess.

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay. [a hissing noise starts] Let me read you the item again: Nix pleasurably seriousness. All right. There was a little kick left in it. Who or what would nix pleasurably seriousness oppose?

PC: Agreeably seriousness.

LRH: All right, very good. On this item has anything been suppressed? It didn't fire.

PC: It didn't fire.

LRH: You pretty distracted?

PC: Well there's that thing – piff and piffing – and there's the uh – um – television making that high electronic sound...

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: ...over there, you see and...

LRH: Yes, yes.

PC: ...I am coming up and trying to go through this implant and – uh – and actually that electronic sound is terribly high and it hurts my ears, that's all.

LRH: Is that so?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Okay, let me read to you this item: Agreeably seriousness. All right, anything else on that?

PC: I don't think so.
PC: Well that di... it – distracts me.

LRH: All right. Let me shut that off.

PC: [laughs] It's better.

LRH: Is that better?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, it's all right.

PC: Mm.

LRH: In this session has anything been protested?

PC: Well, we certainly are in an electronically involved environment, I thought, here.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know, what with the – uhm – that tube up there humming, and the – and that humming and everything humming around, and then all the televisions in the room over there humming, and I thought, "My word, what a humming environment." That's all I thought. It's – it's electronic!

LRH: All right, very good. Okay, now.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Feel better?

PC: Yeah, I do.

LRH: All right. Let me read you this item: Agreeably seriousness. All right. That's still trying to rocket read. Take a look at the step, now, on which you see it.

PC: Yeah, it's agreeably seriousness.

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. And that step has discharged. Okay, thank you. And who or what would oppose agreeably seriousness?

PC: Nix agreeably seriousness.

LRH: All right. All right, on this item has anything been suppressed? Yes!

PC: Well I sort of suppressed it all along while trying to find the other one because of course you get the one and then in the – in the implant it goes pft-pft, you see?

LRH: Hm.

PC: And so this pft over here has been held up for getting this pft off over here.

LRH: Oh, yeah. Very good. Let me read you this item: Nix agreeably seriousness. All right, that rocket read. Let me make sure now that there is no further suppression. Nix agreeably seriousness. All right. There isn't a breath on it, on the take.

PC: All right.

LRH: Okay? And who or what would nix agreeably seriousness oppose?

PC: Dedicately seriousness.

LRH: Very good. And – thank you. Give me some variations on that.

PC: Dedicativeably seriousness.

LRH: All right.

PC: Dedicatedably seriousness.

LRH: Right.

PC: Dedicatingably seriousness.

LRH: All right.

PC: Dedicationably seriousness.

LRH: Very good. Dedicationably?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right.

PC: And dedicately seriousness.
LRH: All right. Very good. Let me read you this item. Dedicatively serious-
ness.

PC: Dedicatively seriousness. That's it.

LRH: All right. Let me check these items now. Dedicatively serious-
ness. All right. And let me read you the other item: Dedicatively serious-
ness. There's something wrong between these two items? Now did you suppress in some way that because it had two on it?

PC: No, except you know, that um – I normally had the "tiveably" and that sort of changed over in the past two banks.

LRH: All right.

PC: Um – dedicativeably seriousness.

LRH: All right. On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been invalidated? On this item is there anything you failed to reveal? All right. Have you had a cognition about it? There.

PC: Yes, I thought – uh someone is dedic... dedicated, you see, to seriousness. Dedicativeably seriousness.

LRH: I don't quite understand that.

PC: Dedicate – you know? One's dedicated to seriousness.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Maybe it's dedicatedly seriousness.

LRH: Oh, all right. Well let's see what it is. Dedicatedly seriousness. All right. Dedicativeably seriousness. What are you doing? You running it over in your mind?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. And dedicatedly seriousness. All right. We haven't got the item yet.

PC: Dedicatedly seriousness?

LRH: Mm-mm. Dedicativeably seriousness. All right. Dedicatedly seriousness.

PC: I keep getting "dedicated to seriousness," you see, so I...

LRH: Well, give me dedicated to seriousness.

PC: Dedicated to seriousness.

LRH: Very good. Give me anything else you can think of there.

PC: Serious dedication. [laughs] That's it.

LRH: All right. Good. Anything else?

PC: No, that's it. That's – that's what was sitting on top of it.

LRH: Oh, all right. I'll read you this item now. Dedicatively seriousness. All right, that was trying to rocket read. Let me check the other one and make sure that it isn't in: Dedicativeably seriousness. All right, and your item is dedicateably seriousness. All right, that rocket read. It has had some other rocket reads – one kind or another, but it's still suspicious as the item as it's got a bit of suppress on it. Is there anything else – ? That? There – there was something.

PC: The only thing I'm thinking about is – is that I'm sort of sitting here holding these cans, and it feels like I'm – because the cans are so sticky, it feels like I'm holding sort of two unwrapped candy bars in my hands and they're getting all messy and dirty.

LRH: All right.

PC: I have never felt such sticky
cans in my life.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Right? So that – I'm suppressing that. You know, it's all for – I feel like throwing them down and going and washing my hands. A bit – not drastically so but it is – it is a bit of a PTP sitting here with – feeling these sticky cans.

**LRH:** All right. Good. Now I'm going to read you this item again: Dedicately seriousness. All right. That rocket read.

**PC:** All right, good.

**LRH:** And who or what would oppose dedicateably seriousness?

**PC:** Nix dedicateably seriousness.

**LRH:** Very good. It didn't rocket read when you said it.

**PC:** I wondered if I'd said it with an "ed." Nix dedicateably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. I'll read you this item: Nix dedicateably seriousness. All right, that has rocket read. On that item has anything been suppressed? Anything been invalidated? Anything you failed to reveal? All right. Very good. That is your item. Nix dedicateably seriousness. All right and that fired...

**PC:** Mm.

**LRH:** ...very nicely. All right. Who or what would nix dedicateably seriousness oppose?

**PC:** Commendably seriousness.

**LRH:** Very good. Now what happened with that one? That didn't rocket read.

**PC:** Commendablebly seriousness. Commendab – commendably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. And who or what would nix dedicateably seriousness oppose? Just to...

**PC:** Commendably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Anything else you may know?

**PC:** Happiness.

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** Happiness.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** No one knows happiness. Prims and propers.

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** Prims and propers – serious people.

**LRH:** Mm-mm.

**PC:** Deadly serious people. Deadly serious people.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** You can be so serious you can be dead. Hmm.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Mmm. Commendably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Let me read you this item: Commendably seriousness. All right, that's trying to rocket read. Ah, as a matter of fact it has rocket read, but you're sitting on something. I'm not quite sure what it is here. It's got this squashed. Now, what is it?

**PC:** Hmm. I don't know.

**LRH:** There's something there. All right. In this session has anything been protested? In this session is there anything which you failed to reveal? In this session
has anything been suppressed? Yes, yes. Yes, what's been suppressed?

**PC:** Well I suppressed for quite a while only the sound of the – just the sound of all the electronics and the "hummm-hummm." I suppressed the – the stickiness of the cans.

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** And then also uh – are you asking suppress or protest?

**LRH:** Suppress.

**PC:** Another thing I've suppressed, is I wondered who owns this E-Meter and keeps their cans in this condition.

**LRH:** Well, all right.

**PC:** You know? I would like to sort of find out who is responsible and tell them to wash their cans.

**LRH:** Okay. In this session has anything been suppressed?

**PC:** Yeah, I'd suppressed I didn't want to seem like an old, you know – nag, nag, nag because I'm moaning about the auditing environment, but those things were disturbing me.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** And then um – also I would – hope that we wouldn't have any trouble, that we'd go along swimmingly, you see?

**LRH:** Mm-hm.

**PC:** Like it usually does. And then, it's not. I suppose it's on television and... That's all. That's it.

**LRH:** All right, very good. Let me read you this item: Commendably seriousness. All right. That's rocket reading. But is giving suppressed read.
items in general? Numbers of items found?

**PC:** No, no, no, not worried about number of items found.

**LRH:** All right. Now that rocket read.

**PC:** Mmm?

**LRH:** Nix commendably seriousness did rocket read. I'll read it again: Nix commendably seriousness. All right, that has rocket read.

**PC:** Hm-mm.

**LRH:** Okay? And who or what would nix commendably seriousness oppose?

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Very good. It didn't rocket read.

**PC:** All right.

**LRH:** Give me some variations on it.

**PC:** Desiringably seriousness. Desirably se... Desirefully seriousness.

**LRH:** Mm-hm.

**PC:** Desirously seriousness.

**LRH:** Mm-hm. What was that one?

**PC:** Desirously seriousness.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** And desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Good enough. Now, on this item has anything been suppressed? Yes?

**PC:** Turning it the other way around. Seeing how it goes that way.

**LRH:** Hm?

**PC:** Turning it the other way around. Saying a serious desirability, or something.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Now, we running into the second implant here?

**PC:** Well, maybe.

**LRH:** All right. How about the first one? I get this first one on this thing. Desirably seriousness.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness.
you had a cognition on this item? There's something there.

**PC:** No, just that seriousness is desired in certain places and at certain times – that's all. And I can imagine some people wishing that some people, you know, would be more serious; or someone himself wishing, "Oh, I wish I could be more serious about things." And, you know, say like he's studying for medicine or something like that and – and he decides that he better be serious about it all. And, well, people can decide to be serious. You know?

**LRH:** All right. Very good. Okay, now let me read you this item: Desirably seriousness. All right. That item hasn't given a satisfactory rocket read.

**PC:** Hm.

**LRH:** It just hasn't.

**PC:** Is it desired-ably seriousness?

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Desiringably seriousness?

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Um, wanted seriousness?

**LRH:** All right, on this item has anything been suppressed? On this item is there anything you failed to reveal? All right, on this item has anything been invalidated? There's a maybe on invalidated.

**PC:** Well it hasn't rocket read, so to that degree it's been invalidated.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** Um, no I can't think of anything else.

**LRH:** All right. Very good.

**PC:** Desirably seriousness!

**LRH:** Mm-hm. All right – doesn't seem to be much charge left on it. Desirably seriousness. All right, there is a small rocket read on this, but it however is a persistent rocket read.

**PC:** Mm.

**LRH:** It keeps persistently giving a small rocket read.

**PC:** It's never given a big one yet?

**LRH:** It's never given a big rocket read.

**PC:** Mm.

**LRH:** Now, is there a big protest against seriousness being desirable? Yes.

**PC:** Mm.

**LRH:** Huh? When did you first spot that – in this session?

**PC:** Well, I'm just protesting seriousness period, you see. I'm dramatizing the oppterm's no, no, no, no, no, no – no seriousness. And I of course protested the goal when I was being run through it, too, you see?

**LRH:** Oh!

**PC:** I didn't like it, you know?

**LRH:** Mm-hm.

**PC:** And um – particularly after "to be happy," you know?

**LRH:** Mm-hm.

**PC:** I felt, well even if these people are crazy, at least uh – at least I – and I'll probably end up coming out of this thing all messed up but at least I might be happy! [laughs] You know? But look at this "to be serious," you see? And then the next goal they put me through is "to be serious" and that – then that sort of throws all hope that I'll even have anything – any benefit from
this whatsoever! You know, I could see myself coming out of this, if they'd left me with "to be happy," coming out sort of compulsively euphoric or something like that and well, although that may have been an aberrated state, it was at least a happy aberrated state, do you see what I mean?

**LRH:** Mmm. Mmm.

**PC:** And then they put this in, and this is an unhappy, deadly type of thing – even though I didn't like it!

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** So desirably seriousness – I didn't desire this thing at all – the whole time I was saying it.

**LRH:** All right. Let me read you this item now: Desirably seriousness. All right. It has rocket read. The rocket read is getting very tiny now. Is there anything else you might – wish to tell me about the desirability of being serious?

**PC:** Well I used to desire to be serious myself! You see? When I'd go to church, I would always laugh and um – and I used to sit there and desire that I could be serious. Oh, yes! And then one time you ran a process – um, it was some group processing – this was in Phoenix, Arizona – and you were running um – "Be serious," you know? And the minute you said that, gave that command, I started laughing. And I laughed and I laughed and I laughed and I laughed and I laughed; and I couldn't stop laughing – and every time you said, "All right. Be serious," I would burst out in more peals of laughter! I thought that was the funniest thing! You know? Every time I tried to be serious, I would laugh! And uhm – so, and in these circumstances, in this lifetime, every time I've tried to be serious, I always end up laughing, you see?

**LRH:** Oh, I see.

**PC:** And I think it's terribly funny, but I know I shouldn't – I should be serious!

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** I've wanted to be serious! Well, I thought other people were quite serious; and I thought that was part of being an adult, too. Adults could be told that they were different from children because they were so deadly serious. [laughs] And then when I was able to view adults a bit better, I thought they were grimly serious and I didn't want to be like that, you see?

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** I've wanted to be serious! Well, I thought other people were quite serious; and I thought that was part of being an adult, too. Adults could be told that they were different from children because they were so deadly serious. [laughs] And then when I was able to view adults a bit better, I thought they were grimly serious and I didn't want to be like that, you see?

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** So, desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** Okay. All right. Let me read you this item here and see what we've now got: Desirably seriousness. All right. That rocket read beautifully.

**PC:** All right. Well, thank goodness.

**LRH:** And a great big one! And who or what would oppose desirably seriousness?

**PC:** Nix desirably seriousness.

**LRH:** Good. All right. Let me read you this item: Nix desirably seriousness. All right. That has apparently blown its charge. There is anything else you care to say about it?

**PC:** No, I'm glad to get that off. I feel a bit of relief.

**LRH:** All right. Let me give it to you again just to make sure there's nothing on it: Nix desirably seriousness. All right. Just – there was just a tick left. Okay. Nix desirably seriousness. All right. Now, who or what would nix desirably seriousness oppose?

**PC:** Wantably seriousness.

**LRH:** All right. Okay. Is there any-
thing about this "wantably seriousness"?

PC: No, it's another like "desirably," but it's – I feel better about that. It's "wantably seriousness."

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll read you this item: Wantably seriousness. All right. And you've said it twice and it blew it to pieces apparently. But I think there's a little more trouble with it. "Wantably seriousness." Got a little more tick on it than I'd care to have here. Yes, what's that thought that's coming across on this? ... There. There.

PC: Well, I just was uh – just wondering about it. That's all. Well, I sort of got the idea that someone uh – you know – seriously wanting – you know? A little bit of reverse on it – on the item. Sort of uh – you know how people – this is not wantably seriousness I'm thinking about – but people wanting things seriously, you know. Like they'll stand and they'll – they'll look in, uhm – well, women say; going window-shopping and they'll – they're so serious, they'll stand there and look at all the things and they're – they're wanting! You know? They're serious about wanting – it's a reverse look on the item – that's all.

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me read you this again and see if we've got anything on it: Wantably seriousness. That rocket read very nicely. That was your item and that was the last item we're going to find.

PC: All right. Jolly good.

LRH: All right. Okay. Well we got – we found quite a few anyhow...

PC: Mmm! We've found that...

LRH: ...in a short period of time. From 3 to 39!
LRH: Mmmm.
PC: And um – I can run it without dying of laughter, so I must be improving on it!
LRH: All right. Okay.
PC: And I had a good session.
LRH: Any more?
PC: I think that covers it.
LRH: All right. Very good.
PC: Oh, I feel better about the auditing environment, too. It seems all right now.
LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, your havingness is just a hair down.
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Put your cans down. All right. Touch that cloth. Thank you. Touch the top of the microphone. Thank you. Touch the top of the can. Thank you. Touch that paper. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Pick up your cans. All right. Squeeze your cans. Let's do that again – squeeze the cans. Well, it's not quite as good as it was beginning of the session. Put them down; I'm going to run a bit more here. All right. Touch that cord.
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Thank you. Touch the back of the E-Meter.
PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Thank you. Touch that microphone stand.
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Thank you. Touch the side of the ashtray.
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Thank you. Touch the top of the cans; both of them. Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right; we're going to leave it at that. Your havingness came up.
PC: Mm-hm. Okay.
LRH: All right. 6:13. And you're down here at 2.75; you had very good tone arm action.
PC: Good! All right.
LRH: All right. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?
PC: Thank you very much; appreciate it.
LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?
PC: Mm-hm.
LRH: Very good. End of session.
PC: Thank you.
LRH: All right. Tell me I am no longer auditing you.
PC: You're not now auditing me.
LRH: Very good. Go ahead.

All right. Before you disband and come apart at the seams or something like that, I want to call to your attention something: The pc did get harassed; the pc did get ARC broken, and the pc did get upset; but the pc came out of it all right because I straightened it all up. I stayed with the pc and straightened it up. You understand that?

And did you see, toward the end there, the fantastic rocket read that was buried underneath? Commendably seriousness. Did you see that rocket read? And if that thing was reading...
somewhat, the same kind of a rocket read that some of you cookies have been getting lately? Oh man – *aurrrruhhhh*. You shouldn't do that! Did you see that rocket read buried underneath there? Well you had one of your little, tiny rocket reads – actually that was a three-quarters of an inch rocket read – that thing. But did you notice that it read persistently. Now, why did I pick on it? Because the rocket read was choked. Now you saw disintegrating rocket reads; you saw choked rocket reads; you saw flicks; you saw things that didn't rocket read at all. And you saw them all brought up to a wide, crashing rocket read without a tremor on the item afterwards when I crosschecked it.

Now, of course this pc was being audited under very difficult circumstances and as a demonstration and so forth, running out a bank and so forth, and this is very tough. But in spite of that, let me point something out to you: that my job as an auditor was to get the charge off and I did – regardless of the pc's ARC breaks or anything else.

Now by golly, if you will stick to it and if you will work like that and you'll do like that and you'll get that charge off, without unnecessarily harassing the pc and so forth, and learn – be sensitive to your meter; work with the pc and so forth, you'll have a pc flying in no time.

Actually, you didn't see the benefit that we got out of this immediate case. Because I could have audited her here now for the next hour and found myself about 150 items. How? Well, the pc was beginning to run; just beginning to run. We got the environment settled down and we got some other things straightened up. But this was a tough bank and the pc ran it and we bled what... an awful amount of charge off of this thing.

I also want to call to your attention – I asked her to take a look at the steps and gray areas and masses and that sort of thing, and at the end, it was her contest with the bank even more than her contest with the auditing room which was crystallizing on this situation. That was what was holding her up. It's always the Routine 3. The auditing session environment can be straightened up with benefit, but it's the Routine 3 in the final run that is lousing the session up. Always remember that.

All right. Now, there was a demonstration. I intended this demonstration to be that of easy run and instead of that, you got a demonstration of a hard run. Your demonstration of an easy run would simply be: Bang, bang and the thing blowing down in all directions, but because of the strange environment, why this pc who ordinarily runs well, was running badly. All right.

There it is. And I think you ought to give the pc a big hand, because she took her case at risk.

Okay. Thank you very much and good evening.
Well, thanks for bringing me up to present time. What is present time?

Audience: Twenty-third of May.

Twenty-third of May, AD 13, the year of the OT. Everybody is calling it the year of the Clear, and we never had a chance. We ran over that, you know.

Well, we could say that we've started the ball rolling to a very marked degree in Australia and California. We've got things pretty well going around the world in general. There are some rough spots. I was presented with a bunch of government type corporation data and tax structure data, and so forth, today and was actually trying to get some time in a little bit earlier in trying to put this stuff together.

This is very amusing. Every now and then an accountant or somebody of that sort wonders why I have not paid more attention to this particular facet of our activities. The only lesson I have learned is when I let the control and copyrights of Dianetics and Scientology get out from under, it gave some very aberrated wog a wonderful idea that he could knock us all off and it caused a lot of trouble. So that's about the only thing I've been careful of, and the idea of putting together Earth type corporations, government type corporations, you see, has always been rather amusing to me. I'm afraid that's the truth of the matter.

And at a very much earlier time in the development of Dianetics and Scientology, I was able to look this over and realize that there wasn't any government on Earth that had any right to give us a license to survive. They all try to assert this right, don't you see. And I didn't go into any vast games condition with them. But it was the realization that we needed a structure fitted to our needs rather than a mildewed, Earth type corporation that made me somewhat lackadaisical in breaking my neck to put together Earth type corporations, you see?

And I've now collided with the necessity of setting up a better corporate structure. And the Earth type corporation, of course, must be there, because of taxation, because of this and because of that and so on. But to expect an Earth government to protect us one way or the other is laughable. It isn't like setting the lion to protect the lamb; I'm afraid that is not it, you see? It's setting an ant, you see, to guard the citadel. And it – it just – it doesn't – you know, it's just silly.

So I am faced with this and quite a few other problems at this particular time. And with everything else you say, well, how could he be faced with those problems, too? Well, I manage to get faced with a lot of problems.
I learned the other night that a present time problem is only caused by not having enough time. That actually blew all my present time problems. It was just a cognition. If you want to know why you've got a present time problem, well, you just don't have enough time, do you see? Time factor is missing out of it, so therefore it's a present time problem. It's as simple as that.

Now, very many things come up and looking over and examining the state of planets and civilizations before the Helatrobus Implants... call them the "Heaven Implants," public will understand it a little bit better. But they are the implants implanted by this – wasn't even a confederacy, this interplanetary nation called Helatrobus – little pip-squeak government, didn't amount to very much. They had gold crosses on their planes, like the American Red Cross or something of the sort. And everybody thought they were nice, ineffectual people. Nobody could trace down who was doing all of it. They had developed some technology. This technology probably was not totally unknown around about the place, but nobody put it together or combined it with an energy which was peculiarly commanding upon a thetan.

Now, that energy was cold energy. And that's probably the big mystery about it – you wonder what this energy was. Actually it's frozen energy. It's based on the fact that certain energies do not thrive in sub-sub-subzero temperatures. And this is a cold energy action, so therefore your pcs get very cold and get very hot and so on while running it.

Now, they were able to put significance very directly into this energy so that it tended to talk, and which was an interesting electronic trick. But all of that so commands your attention that you overlook another factor. They had figured out, above all things – this is fantastic – something which looked to everyone else like a natural phenomenon. And I can see the learned, MIT-type scientist now, sitting around explaining the presence of radioactive clouds. We call them in Earth's astronomy lingo a Magellanic cloud. Those exist in tremendous profusion toward the center of a galaxy. There are tremendous quantities of these huge radioactive clouds.

Anybody that's ever been through planet-building or anything like that recognize these things. It's the cloud that you bung a big mass into to make it fission and collect all the particles to become a sun. And anyway, these are in enormous profusions toward the center of a galaxy. Now, when we say galaxy we mean one of those wheels which you see in the astronomy textbooks. And when we say an island of galaxies or an island galaxy, or so forth, we mean six or eight of these wheels, and they're clustered together. And this universe is composed of a galaxy, a collection of galaxies isolated from other collections of galaxies, you see? They've recently started to call these things "island universes." I don't know why, but that fits in with Earth technology on the thing.

Well, anyway, one of these great spinning wheels has, of course, in it just literally billions of stars. I don't know what the factor is. I was going to say trillions; don't – perhaps not that high – maybe it's higher. And every one of these stars is capable of having planets. And it's a greater oddity to find a star without planets than it is with one. The egocentric characteristic of man dictates Earth as the only planet that goes around a sun. I consider this very, very interesting, but it just shows you how bad off you can get after you've been implanted. Anyway, the system of stars in its greatest aggregate, of course, is visible as this thing called a
galaxy. And you'll see pictures of them in astronomy textbooks. You want to get one of these kid's astronomy textbooks, if any of this is beyond you. As an auditor you may have need of the data to know what the devil the pc is talking about. Not because you tell the pc, but there it is.

And one of these great wheels tends to be rather oblong and the stars tend to be massed up toward the hub. They're not a sphere, they're a flat wheel. They've got a hub, and they've got a rim, and this pattern of stars scattered in.

When you look up toward the Milky Way, and when you see the whitest portion of the Milky Way on a clear night, you're looking straight at the hub of this particular galaxy. And when you look in the opposite direction, you're looking at scattered patterns of cl... of stars, even though some of them are quite large, and you're looking out away from the hub. And doing that you recognize that Earth is an awful long way from being at the center of this galaxy. In fact it is classifiable as a rim star.

Now, these galaxies in composition are, of course, a great condensed radioactive cloud of some kind or another that existed at one time or another and you've got a condensation. And this condensation brings about a sun, and then because of the orbital influences of bits of matter and so forth, these collect around the edges of it and are formed as planets. And these planets sometimes shatter, they have political accidents or something, and you'll get a belt of asteroids. And the planets vary in numbers, and classified at a higher level of astronomy each type of star has its own classification, depending not so much on its order of magnitude, although that is there, too, but on the brilliance per mass. It's the brilliance per mass of a star. So that you get actually coal-black stars. They look coal-black. You get up right close to them and you find out they're red-hot. Well, that's been referred to as a dead sun, or something like this. And it's pretty grisly if you ever happen to not navigate correctly, because they get in your road most God-awfully. They don't radiate enough to be detected.

And that moves up to your dull reds, the dull-red sun – you can see these things. Let's see, where is there one around here? There's – which one is it? Aldebaran, I think, is a dull-red one. There's one up there in Taurus, the constellation Taurus, and it is bright red. And then you move up from that, you get to a yellow sun. And that is more or less the characteristic of Earth's sun; it is – tends to be more yellow than otherwise. And then you move up to a higher radiation factor, and you get a white sun and you get a blue sun. Those are the various radiation factors. Your white and blue there may be interchanged. But the point I'm making is, is there's different brilliances, and then there's different masses for these brilliances. And all those – these things have some relationship.

Now, you go down into the tropics in a meat body, you're liable to get ultraviolet poisoning. Because the sun's rays are so directly ahead that you get too much ultraviolet. Well, around a brilliantly blue sun, of course, these types of rays are just pounding away all the time, all the time, all the time, and you'd fry in the type of body you're in. Nevertheless, just because a meat body is at a highly critical temperature and mass level – that is to say, it can only live on a planet of so much mass, it can only live on a planet of so much heat or cold, you see, is no reason why life forms or bodies, which have two arms and two legs and a head and so forth – no reason why bodies don't exist that can stand these extremes. And the upshot
of this is that the science fiction writer is always trying to tell you about… You see, the science fiction writer's memory is faulty, and he gets himself all restimulated and so forth, and he doesn't remember straight. Some of them remember it quite well, but then they reverse their time – we wouldn't quite know why that is – and put it all into the future, which I consider quite interesting. They, of course, wouldn't know anything about the implants that turn every... all time backwards.

Now, I imagine in the days of Columbus, you go along the docks, you'd hear some old salt who has been actually outside the breakwater explaining to some young aspirant as to why Columbus cannot reach the other side of the ocean, and you hear tales of monsters and that sort of thing – because you mustn't go out there, you see – and the horrible monsters of the sea, and they have huge tentacles and they gobble you up, you see, and they swallow whole ships, and all of this sort of thing. You would have found that very current in Cadiz, the port of embarkation there, just before Columbus' sailing.

Well, it's worse than that. These tales were probably spread by the Phoenicians, who made regular voyages from the Mediterranean to England to pick up tin and didn't want anybody else cutting in on their racket, see? And so they talked about these monsters that existed at sea, and it was all terrible, and you didn't dare venture out through the Pillars of Hercules, or out of the sight of land, because you'd get et up.

Well, mothers have the same trouble; they tell their little children if they aren't good that somebody will get them, or the bogeyman or something like this. In other words, this is a standard mechanism about the bogeyman and the terrible beings and all of that sort of thing. It's a standard mechanism that's used for various reasons in various places. And that has existed through this universe. So that most people have parked somewhere in their consciousness the idea that if they went to the planet Gyppo, you see, that there they would find huge tubelike creatures, you see, that would *pfssss* suck you all up at a *gluph*, see? And – you know, bogies. And the science fiction writer, being the furthest from reality on the situation, is liable to perpetuate the bogey faster than he perpetuates fact. I should not decry him because he's done a very good job.

But the truth of the matter is that most planets are inhabited by and lived on by and run by animal forms quite similar to Earth's. Actually they classify – they're classified by rings. So many planets out from a yellow or twelfth-rate sun has a certain type of flora and fauna for each one of its continents. You see, it's all classifiable. But you get this modified, then, when you go out into the next planetary ring and you get this modified when you go into the next planetary ring, you see? But it's more or less classified. It's pretty standard, it's what can adapt to that particular type of environment. And although I don't think you'd have very much pleasure out of kissing a girl from Jupiter – that's a heavy-gravity planet, and if you stepped on the planet Jupiter in one of these meat bodies that you presently have, you would become a pancake promptly, you see? And what atmosphere it has lies in seas of liquid air and so on. You might say that this is somewhat rigorous as an environment, not completely similar to Russia but… So you do get these various variations. And it's not all that horrifying, however.
You find somebody running around the planet Jupiter, he'd be built to withstand that climatic condition, and that gravitic condition and so forth, and his legs might be a bit modified and his arms and that sort of thing, but he probably would look like an Eskimo. The truth of the matter is, then, that the universe is not a strange place filled full of terrifying beings of one kind or another, but in actual fact is a rather pleasant place, except where people have been very, very busy making it an unpleasant place.

Now, if you face up to what has happened to meat bodies and what has been done with this universe, you could become very disheartened and you could become very caved in, and you could say well, this universe then is fully and completely a trap, until you recognize that this factor has occurred: The thetan is helped all the time by MEST – all the time, all the time, all the time, all the time by MEST. It gives him consecutive scenery, gives him location; these are all things which he does not – is not just been overwhelmed by, but things which are actually things that he likes. It gives him a permanent, persistent structure of matter. He can put up a little shadow of a house today or something like that and it's there tomorrow, you see? If he forgets about it, it doesn't disappear. All kinds of problems that a thetan had have been solved by this universe and he's on a one-way help flow when he gets too far down. Universe helps him; he doesn't help the universe.

Somebody who is in that frame of mind, you can simply ask this simple question: "How could you help the physical universe?" You get the degree it helps him; makes a stuck flow. All right, "How could you help the physical universe," see? And he's liable to comm lag on that first answer for a little while, but he suddenly will come up with a whole bunch of answers and he'll suddenly feel better about this universe.

In other words, if the universe is anything, it's too good for you. And people can't stand this, so they decide the MEST universe is evil. So every once in a while you'll get some bloke that decides to make it a very evil place. And he'll get some wild, weird idea of what is wrong with it. What he thinks is wrong with it is inevitably that it has free beings in it. He always comes to this conclusion, if he's that degraded, and therefore starts to get very busy to make beings unfree. The net result of this is chaos.

The origin of the universe in the first place is probably – and this is very hypothetical, even though we have found this type of thing time and time again, it hasn't been too well explored – probably was a collision of home universes. Everybody was busy building a universe, and it wasn't in any time period and its collision, one by one, and another by another, would form this big universe. It's probably made out of fragments of home universes – some such thing.

Well, the problem of why everybody stays in present time is one of the more fantastic problems. And I got a short breakthrough on that not very long ago, which was just this as a breakthrough: There's a vibration; a response to a vibration. And that response to a vibration is so uniform that from one end to another of this universe you have one present time. I don't care if it takes you a long time to reach some other galaxy, it's still vibrating in this exact instant. Or even if its light takes so long to get from it to you, that cuts no ice. In this very split second it is vibrating at exactly the same vibration not only that this universe, this galaxy, you see, is vibrating at but that you and your bank are vibrating at. In other words, your bank
is a bank because it has a vibration of MEST. Interesting, isn't it? The only variation in that vibration is time, so therefore you can move somebody on his time track and you can get different sections of the vibration.

One time or another somebody was overwhelmed by or did a lot of overts and overwhelmed others with vibration. It was a very minute vibration, now; we're talking about a very minute vibration. Not the vibration of sound, that's terribly coarse; or even supersonic sound, or even the vibration of that; we're talking about the vibration of a light particle. We're talking about the vibrations of the L-ring of the electron. We're talking about a vibration now which is unimaginably far away and forgotten as far as a thetan is concerned. And the unison of this vibration of matter is something to which the thetan responds. All of that is very hypothetical, but I've been looking for things which would detach a time track, and this was an hypothesis I came up with which might explain the phenomenon of present time. And I couldn't think of anything else that would explain the phenomenon of present time, offhand.

Now, the time track itself is formed by an involuntary intention. Now, in studying the power of an Operating Thetan, I have had very many pauses in my thinking. I knew intellectually the power of an Operating Thetan. This I knew and have discussed it, and you'll find it in various books and writings and lectures and so forth about Operating Thetans. And we all know what we're talking about when we talk about Operating Thetan. That's what's another weird thing, you see? Something that interdefines itself. But instead of just this intellectual appreciation of the data, I myself have in very recent weeks, have been exploring the actual potentialities of an Operating Thetan. And I was giving a demonstration the other day in the Instructor's meeting. You take the cellophane off of a packet of cigarettes and set it down all by itself, and ask somebody to pick it up without denting it. And don't let it dent even slightly. And he actually won't be able to do it. If you don't believe me, why, make it as an experiment sometime. It's quite impressive. You think, well, you can get your fingers on it, and so on, you'll always see a flutter of dent. You can't handle it delicately enough to pick it up without denting it. It isn't just the structure or fabric of it; it's the fact that if you could actually exactly measure the exact pressure to put on that cellophane packet, you could pick it up without a dent occurring in it and without any collapse of its wall or side.

That's probably the basic problem of an Operating Thetan. And that problem itself may give him his time track. This is a wild bow, isn't it? I mean, how do you make that connection of logique? Well, it's this way: The power of an Operating Thetan is such that if he were to pick up a steel cylinder capable of resisting several hundred pounds to the square inch, he would have that same problem that you have with the cellophane.

His problem is, how does he touch things without crushing them? He picks up this steel cylinder and he looks at it and it's got a dent on both sides. And you actually should practice this with some cellophane – with this cellophane cigarette wrapper, to get the exact sensation of being careful that an Operating Thetan has in handling MEST. You'll find it quite restimulative.

Now in handling this then, he seeks another method of handling. After you've politely picked up a little boy's toys for him, or some friend's mock-up to give it back to him, you see, and it's now lying there in a remarkable state of crumple, you get the idea that you're quite
destructive. This brings about the idea of destructivity. As Suzie said the other day, "I think the reason they do this is they're just jealous of an Operating Thetan." People who haven't that level of action then are coaxed into believing that an Operating Thetan – or a free thetan is a better designation, because we knew of ourselves as free thetans, you see? There were various kinds of thetans and a free thetan was somebody who was free of a body. He wasn't free of organizational commitments or ethics, but he was free of a body; he didn't require any body.

Now, this would coax them to believe that a free thetan was destructive. And they would then lay this into him and even trap him with the idea of making him touch something to break it up and even build something that looked strong but was fragile to convince him even further, don't you see? That's your first trap. Because it caused the free thetan to pick up a new trick, instead of squash things by picking them up – doing things by intention.

Now, we've always thought of that as primary, and it is not primary, it is secondary. The postulate and action through a postulate is secondary to action through energy. You have to be able to do both. It is more natural for a thetan to pick up this crayon by picking it up – not necessarily mocking beams to pick it up, but by picking it up. You understand? Just picking it up. But if his idea of his own destructivity is so great, he then will develop a secondary means of picking it up. And this secondary means of picking it up is operation by intention. He'll pick it up by postulate; he'll pick it up by intention – he will intend it up. You understand? And he can do that, too, but it imposes a great restraint on him and is in actual fact a great downgrade from simply picking it up.

You sit over something and strain at it to make it move and this will tend to prove to you that you can't make things move anymore. Where as a matter of fact that is quite unnatural, what you're doing – intending to make this move. Intending to make this move. That's quite unnatural. Your actual bent is just to move it. Just move it. Do you get the difference? There is a world of difference. And the reason one stops moving it is because he's afraid he'll destroy it. There won't be anything there to move, except some powder. So he develops this trick, which we call an intention.

Now, this intention he trains to become involuntary. The involuntary intention. Now, that is very far from imaginary – the involuntary intention.

You have involuntary muscles which make your heart beat, involuntary breathing arrangements – we're used to this sort of thing. Now, I don't know, they taught me in school about voluntary and involuntary meat bodies one way or the other, and I used to get awfully mixed up as to which was the ones which went off by themselves and which was the ones that didn't. Let's just bypass the mix-up and let's say that it is a type of muscle which you don't have to pay any attention to to have it work or continue to work. It's a non-intentional action, you see? Same thing as you're saying when you say an involuntary intention.

You intend things. Get that as a big difference. To intend this piece of chalk to rise. A thetan can do it, but he doesn't have to touch it and doesn't touch it. He intends it, and it will rise. And that's very downscale. That's monkey business and nonsense. That's the same as putting yourself on a fantastic withhold. You'll get that same sensation when you do this one with the cigarette packet cellophane. Take it off the cigarette pack and after you've seen that
you can't pick it up without making it ripple in some way or another, then do the rest of the exercise and sit back and get the idea of intending it to rise. And you'll at once get what you once did with other things.

Now, on the involuntary intention, it sounds very funny, an OT answering a telephone. You say, what would he be doing answering a telephone? Well, he'd be doing everything answering a telephone. Telephones existed before Alexander Graham Bell. Oh well, I don't know that that's true. But anyway, the telephone is actually a problem to an Operating Thetan: things are fragile; they short-circuit; their lines fuse.

Now, once in a while you'll see this come up in a co-audit. It came up the other day in some co-audit some place or another; I've forgotten if it was in New York or Sydney. But they threw the goal "to forget" into the co-audit, and one of the first reactions was somebody fused an E-Meter. Melted the lines. We've had, before, somebody drive a hole through an E-Meter electrode but not fuse an E-Meter. That was the end of that. So I think probably we'll have to put a fuse... [laughter]

Well, what did that? That was actually some involuntary reaction on the part of that thetan was triggered. Here he is sitting here in a meat body, holding himself down and being good, and somebody just suddenly triggered this, see, and he went psssheww, see, and that was the end of those leads. Melted. Yeah, but you can only do that in a blast furnace. Blast furnace! We were talking about power, heat; we're talking about a thetan.

Well, unless you understand this as too great an exerted power and force within the ethical limits of the individual, then you will never understand the problems an Operating Thetan has. Strong men and big people very often have these problems. They're afraid they'll hurt somebody and they always go around talking about hurting somebody and so forth, you know? And they pick up the little woman in their great blast of enthusiasm, you know, and they set her down and they're just about to say "Dear, I brought you a box of candy to celebrate the anniversary," and she's standing there with two cracked ribs, you know? What they never get through their thick skulls is that really she didn't object. But the point I'm making here is a thetan, in dealing with himself, is dealing with somebody who is stronger than the fragility with which he is surrounded. And he compensates for this by reducing his power.

Now, let's talk about this telephone again. How do you answer a telephone as an OT? Well, the right way to answer a telephone is simply to pick it off of its cradle and put it up somewhere in your vicinity and talk into it. That's very simple, isn't it? But supposing you get mad at somebody on the other end of the phone? You go crunch! And that's so much Bake-lite. The thing either goes into a fog of dust in the middle of the air or drips over the floor. How about the telephone line? Well, that fuses of course if you say into it "Now listen! Oh, it's – oh." Severed your connection. [laughter] That was the end of that.

All right. Now, there are two solutions to this. And this is the solution that the Operating Thetan ordinarily took and was wrong. And that's to develop an involuntary intention. When the telephone rings it springs into the air in his vicinity and he talks. It actually will spring into the air and stay there. In other words, he's got an automatic action. Ring telephone, telephone springs into the air, you talk. Got that? Involuntary intention. He's got a postulate then which does things without his having to actively intend them.
There's nothing wrong with this, but why an involuntary intention? Well, that's to keep from crushing telephones. And that makes it very easy to answer telephones, and the telephone stands there in the air and you think this is very tricky. Well, that's all very well. That's all very well. But it's that same thing that gives you a time track. Apparently there's no difference between an involuntary intention to act and an involuntary intention to duplicate and an involuntary intention to create. And that's probably the genus of the time track. That's hypothetical. The other I'm giving you is absolutely actual, the telephone bit is the McCoy.

I'm trying to get at the basis of this time track, you see, to strip away the whole time track. It gets into a... this, so you mock things up according to certain vibrations and it gets to be an automatic intention. And then he doesn't know what this automatic intention is. And then somebody comes along and gives him things for the automatic intention to mock up which are things that would be bad for him, or they jam the machinery of his automatic intention, don't you see? And they make him fight his own automatic intention. And the next thing you know, he's got a messed-up time track, and the next thing you know, he's solid. And the next thing you know, he picks up a meat body. See how it goes?

But the withhold begins with the piece of cellophane. Steel is cellophane.

And the other solution that I just spoke to you about is surround yourself with things that don't go boom! Get the idea? What's the idea of having a telephone that you can't pick up? That goes to powder of Bakelite and fused wires every time you pick it up? Well, the devil with it. It's something like you're trying to play croquet with a lady's watch as a mallet. You wouldn't do that ordinarily. You'd go out and find a croquet mallet. Well, you see a telephone like this that you're supposed to use all the time, recognize what's happening to you and put something there that you can handle – that's a simple solution – and you won't be going downhill. If you find yourself on a big withhold all the time, what are you doing? You're withholding. You know the basis of withholding. That sets you up to all sorts of things.

But the main thing it sets you up to is this mechanism of automatic intention and that sets you up to an automatic time track. Next thing you know, why, somebody's running out your engrams. Who's putting the engrams there? Well, you are. How do you stop putting the engrams there? Well, there isn't any way to stop putting the engrams there unless you eventually track it back to your automatic intentions and get your early track material which undoes this. But you're not going to undo this time track so long as it's so charged you can't come near it or run anything with reality. Don't you see? You've fixed up your own theta trap just because you've been betrayed by theta traps. All sorts of things like this occur.

All right. Now, that's – that's that – so much of that. But what's this got to do with this galaxy and that sort of thing? Well, it has a lot to do with this galaxy. I don't think you could go into an ant house, one of these anthills, with human fingers and rebuild these various places where they lay their eggs and store them, and I don't even think you could pick up very many ants with human fingers without crushing some. Well, what's the idea, see? What are you trying to do? What are you doing fooling around with an anthill? That's one of the questions.
Now, these questions actually have to be answered from a technical viewpoint. But they have a great deal to do with the organizations of Scientology. A very great deal to do with that. Oaah! What's this? Where are we going? Because the second we look at the character, the actual true character of an Operating Thetan, we'll recognize what we are dealing with here. We see very clearly that all this could be very — uah! — upsetting in various directions. I think we have some responsibility in at least heading it off in the right direction and organizing it to some degree. And this is the only point of upset which I feel about this, is early on, conceiving that free thetans were very dangerous and should be shot down in their tracks, people such as this group in Helatrobus started laying in implants and picking people up and weakening people down and doing all this sort of thing and all this nonsense and worked on it very hard. What industry! Think of what would have happened if that industry had been devoted to a worthy cause. And this you possibly have not run into, but you will eventually before these implants. Planets were surrounded suddenly by radioactive cloud masses. And very often a long time before the planet came under attack from these implant people, waves of radioactive clouds, Magellanic clouds, black and grey, would sweep over and engulf the planet, and it would be living in an atmosphere of radioactivity which was highly antipathetic to the living beings, bodies, plants, anything else that was on this planet.

Now, this period might be as long — well, it could be billions, certainly, quite ordinarily a million years before the first capture of your pc or something like that, and certainly was a hundred or two. All of a sudden these otherwise clear skies that would ordinarily have merely rain clouds in them would become radioactive. And this was explained by the wise savants of the day; they were — sat there stroking their long, useless diplomas. They explained it as a disintegration of the universe, natural phenomena and so on. How did they explain it this way?

Well, the hub of a galaxy has in it a great deal of radioactive material. It's not that it doesn't have stars and planets in it that are perfectly free from this, but there just happen to be more Magellanic clouds scattered around there than other places. And a universe has vectors of force. They go out like a — not really like an Archimedes spiral, but I don't know quite what the geometric figure is. It's the line that goes from a center out to the rim in a curve and hits the rim at an oblique. You've seen some old wheels — spring wheels and so forth are made this way sometimes.

Anyway, there are lines of force in a galaxy. And these cookies had actually found how to detach matter along a line of force. And so they'd set a Magellanic cloud loose along one of these lines of force and it would swing out of balance and move on out and engulf a system. And then swinging out further would engulf another system. And would spend an awful long time hanging around the system as it went by, you see? And frankly, these clouds would get to systems which they didn't come near for maybe thousands and thousands of years. They didn't direct these clouds intimately, they just set them loose and they would drift out through space. And these wise professors (I've never trusted a professor since) would sit around stroking their diplomas saying, "Well, this is the natural consequences of the disintegration of a galaxy. A certain period in the life of a galaxy, the Magellanic radioactive masses at the interior of the hub begin to disperse themselves out toward the rim. And this is known
as the Keplin-Spreplin law and the Booplum-Booplin law, and the calculations are $M$ to the gup-gup squared or the rippety-rip-bop to the tenth power."

Everybody sat around being very, very amazed, see? The truth of the matter is somebody was letting them loose. And because of that scientific theory, nobody found out about it for a long time, that it was being done. Because it was incredible that anybody would do it. The natural law of it was not known, that you could do it.

And so planetary systems would become engulfed in radioactive masses, gray and black. And the earmarks of such a planetary action was gray and black-gray, towering masses of clouds. These Magellanic clouds would not otherwise have come anywhere near a planetary system.

Well, there's such a thing as the Dark Horse nebula in Orion today. You can maybe see some pictures of that in astronomy books. Well, that is one huge radioactive black mass, towering up there. It's, oh, light-years across, you see? It's heavy, it's thick. Well, any piece of that, of such a mass existing at the hub, any chunk of the Dark Horse Head nebula set loose in the galaxy would spin on out and engulf systems.

Now, when a system had been engulfed – and they had it on their timetable – they would send ships in. And they had little orange-colored bombs that would talk, and speech and so forth was frozen into electronic capsules. It was all very clever. The utter insanity, you see! This makes it so incredible nobody believes it, you see, and that was one of their greatest protections. Why would anybody go to this much trouble?

So the clouds would talk. And here you'd have a gray cloud going by and it'd be saying, "Hark! Hark! Hark!" you see? "Watch out! Look out! Who's there? Who's that?" You know? Sounds like a fun house. Or somebody would find his front yard all full of black spots that looked like rabbits and he'd come within them and they'd suddenly explode. And all the vegetation would start dying off around there, and he'd say, "Ouugh, something's going wrong here." Or they'd plant something up like this: They – you'd see a big tangle of barbed wire on the edge of the seacoast and a wrecked aircraft, and a pilot in a doll body pinned on a theta pole. And he'd say, "The poor fellow! I wonder what happened to him?" you know, and he'd go over and here's this aircraft and so on. "He must have crashed," and investigated this thing – what's wrong here, see? Of course, it's just a plant. You walk into it and the ground all of a sudden starts going crack-bap-grap! and saying various things. Well, the thetan didn't know what the devil was happening.

For some reason or other, the symbol of aircraft goes through all of this – weaves its way through this. Aircraft. They looked like Pan American planes – rather stub-winged. Well, actually that begins much earlier. That's back around eighty-some trillion, you will find aircraft being used as part of implants. Because the aircraft is the translating symbol of "you need a machine to get you off a planet or into the air." You can't just levitate, see?

Anyway, here you might find, then, that for some years or for thousands of years or for even some much greater, higher figure of years, that a planet had been engulfed with radioactive clouds and nobody had done anything at all on that planet. It went along like that for a long time. And then all of a sudden one day there was an orange burst and it said,
"Hark! Hark! Look out! Watch out! Come here! Go back!" you know? "Come here! Can't come here!" It's always the double, you know? "Come here; can't come here." Where we get, I guess, the idea of double talk. And then they'd hang around.

Now, don't think that your pc, as a thetan, was picked up the first time. Oh, they'd try and they'd tug at him, and they'd pick him up and try to pull him into the sky. It was very clever. They had some means of contracting a beam. Traction beam. These guys were pretty smart electronically, way advanced. And he'd resist it. But in a year or two, why, he'd ran into another one of them, and again he'd resist it. And a while later he'd run into another one of them, and again he'd resist it. And then he – finally he hasn't got his attention on it and he's already been weakened down and he's collapsed a bit himself already, and he's beginning to worry. And the beam goes tsccup! and pulls him up into the sky, encloses him in a capsule and there he goes.

One of the ways this was done: A small capsule evidently could be placed at will in space. It shot out a large bubble, the being would grab at the bubble or strike at it and be sucked at once into the capsule. Then the capsule would be retracted into an aircraft. Very interesting technology. All of this assaulted his credulity. He couldn't understand what was happening. Nobody had ever seen anything like this before. Puzzled him.

And then, of course, they'd ship him off, and anywhere between the next month or six months or something like that they would shoot him into this period of the implant area, and fix him on a post in a big bunch of stuff – probably looked like railway sheds, I haven't had a very good look at it myself – put him on a post and wobbled him around and ran him through this implant of goals on a little monowheel. Little monowheel pole trap. And it had the effigy of a body on it. You see, he didn't have a body and was put on the pole trap; the pole trap has a body on it. They didn't care whether somebody was used to having bodies or not used to having bodies. And away he'd go through this thing.

Well, he'd eventually get off of it and go home, and then sooner or later he was liable to have been picked up again. And this time he would be found much weaker and they would throw him through. Now, whether they could identify somebody who had been implanted once, which I rather think was the case, and send him through a second implant series because he'd had the first one, or not, I don't know. We'll know when we find our first person with only the second, and so far we haven't. We have found two and we've found four, but we have not found one or three. We'll know more about that, but that's not particularly the subject of my lecture today.

Now, the Helatrobus Implants (call them the Heaven Implants for the public), these things were preceded, then, by a tremendous period of unrest. You could imagine what would happen on a planet which has been going along its peaceful ways minding its own business – no trouble, no wars, nothing like that – and suddenly its clouds turn into radioactive masses. Well, maybe there wasn't a great deal of trouble for a while, but then all of a sudden you'd have these orange bursts suddenly coming down out of these clouds, representing God and chariots, or something, you know, and all kinds of rumors being thrown around, and talking, this and that. After that period, the planet would be almost totally in revolt. No organized government was possible, people were going out sacrificing themselves, everybody was in a
terrific state of gloom or fantastic warfare, they would fight anybody they laid their eyes on because they didn't know what was happening. Trying to hold the fort during any period such as that was well nigh impossible.

During those days, planetary forces usually consisted of territorial or terrestrial officers, terrestrial governments and galactic officers who more or less didn't interfere particularly in the terrestrial affairs but supervised its activities. You had a higher level of technology. In other words, a terrific chaos, terrific chaos. Looked like this planet during the last couple of wars, during the last half-century. You had this kind of an operating atmosphere, you see? Madmen suddenly get up and say, "Down with the Jews!" you see? "Kill all the Jews!" and so forth, and then we'd have all kinds of people piled into the front-line trenches shooting at all kinds of people or something, you see, and mad stuff going on. And troops got madder and madder, and everybody got crazier and crazier, and things were more and more armed, and so on. So it got to be usual, almost, that your brave boys were charging over the top just fine and they turned around to a man and shot you. Got so you just didn't know what to do, what to control, anything, see? That's that period before the implants.

You had a very worried thetan by that time. Now, what were these planets like before the implant occurred and before all this nonsense took place? Well, occasionally some eager beaver would show up and plant a few theta traps. Various things would occur from time to time and cause an ARC break and so forth. Actually it didn't disturb too much. There have been periods of tremendous activity in the past, but the time when the Helatrobus Implants took place were a period of great tranquillity which had gone on for quite a while. These planets were pretty peaceful.

And if anybody wants to say then that free thetans are the cause of revolt, upset and unrest on a planet – ha-ha! He had better examine the facts off the track and find out that it was only when they were threatened and made unfree that the government of planets became a chaotic mess and you got such loathsome things as the government of Russia, or the United States as it exists today. Just a bunch of corn. These were bad boys. "Appropriate sixteen billion dollars for the psychiatrists. Electric shock everybody. Oh, they don't like us, well tell them they're insane, and..." you know, I mean, just corny, you know? Nuts.

That is the atmosphere – that is the atmosphere of an ungovernable area. That's the atmosphere of hysteria. You're going to find the world going crazier and crazier in that particular direction. Why? Because radioactive fallout is adequate enough to start keying it in. Various other little symptoms will fly up in the air. We are not looking at a calm future on this planet. If we weren't sitting here today doing our job, Lord knows what would happen on this planet. Now, I don't wish to overemphasize it because it's there. This planet would be a billiard ball in just a few years and anything left would just be a madhouse.

But we have some responsibility in this direction ourselves. What do you think a thetan feels like when he suddenly finds himself freed, or a third free and perhaps able to operate some much and sees around him the symbols which have been carried forward on the track which destroyed his civilizations in the past? Now, what do you think his reaction is going to be? I consider this very interesting, and this becomes to you and me, boys and girls, a very interesting problem. Because I've gotten mad a few times about it myself. It's all right
for me to say, "Well, actually it isn't the Kennedy government that planted the Helatrobus Implants." And I can say this to myself, you know, sit there very rationally, and say, "Well, they didn't do it," you see, "and they're just implanted, too, and the reason they act this way and so forth is they're just implanted, too, and just implanted, too… Why the hell do they have to carry along all of the symbols?" you see? "Why do they have to act this way?" you see? "They don't have to perpetuate the misery that this created in this universe." And the next thing you know, I'm roaring mad about the whole thing, you see?

Well, all you'd have to do with something like that is just let go of some of your voluntary intentions, you see? [laughter] Well, I can appreciate this frame of mind. I can appreciate this frame of mind.

This planet is in sort of a situation of, at least for a while, where they're damned if they do and damned if they don't. Because if we start in with our program, we can do everything we possibly can to make it go smoothly. Now, I'm sure that it will, over any kind of an operating period of time, go quite smoothly. But this does not avoid a period of chaos. We can make that minimal, and should. And if we plan like mad and work like mad in that direction, we will make it minimal. But I don't think we can eliminate it. Because the chaos out of which all this travail was born was in itself too chaotic. Some of that will restimulate, one way or the other.

Look at it this way: The planet is doomed if we don't operate. So therefore we should do all we can to operate smoothly and orderly. And my attention is therefore on organizational concerns which have very little to do with the legality of corporations under governments.

How do we move through such a period? Oh, I leave it to your imagination what might happen. You remember the fisherman and the genie? You know, the first time they let him out he said, "The first man that lets me out, I will reward him with the riches of Earth." And nobody let him out for ten thousand years. So in the next ten thousand years he began to nurse a grouch. And he says, "The next ten thousand years, if somebody lets me out, I will… ha-ha-ha-ho!" see? And the very clever fisherman asked him to get back into the bottle. But I don't think that was clever of the fisherman.

No, thetans are mad; down deep, they're mad. You get them halfway through one of these things, you'll find out they'll start getting madder and madder, not more apathetic and more apathetic. They philosophically have been understanding everything, and they've understood it thoroughly and so forth. Well, as long as they have that much rage in their hearts, their ability and power will, of course, be remarkably curtailed just by the nature of the situation. That in itself is to a marked degree a safeguard – they who have power who can control it. That stands in our stead and in our favor.

But if we're just totally irresponsible for what we are doing and just let it happen, and don't make any plans of any kind whatsoever, and make no organizational structures of any kind whatsoever to handle anything, not hook anything up in any way, but just let it happen on a big, broad chaos, I think we will greatly have slowed down our forward progress over the thing, and I think we have some responsibility for straightening that out before it happens.
It even answers up to the state of the universe. We're not even interested in that island of galaxies over there, or the galaxies which are up the line, next galaxy, or something like that. We're not even interested in that. We'll find ourselves, however, in almost immediate collision with the forces and powers of this galaxy. This is inevitable. If Earth hasn't already cut her own throat – she's been sending out space probes; she's about ready to fire on the moon. Her actions are quite interesting. And it's only her extremely isolated position and condition and other people's comm lags that won't do anything about this at all, so there's another factor immediately interjected into the situation. Earth has blasted herself off into meat-body space opera. [laughs] Nuts, you know! Absolute nuts. It's impossible to make them do it, you know? But there she is, attempting this sort of thing. Somebody may not appreciate this.

Now, we talk about the man from Mars, and that sort of thing, and we say this is very far-flung and this is very unreal to the people of Earth. As a matter of fact, it is so unreal to the people of Earth that the last time anybody announced a landing from Mars – Orson Welles's broadcast – they practically tore everything to pieces in the United States.

Well, that didn't interest me. That didn't interest me at all that they tore things up in the United States; we've had a lot of science fiction around and that sort of thing; people could be worried, they'd be hysterical and so forth. No, what interested me was that in Quito, Ecuador, that had no space opera, that had no tradition along in this line (it might not have been Quito, but it was one of their big cities), their main radio station put on Orson Welles's landing of the men from Mars. And the people rose up in the streets as a spontaneous action and tore that radio station, a skyscraper, to bits and killed seventeen people in the process. Bang! Well, this answered an interesting question for me. These people we call the "natives" of Earth, they're blood brothers as far as this is concerned and they know all about this, otherwise they wouldn't become that hysterical.

So there are several factors that confront our immediate future. These are political and organizational factors; they have to do with facts of things as they are, not as things as we would like to have them. Well, if we handle the things as they are, it may possibly come about that we can also have things as they – we would like to have them. But I'm afraid we have to take it in that order and plan and work accordingly. And if we do, everything will be well.

Of course, your job at once is to make somebody Clear, make somebody OT. Of course, you're trodding on my heels. See, this is happening fast. People who couldn't handle 2-12 can handle this material we're issuing right now. Oh, they handle it in a very knuckle-headed fashion, I assure you, but they are handling it.

Therefore, this process that we are using and these processes we're using are far more workable. They're fast and finite. And therefore with everything else I have to do, I've got to look at this other side of the picture. What happens next? Well, let's hope it'll be as pleasant as possible.

Thank you.

*Audience: Thank you.*
HANDLING ARC BREAKS
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Thank you.

Thank you. Well, it's a good thing you put me into a good mood with all that applause. Reports I've been getting on the Zed Unit for the last twenty-four hours – practically unpublishable. We'll take that up in a moment. I know, you'd better look sad, because it's pretty sad news.

All right, this is what?

Audience: 28th.

Twenty-eighth? 28th of May, AD 13.

All right. Now, this lecture is not for people with weak hearts. If you can't take it, why, I advise you to go over into the other building there, where they have a speaker, and turn it off. [laughter, laughs]

This auditing dissertation here actually is possibly passed by, by the student who is doing other types of auditing, but it applies to him very much.

I've discovered the common denominator to ARC breaks. And that common denominator of all ARC breaks – all ARC breaks – is bypassed charge. That's the common denominator to all ARC breaks. And that includes, therefore, all misemotion exhibited by the pc at the auditor.

Now, we should define an ARC break as the pc's transfer of attention from the bank to the auditor and a dramatization of the bank directed at the auditor. And that is an ARC break.

Now, you can get the mechanics of an ARC break just by dropping your E-Meter, or something of the sort, and just calling the pc's attention off of his bank onto the auditor. The ARC break might not take place, but you have approximated the mechanic of what happens. And the probability is that it will take place. See what I mean?

So, we get down to this fundamental, which is not terribly important at first glimpse: but dragging the pc's attention onto the auditor, you see, and onto the session is a precipitating factor even though the pc doesn't dramatize. You see, that's beside the point. You've dragged his attention onto the session. Well, that's an ARC break in sort of reverse.
Let's show you something; you go like this: [makes clicking noises]. [laughter] You've not laid a fundamental for the ARC break, but you've approximated one of its mechanics, don't you see? You've dragged the pc's attention onto the auditor.

Well, very often when you do that, you leave the charge of the session not held back. See, the charge of the session now is not being as-ised, and therefore provides a background booster, and the pc "row-rows" at the auditor, see, or becomes annoyed or something of the sort, don't you see?

Well, so not even that one falls outside this definition. It's bypassed charge. See, pc's attention is on his bank, the auditor does something weird, attracts the pc's attention off the bank. Then, you see, you've bypassed some charge. You've left some charge there, the pc's attention is not on the charge but the charge is restimulated. Do you get that as a simple mechanic?

So that in normal course of human events you're talking to this same pc out of session, you know, and you drop an anvil on his toe or something of this sort, and he'll argue with you about it, but he won't ARC break. You see? It is not, then, that a social faux pas has taken place that causes the pc to ARC break. So an auditor very often feels terribly reserved and preservative of the social amenities and all of this sort of thing, and walks around on tiptoe in a session being terribly polite and so forth. Well, you see, that isn't necessary to prevent an ARC break. You see?

But this mystery is presented: In common course of human events, you make some crack at this person, and they, make a crack at you and you yap-yap, and that's all there is to it, you see? And in a session, you make the tiniest inference about this person and all of a sudden he's splattering all over the walls with an ARC break.

Well now, if you understand what you have done, you understand this matter of bypassed charge and so forth, this most flagrant example – the easiest to observe, don't you see; the easiest to observe and actually not of any really very vast importance but I've just given as an example to show you what this is: In the session he's got his attention on charged areas. And then you take his attention off the charged area and put it on the auditor, you bypass charge and that's what causes the ARC break, see?

He's about to tell you "… and then they drowned me in a well." He's saying, "And I – I – I'm standing here, and I'm looking down into the thing, and there's somebody grabs me by the arm, I can feel his arm, and he's about to throw me over…"

And you say [operates a switch on the meter very noisily], "Just – just a minute. Let me see if I can get some charge on this. Let's see," [repeats the noise] "I – I beg your pardon, my meter – I don't know, I guess I forgot to charge the thing," or something like that. And the pc goes splatter!

Oh, that's very obvious, you see, what's happened there. See, he's got all this charge he's sitting down on, and all of a sudden his attention comes off of it, and you in effect have bypassed the charge right there.

Well, now, the other part of it is he is being cause over the charge, right? As long as he's running it he's being cause over it, see? All right. Now, the moment that his attention is...
flicked off of it he is now the effect of that charge. And any tone level or Know to Mystery Scale level higher than the chronic tone of the pc... Now, get this; you know what chronic tone is, the old Know to Mystery Scale? Boy, we're back amongst the familiar tools here these days, you know? The Know to Mystery Scale, the Expanded Tone Scale, you see – all of those things – quite valid, see? And let's say the pc is at apathy as a chronic tone – that's pretty high, by the way. Very few pcs are there; they're more or less kind of wood, you know? They're way down below that.

The other day I suddenly realized that I was feeling continuously apathetic, and I thought something is happening, my auditing is doing me in or something of the sort. I went around like that for about twenty-four hours and then suddenly realized it was I, a free thetan, who was feeling apathetic. All of a sudden, you know, any consequences of it blew, you see? And I realized suddenly I was feeling much better than I had for a long time. See, I hadn't felt like myself, a free thetan, for some time. You know? You get the idea? I mean, gradually the Tone Scale had come up, you see, not as Ron or human being, you see, but had gradually come up, up, up. See, I'd feel pretty good as Ron, you see? Fine, feel very high-toned. But I'd come up, up, up, and I didn't get the sneaker of it. And the first emotional response you get to it is feeling apathetic. You know, "Well, guess I'm not worth much. Look what they're doing over in the States these days, you know? People talking about rerunning Kennedy. You know?" I was kind of thinking about things that way, you know? And all of a sudden: "Hey, that's me!" you know? [laughter] "Me! That's me I'm feeling about! " And it felt wonderful. Was a great feeling after that. I went around and enjoyed it, you know? [laughter]

Well, actually, a pc will come up through degradation as a chronic tone, and actually will come up from unconsciousness as a chronic tone. We had a pc over in the States. I mean, it isn't anything esoteric, you know; he just lies there conked out all the time. You try to audit him and he – conk – you know? And audit him and – conk. And talk to him – conk – you know? And he's actually existing above his chronic tone. His chronic tone is unconsciousness. And so this boy, of course, processed – you process him now to get rid of his unconsciousness – well, cut your throat; you'll never get anyplace, you see? You just have to generally process his case with processes which are real to him and bring up a general case advance, and the unconsciousness will disappear. You see that as a different look?

That doesn't mean that there are chronic tone levels of maladies, you know? You don't have maladies as chronic tone levels, but anything above – anything above – the pc's chronic tone, you see, being higher than the pc, can be cause over the pc and therefore become a dramatization.

There is nobody more amazed than the pc to find himself in raging anger in a session. He's absolutely flabbergasted! Well, some charge gets bypassed, and he doesn't know where to look, he doesn't know what charge is bypassed, he doesn't know where he looks – he doesn't know where to look. He looks at the auditor – the auditor doesn't even have to fiddle with the E-Meter, see? He looks at the auditor and there is something, you see, and anger or something like that, being higher on the Tone Scale and contained in the incident which has been missed, causes the pc to dramatize. And the pc is actually as helpless as a dish towel in a hurricane. He's totally helpless. He says, "Ohh – aww, what's going on?" And he's shouting and screaming at the auditor, you know?
Well, you can get somebody who is dramatizing effort. You know, he's got to pick up the chair and break it in half, you know, something like that? Well, that's a pretty low-level dramatization, that particular one. Anger is more common. Bored is something you very often don't recognize as a dramatization. PC is getting along fine, and all of a sudden ARC breaks and feels very bored.

Now, similarly, you could go further and find a pc ARC break into a total manic. I have never seen this, but by extrapolation, you could say he would become very manic, you see—terribly, wildly enthusiastic, with glaring eyeballs, you see? Be an ARC break.

So an ARC break, then, comes about whenever charge is bypassed, which then puts the pc at its effect-point. And the pc then dramatizes the charge that has been bypassed. This is actually far simpler than it sounds. I'm just giving you all of the ramifications of it—giving you all of the ramifications of it. These are the mechanics involved in the thing.

Now, the remedy for an ARC break is to locate and indicate the bypassed charge, at which moment the ARC break ceases. Now, that could be interpreted by a Q-and-A artist as meaning you have to go and run the bypassed charge right now. You see, he goes into a do. No, that gets into impossibility. You find yourself fifth on the chain. You are running the fifth engram and the pc is ARC breaking on the chain, and... well, then you would interpret it and say, "Well, you can't possibly run the fifth engram because the pc will ARC break," you see? Some Q-and-A artist would interpret it at once, you see, in that category. And you will find them doing so no matter if I've said so. And if you'll just remember I've told you this and remember this particular mechanic, you can prevent this other consequence from taking place.

And the consequence is this: Well, the pc is ARC breaking, running this engram, so therefore you have to at once go run the earlier engram. And that is not what I have told you. If that were the case, then to prevent everybody from ARC breaking would require continuous auditing. See, that is not the remedy. The remedy is to find and indicate the bypassed charge. And the ARC break ceases, [snaps fingers] right like that. Find and indicate the bypassed charge. It's actually as simple as that. Nothing to it.

Now, you are, all of you, cognizant of the trick of turning off somebody's anger at you by saying "somebody's missed your withholds." Sometimes it doesn't work. Sometimes it doesn't work. The person just gets more insulted. Well, that's because a missed withhold isn't the source of the bypassed charge. You just indicated the wrong bypassed charge.

But this fellow does have missed withholds, somebody has missed a withhold on him in session, he doesn't even know this, and he's ranting and raving at you, or something of the sort, and you say, "Boy, somebody missed a withhold on you, man." He cools right down.

It isn't, as you might think, that it introverts him so that he immediately begins to look around inside of his skull, "I wonder what the missed withhold is," and so pulls him off of your neck. That isn't what's happened there. You take a good, close look at it. Get some experience on this and get some reality on it yourself, and this material will really be in your grasp.

Now, sometimes you've said to somebody, "Well, somebody missed a withhold on you, man," and the person has said, "Goddamn, don't you pull that on me!"
Well, it wasn't a withhold that was missed, see? Somebody missed a goal. Get the idea? And if you were to pursue it right then and say, "Well, let's see, was it – it was probably a goal that was missed. Probably somebody missed a goal on you – missed a whole GPM. Somebody missed a whole RI. Somebody's missed some RIs on you." And he's just about to let out of his mouth a horrendous scream and follow this thing through, and he all of a sudden says, "I wonder if it could have been a missed RI? Probably was." See?

So the trick of turning off an ARC break is to find and indicate the bypassed charge. But it must be the charge that was bypassed. See, that's where the accuracy comes in. And that makes you an artist.

Now, it's still within the realm of scientific approach – still within the realm of scientific approach because there are only a few charges that can be missed. See? There's engrams and GPMs and goals and RIs, an engram more basic on the chain or an incident more basic on the chain, or a failure to acknowledge, or a refutation of reality, or a rejection of affinity. This character is feeling you're a pretty good auditor and you say, "Ah, nuts!" see? All right, he's got a charge there of affinity, see, and that isn't acknowledged and you bypass it. You rejected it. So you get this thing firing back in your face. Don't you see what that is?

Now, these are not mechanisms which are totally relegated to session, but they relegated themselves to life. Now, you're a Registrar and somebody is coming in, or you're signing up pcs. (All of you have to wear a Registrar's hat at one time or another.) And you're trying to get somebody to get some auditing, you're a Registrar, see? And there you are one fine day with a yow-yow-yow and a scream-scream-scream standing in front of your face: Seventy-five hours of auditing have been delivered – he feels terrible! He says, "Oh, I could kill everybody in the place," and he ought to go out and sue everybody, and he's going to inform the government that so on and so on and so on – yap, yap, yap, you never hear such a thing. Don't worry too much about the threats, because the person totally lacks direction. Person will go halfway down the steps and change his mind and do something else, don't you see? They're incapable of carrying forward a program that has any cohesion or direction, see?

Now, you actually are very foolish to engage this individual in any reasonable conversation, because it's not a reasonable situation. That attitude is wholly the product of bypassed charge. And as Registrar, you simply should hunt and punch around till you find the bypassed charge. That's all, just hunt and punch around till you find the pc's bypassed charge. All of a sudden the thing expires. It just goes, because you've found and indicated it.

Be perfectly all right to just grab a meter, and – trying somehow or another, to get him to hold the cans – and just give him the standard sort of an assessment: "Did somebody run an engram too late on the chain?" you see? "There's a more basic engram run? Oh, clang. That fired. Ah, yes. Well, somebody was running an engram on you and there's an earlier engram."

"Oh, is there? Yes, you know, yeah."

Where's all this rage? Well, you see, the rage is an automaticity. And I have told you often, often, often, the tenuous character, the extremely delicate, balanced character of neurosis and psychosis – and such other nasty words – makes it almost impossible not to undo it. Because it is incapable of continuation. It is set up in such a delicate balance that almost anything can make it slip, if it's effective. You understand that?
You see, some guy is down in a padded cell someplace, and he's a "raving gamaniac" and he is screaming away and throwing stools at the warders and so forth. And although I don't blame him for throwing stools at these blokes, this is the point: His condition is not a condition of terrible, difficult, hard, mean, impossible-to-reach, go-on-forever dramatization, see? That is not true. Actually, the difficulty of maintaining such a state is almost impossibly difficult. You can make it go bzzzt! And all of a sudden it no longer hangs in balance and can't go on dramatizing.

You've heard me talk to you before about the slip: old ARC Straightwire, the way you can knock apart a neurosis – the difficulty of maintaining a neurosis. Old ARC Straightwire has broken up more neuroses than you can count. See, it – too difficult for the pc to go on being neurotic on this particular point.

And this, of course, is at wild variance to the commonly held belief. The commonly held belief is a person is psychotic – well, that's it, they've had it, you see, and they're psychotic, and that's all you can do about it. You can't do anything about it, you see, because it's a very tough, vigorous, dangerous, enduring condition. See, that's the commonly held belief. They believe that a neurosis is a fantastically arduous thing.

Read a funny story: Somebody – people send me clippings all the time. I get lots of clippings (appreciate them). And one of the clippings I got the other day was a yap-yap about a psychiatrist; it was very funny. It seems like he'd been treating this fellow – he's telling his story, you see? And he'd been treating this fellow for four years at an hour a day. And when the fellow – he'd had a tremendous success, the psychiatrist was saying, because when the fellow first came to him, why, he just felt terrible all the time, because he just had this urge to kill somebody. And so he gave him an hour's treatment every day for four years, and at the end of that time, why, the fellow walked into the office, and the psychiatrist knew he'd had a wonderful success because the fellow said he just felt wonderful, he just felt wonderful, he'd never felt better, and so forth, and that neurosis that he had been working with, that always used to make him feel terrible, now made him feel wonderful. And as the fellow pulled the iron bar out of his pocket, the psychiatrist said… And that was the end of the story. [laughter]

In other words, there are two things, you see, that argue in favor of a lie in this direction: One, the absence of technology and the absence of understanding of these states combines with the professional need of tough cases. You see, if psychosis wasn't unsolvable, you wouldn't find the – and very tough and very enduring and very terrible – you wouldn't find the US (ha!) government shelling out sixteen billion quid (or bucks or whatever they're using these days) to build themselves up endless numbers of sanitariums, and ten research centers. They're going to build ten research centers and so forth. And they might even get up to prenats in these things, you know, because they'll probably use our work. And man, look at the kitty! Sixteen billion, see? And that's just the initial appropriation. That's going to cost five billion a year afterwards. The armed-forces construction program of the United States is only 1.6 or 1.8 billion. Give you some weird perspective? That is fantastic.

Look at the vested interest in psychosis being incurable. These nuts that are in charge of the nuts will never do anything, of course. It's worth too much to them not to. Somebody
comes along and said, "All you have to do is find and indicate the bypassed charge and the Person go fitt! and he's sane."

"Oh," they'd say, "take that nut out and kill him, ha-ha-ha-ha! He's about to cost us sixteen billion hard-earned legislative bucks! Ha! Shoot him."

It's not for nothing the FDA is mad at us. You see, they don't for a moment believe any of their charges. See, they have made a comprehensive, thorough investigation all up and down the land, and they haven't found one single human being who ever was told that an E-Meter would cure anything. But they've invented the statements. Why? Well, we constitute a fantastic threat to a fantastic vested interest.

These are not men of goodwill. They're caved-in dramatizers themselves. Never make that error. You can very easily make that error. These guys are dramatizing. I don't know -- much care what they're dramatizing, but they themselves are doing a heavy, hard dramatization, by which they say, "We can do what we do without conscience, because man is after all an animal and is nothing." See, so they spread the plea that man is an animal and is nothing as an effort to get over committing overts. So this hangs them with being an animal and being nothing.

I imagine that if you took thirty psychiatrists -- I know it's unpopular to talk about these people, but if you took thirty psychiatrists at random, at least one of those thirty would be sitting there barking. If you just called on thirty in a row.

You think I'm kidding -- try it sometime. I'm not kidding. These people need help probably worse than their own patients. How would you like to be up against something that you advertisedly considered incurable, totally damaging, nothing could be done about it, and you're collecting money right and left to do something about it? Krrrrr! That's a pretty nasty position for anybody to work himself into.

Now, we probably cut those blokes off by my continuous saying this and that, we probably deny them help one way or the other. But every time I have ever tried to work with any group of psychiatrists or anything of the sort, the only thing they'll send me is one of their number who has already gone potty. This bird's around the bend or something like that. And I've never been able to teach them anything. And they actually have worn out their welcome with me, that's all. But I would still help them today.

That's beside the point. The point I'm making on the thing is that you can work yourself into a position where you consider an ARC break unremediable, terribly powerful and overwhelmingly destructive, so that you will label certain pcs as ARC-breaky pcs. You can fear this ARC break, you see? You can become afraid of these ARC breaks occurring. And that can make you unwilling to audit, or if you don't even go that far, will rough you up enough to do a stinking auditing job, which of course causes more ARC breaks. You got that?

So unless you corral the ARC break, unless you yourself get a good reality on handling the ARC break, unless you understand this one and you develop the skill necessary to find and indicate the bypassed charge -- that's the only skill you've got to develop -- you'll get into a position where you'll audit for a while and then feel like it isn't worth the candle and
man is no good, and go the route, man! Another half a century you'll be telling Congress, "Well, we need sixteen billion dollars because – to handle the nuts."

You see, what you've got to break through with you is, one, a condemnation of ARC breaks. They don't mean anything; they're not diagnostic in any way, shape or form. They're not diagnostic, that's all. They don't tell you the ease with which a pc runs or the unease with which he runs. They tell you nothing. See, the pc who runs like a well-oiled player piano may ARC break all over the ceiling. And some pc that you couldn't get a gain on with a building jack never ARC breaks at all. So, you see, it's no indication at all. There's no index there.

The pc who is very easy to audit very often is the pc that is very hardest to get a gain on. And the pc who is very difficult to audit very often gets the highest gains. So, you see, these are not coordinated factors. So this is something that should tell you that temporary or permanent conditions of misemotional stress are something that you have to face up to as an auditor or just get out of the auditing chair. It'll catch up with you sooner or later, man.

I catch myself every once in a while in some kind of a session. You know, pc says, "Row-row, row-row-row-row, row-row-row-row-row." See? "You just ask me for one more of those suppresses on this RI and I'm going to blow! Because there aren't any suppresses left on the RI!" You get that kind of an approach?

I say to myself, "This pc's trying to convince me that I mustn't take the charge off the RIs. This pc is in a big sell." See?

Well, actually that would be the inevitable effect of it. I eventually would say, "Well, all right." And, "All right, that rocket read," you know. "It rocket read," and so on. Get the next one, the next one, the next one, and so on. All right. Yeah, you've finished the bank. * To hell with you," you know? See?

You're doing the very thing you must have done in the first place that caused the ARC break. And you got to get some wins on this, auditor – you got to get some wins on this. This one you got to get wins on.

I want you to get a confidence that when a pc goes row-row-row, that you can find the bypassed charge, either just by knowing what it must be because it couldn't be anything else because you weren't doing anything else, don't you see? And checking on a meter, or going into a full dress parade of assessment to get the bypassed charge – however you get that bypassed charge – find it and then by indicating it to this pc, realize the tool that is in your power. By the fact that the mere indication of it turns off the ARC break, right like that. You didn't do a thing about it except indicate it.

How do you indicate it? You say to the pc whatever you say to the pc that indicates it, that's all. I mean it's as elementary as that. There isn't any hidden magic here. It's not like that if you... "I can teach you now how to make gold. And the way to learn how to make gold, the way to make gold is to go up at twelve o'clock on a night of the full moon, and sit down on a punky stump with two pounds of lead and one pound of arsenic. Rub these two together, and

* Editor's note: "bank" here and in several other places in this lecture is used in another definition than the usual one and means "one GPM"
if you don't think of the word *hippopotamus* you will find you have made gold." See? Impossible – completely impossible assignment.

Now, this is not an impossible one. This lies well within your reality, your action, your ability and so forth. There isn't anything else spotted here, see, that is esoteric or outside. I didn't mean to degrade your reality or anything like that; I'm saying, just, it's something that you can have a reality on right now. The only times you'll miss on this, you very often will pick it up a session or two later. You had an ARC break, *bow!* and you couldn't find anything to – and then nothing happened, and you couldn't cure the thing, and *blooww!* and you couldn't do anything about it. And two sessions later you find out – my God, you had passed a whole GPM. You all of a sudden remember, "Hey! Two sessions ago when I jumped that bank, you know, I got that next goal, and – ha-ha! And we just found out that in between there is the goal 'to spit.' Hey, what do you know. Ho-ho!" And you say to the pc, "Hey, what do you know about that." And the pc gets very calm all of a sudden.

You very often find out a couple of... some time afterwards what the bypassed charge was, and that will make you very enthusiastic on what I'm saying just now. You'll get more enthusiastic than that, because you find out it's an invariable fact. It doesn't vary. Why didn't you find the bypassed charge at the time the charge was bypassed?

Now, the rest of it is, you actually shouldn't let an ARC break endure more than two or three minutes, because ARC breaks multiply by the square. They're not a lineal development. You let an ARC break run one minute and it doubles. You let it run two minutes and it quadruples. You let it run three minutes – you get the idea? There it goes. This thing is developing on a very steep curve. And you actually owe it to the pc – not because you're afraid of it, but because you'll have more trouble and waste more session time – you owe it to the pc to get in and turn it off fast.

Now, you see, a whole government can be intimidated by a riot. The United States government is actually being conducted today by riot. The only people who get any attention or get anything passed are those people who riot. See? The Japanese government went by the boards because there was a riot. Somebody went down and slipped a few yen to a few students and they went up and went *yow-yow-yow*, and Eisenhower was unable to visit the country, and so forth (because, after all, students are pretty dangerous, you know?). And can't have all that shouting, you know, and so forth, and the government fell.

This government – my hat's off to this government. They "Ban the bomb," you know, and the police go out and pick them up and put them away. And they "Ban the bomb," and the police go out and pick them up and put them away. And I don't think there's been a ripple in Parliament. I don't think Parliament has even heard about it. It's very, very remarkable. They've gotten used to that over here, see? So they're not being run by riot. Get this as a method of government: running a government by riot.

There are many methods of government which I have studied from time to time and been called to my attention, and so on, which aren't in the civics textbooks. You know? You elect the mayor, and the mayor does this and the aldermen do that and all that sort of thing. These aren't in the civics textbook, but they are basic methods of government. Government by assassination: There are many texts on this subject. Texts!
The government of Japan, for some vast, vast, vast period of time, was run by the Black Dragon Society.

Some bird dramatizing the Helatrobus Implants. I think they're called the Sharif Mohammedans or something like that, they were at the time, from which you get the word assassin. Old Hashshashin, the Old Man of the Mountain, used to kidnap young fellows and tell them that when they got killed they could come back to paradise. He'd give them a few days in paradise, you know, and he'd get a lot of good-looking dolls and rivers of milk and honey and all that sort of thing, and the guy up there – that's where you get the word hashish too. They'd get this young fellow in some cafe and feed him some hashish, take him up there, and these babes would chuck him under the chin for a few days, and then the old man with the false halo would come around and say, "Now, son, the way you get back here and live forever in perfect enjoyment is to do exactly what we say."

"And what is that?"

"Well, go get yourself killed, of course."

"Well, how am I – get myself killed?"

"Well, you have to assassinate the sultan of Persia."

Well, the young fellows look at these girls and all the curves, and he'd say, "Tsk, tsk! Why not?" See? And the next drink of wine they slipped to him, why, it'd have some more hashish in it, and he'd wake up in the capital of the shah. Next time the shah walked through the streets or rode through the streets or something like that, there he was and off went the shah's head, see? Of course, the guards would kill the fellow, but that was exactly in the plans. And a lot of young fellows got surprised by not being able to find the top of this mountain again, and there they were.

But that was government by assassination. And all the Old Man of the Mountain ever had to do was just indicate to the Chinese head of state that he'd like a couple of camel loads of gold, please, and they would be on the way at once. Everybody was terrified of this person. Government by assassination. Any policy could be laid down, anything else, because of this fear of assassination.

This lasted a couple of hundred years, by the way, and it's oddly enough, a direct dramatization of the Helatrobus Implants.

The Helatrobus Implants didn't have that as a purpose. They just had a purpose as doing you in – it was far more elementary. But – that's why they're so easy to deal with. They're so monomanic on the subject. You were supposed to be human, have a body, not fly around anymore, not trouble anybody. And then you were supposed to have such diverse purposes that you could never unite on a single cause. Easy to govern. Yes, I must say so. But, of course, the Helatrobus government never got around to establishing the government they had then set up. Rest their bones, rest their bones.

They must have had the whole galaxy laid out for a total conquest. And they were too covert to ever take over. Covertion became the order of the day, you see? They could never
assert dominion of what they'd set up. Interesting. Interesting point. I see that that saddened you. Don't worry about it, don't worry about it. We can straighten that up.

Anyhow, getting back on this other: You realize that if you governed all of your actions by reason of ARC breaks, you'll get a government of Scientology by ARC break. And you as an auditor, in your auditing actions, will be governed by ARC breaks. Do you see that? Do you see that? That's why I was taking this political excursion, just to show you there that it is possible to have your actions governed by that.

You are never governed by that which you can handle with ease. So therefore the greater the facility you develop in handling ARC breaks, the less you are governed by ARC breaks, until you're not governed at all by ARC breaks. It just becomes another phenomenon. Pc's nose is running or he starts... tears leaking out of his eyes, hand him a Kleenex. Has an ARC break, why, locate and indicate the bypassed charge. Bang-bang, you see? And keep on with what you're doing. You got it?

Now at first in developing these activities, you will make mistakes as to what the bypassed charge is on, and your faith will quiver and grow faint. And you'll say, "The ARC break must be caused by something else, because look, I found and indicated the charge and the pc still has an ARC break. Therefore there must be something about this that Ron did not tell us."

No, there was something about it that you didn't hear. You have to find and indicate the right bypassed charge. There are only a few of them, but you have to find the right one. And the ARC break vanishes at once. Therefore, there is no reason under the sun to have ARC breaky sessions. No reason to keep a pc ARC breaking.

Now, those pcs who have continuously ARC broken sessions can be run on a process which is the three-way ARC Break Process. I'm not talking now about they have an ARC break, you run this process. You get that one wrong way to and I'll get cross, because we used to have processes to handle the ARC break. But they won't handle the immediate ARC break, you understand? We're not interested in a process that handles the immediate ARC break. We got that technology and it's much faster than a process.

But somebody whose bank is mixed up because of ARC breaks has this other ARC Break Process. And an auditor who has gotten himself stuck around and messed up because he has just run too many ARC breaky pcs, with this run on him, finds it all stripped away. "In session...," "in auditing...," you know, "what attitude has been refused?" You know, the "In auditing, what reality has been rejected?" "In auditing, what communication has not been acknowledged?" It's that trio. And they'll straighten up, using "In auditing" as a prefix, more auditing than any quantity of mid-rud buttons.

I've gotten a repetitive process which upscales this. We needed a repetitive process at this time for many reasons. But there is a doll, because this one even runs an implant. You see, we have good history on this process, because this is old ARC Straightwire. 1958, the only thing that'd go into implants and open them wide open was ARC Break Straightwire. Remember that process, 1958? All right, this is the immediate successor. And here's one of the most worked-over areas of repetitive processes known. It's based, of course, on the whole technology of the ARC triangle. Now I'm giving you the rest of the technology.
Why does it work, you see? Because it does nothing but spot bypassed charge. That's
how I redeveloped it and redeveloped it, you see? And I got it redeveloped along this line.
And there's trick ways of clearing the auditing command and so forth I'll put into your hands
so that you can do an assessment on certain words, so the pc has a complete understanding of
what you're doing. And this is a doll. It isn't any too little, two-bit process. In fact you will be
doing it on Fridays.

Well, what I'm getting around to here is your attitude on the subject of ARC breaks
must never be one whereby you're driven by the ARC break. Because you'll be driven, man,
into not getting the items clean. You'll be driven into taking the pc's orders, because a pc ARC
breaks just for so much time and then starts to issue orders because his duress is so great,
and those orders are the direct result of dramatizations. So, the orders are the significance. See,
he's dramatizing the significance contained in what you just put him at the effect of. See, not
only is he capable of dramatizing the emotion of the bypassed charge, but he's also capable of
dramatizing the significance contained in the bypassed charge. And therefore it's a very dan-
ergous thing to take the orders – it's very dangerous to the pc to take the orders of a very ARC
broke pc. Very dangerous – to the pc, not to you.

So what's this add up to? This adds up to two things: that you should learn to handle
bypassed charge, and be good enough as an auditor not to ever bypass charge! Period! How
do you do that? Well, just get hot, man.

How can you bypass charge? You can bypass charge by not finding any. You get a pc
who is on suppress, suppress, suppress and is all upset and going sideways, and you try to
find the next goal. You're pressing on with the session in the teeth of some kind of a weird,
apathetic ARC break or a low morale, see? So you do this list, only he never puts the goal on
the list. He puts some other goal three goals down the bank on this list. You take that goal,
you see, because you can't do anything else and so forth, and you just really can't do a good
job on it. So you take this goal and you bypass a couple of GPMs. Now, brother, you're going
to have a picnic.

See, you were driven into auditing somewhat carelessly or apathetically or defensively
or something of the sort, so you did a bad job of auditing and then you laid in more charge –
bypassed, see? You lay... you didn't lay in more charge, you bypassed more charge. See? The
harder you are driven into doing a bad job, then the more charge you bypass. So then you try
to find the top oppterm of this new one you found; it doesn't fire. Got two GPMs ahead of it.
Or you try to find its terminal, and that takes you two sessions.

What do you think the magnitude of built-up charge is by this time on the bypassed
charge? The bypassed charge is always prior to the charge you were working, you see – al-
ways prior. What do you think this does? Well, it just confirms the bypassed charge.

The reason you can't get anyplace with what you are doing is because you have by-
passed charge. And therefore look on the ARC break as a blessing in disguise. It tells you,
even more accurately than the meter, that you have bypassed some charge. Well, it tells you
you haven't got basic on the chain of the engrams, regardless of the meter. "Is there a more
basic incident on this chain?" The meter doesn't do a thing; it just sits there and does nothing.
If the pc ARC breaks, well, brother, there is a more basic incident on that chain. In other words, he can look deeper than the meter, see?

You've said, "All right, now let's pick up the first incident. Good. What are you looking at?"

"Oh, I'm looking at the clouds going by here."

"All right. Good. Now, see anything else around you?"

"Yeah, I see this black cord that seems to be coming down from the sky."

"All right. Now go to the moment just before that black cord reaches the ground or reaches toward you."

Pc ARC breaks. Well, you say, "Well, I'm – I was just sitting here trying to run the basic engram on the chain, and it said on the meter that it was the basic engram, and – and – huh-uh-mm-mm."

Don't feel so damn pathetic. You asked him to go to the beginning, so that restimulated it. And then he didn't get there, and he saw a picture that was the fifteenth incident. And you started to run the fifteenth incident; there were fourteen before it. So the pc ARC broke.

Now, you say, "Well, I've got to run this incident, because I can't get any trace of the earlier incidents unless I run through this one once. So therefore I don't dare run through this one once because the pc will ARC break." Not unless you haven't heard a word I said in this lecture. See, you won't be able to if you haven't heard a word I've said. You will always have to run the basic and, of course, it's not available. It's seldom available till you've peeled off a couple off the top of it. Look at the trouble you're having trying to get the first goal on the first series. Look at the trouble you're having. Why are you having trouble? That's because you've got to audit a few later ones to get the charge off enough to find the first one.

Well, all right, isn't that automatically bypassed charge? No. It's bypassed charge, but you've already cured the ARC break. How? You told the pc, "I can't find the first goal right now and it's undoubtedly there; we're going to run the one we've got our hands on." So you've already found and indicated the charge. So the pc won't ARC break, of course, because he knows there's charge up ahead.

All right. All you have to do is find and indicate the basic... the fact that there is a basic on the chain. Well, the pc ARC breaks... start to run this chain. You just try it on for size.

You say, "Well, you know, the engram that we've just started into here, that's evidently late on the chain, isn't it?" And you look at your E-Meter and it'll fire right about that time, because you said, "Now, we're going to run the one we get through so we can get back earlier."

"Oh, well – oh, yes? All right, fine." And the pc'll go right through it.

He'll run – he'll run the eighty-ninth on the chain, as long as he knows not even that it's the eighty-ninth but that there's an earlier one on the chain. It's that elementary. It's that elementary.
Now, why does a pc ARC break when you're putting in rudiments? Well, the rudiment is out in the incident that you are running, and of course that's prior to the session. You try to put the rudiment in in the session; it is out in the incident, so of course you've bypassed the charge, so therefore the pc ARC breaks and said, "All you're doing is sitting there running mid ruds and mid ruds and mid ruds, and you're mid-ruding me to death." See, that's just another case of bypassed charge.

Pc ARC breaks in mid ruds, you say... you don't have to find it. In fact, you better hadn't. There's probably a suppress in the incident. See, you're running Suppress and the pc ARC breaks. You say, "Well, in the incident we'll probably run there's probably a suppress."

And the pc – "Oh, yes!" That's the end of the ARC break. You understand? You get how many ways this cookie crumbles? See? It's the number of ways this pie can be cut. It's always bypassed charge.

And what's that make you for chickening off on cleaning an RI? What's that do, when because the pc is so ARC breaky and restive that you don't get all the charge off of... out of an RI? What does that set up? What does that set up for the next two or three RIs? Learn to think in those terms. It sets up an ARC break, of course. Because you didn't get the charge off the RI, the next RI now has bypassed charge behind it. Least that'll happen is your pc's morale goes down, and you can't get the charge off the next one. And you get a cumulative error. See? But, of course, you are so protective of your skill as an auditor you never say to the pc, "Hey, I don't think I've gotten any of the charge off the earlier incidents in this bank."

And the pc says, "Oh, no? Haven't you? Well, careless of you." And that's the end of that ARC break.

Look at the cumulative error. Item one: you got it to fire; it fired over a sixteenth of an inch, sensitivity 128 on the meter. "Well, that's the end of that one. All right, what opposes it? 'Nix scrambled eggishness.' You know? "All right, that fired a sixteenth of an inch." So you say, "Good. All right, let's take the next one, number two. 'Absolutely scrambled eggishness.' You know? "Well, that ticked. Well, that's good enough. There probably wasn't any charge on it. Probably the speaker was out that day. So let's get the next one. 'Nix scrambled eggishness.' Hm – hm. That fell slightly." (Tone arm went up so you got "tone arm action" on it!) [laughter] "Oh," you say, "well, I better get industrious. 'Perfectably scrambled eggishness.' I better get industrious and I'll really clean this one. This item been suppressed? Protested? Upset? Anything – anything been Upset? Invalidated? 'Perfectable scrambled eggishness' – anything been perfectabled?"

And you're sitting there looking at the wildest ARC break you ever heard of. "Where did it come from? Just because I'm trying to put in a couple of rudiments on 'perfectable scrambled eggishness,' this pc is ARC broke because he doesn't want me to..." Looks mysterious, doesn't it? Well, it comes from "nix absolutable," "absolutable nix," and the top oppterm.

Want to set up an ARC break? You can set it up perfectly mechanically. Just start going down the list, just drop one – just drop an RI. See? Notice the pc is a little abstracted and say, "Give me number thirty-one." Ticks. You say, "All right, that's fine. Give me number thirty-two." This pc will get a weird look in his eye. And certainly by thirty-three, thirty-four
or thirty-five, you will have a God-awful ARC break on your hands. And then you say, "I didn't take the charge off number thirty-one. Didn't take the charge of it off."

"Oh? Oh."

I wouldn't say you'd do this to any pc, but you actually could. And it's just as predictable as that. One, two, three: You bypass the charge, keep it a secret, ARC break.

Now, you start struggling around with a pc and ramming around one kind or another and harassing the pc and chewing the pc up, after you've bypassed two and three-quarters banks full of no blown charge, and what do you think you're going to be able to do with this pc? Exactly nothing. You're going to get nothing to discharge, you're not going to be able to run a session and so forth. What's your remedy? Your remedy ordinarily is find an earlier goal and run it well.

What if the pc is so bogged down by this time that you can't get up to an earlier goal? Well, run this ARC Break Recall Process for half a session, your pc will be able to find some earlier goals. Yeah, well, that's a crude remedy.

Any trouble you have with Routine 3 today is caused by bypassed charge. Any ARC break that you're having is caused by bypassed charge which has neither been found nor indicated. It's all under the heading of bypassed charge. Get a reality on it. How many ways can you bypass charge? Then you'll be able, not only to run a smooth session, but you'll have everything blowing, left and right, all the way on down.

There are numbers of ways to run charge off of RIs – numbers of ways to do it. But don't take the charge off of a GPM, your next GPM isn't going to fire. Don't take the charge off of four or five consecutive RIs, the sixth isn't going to fire. That's all.

Now, don't yammer at the pc on the seventh, trying to get it to discharge. Well, that's nonsense. How can it discharge? Pc is all of a sudden... his morale's down, he's ARC broken and so forth. The perfect way to keep these implants from running is to bypass charge. Then you're not going to get anything to run.

Well, I've even given you a weapon that puts the pc back together again so you can bypass the charge you've left on the bank. And that's your ARC Break Process, and that's marvelous anyway. The only thing known that'll cut into an implant like a band saw. Good Straightwire process – sit there and run it for a while, pc's that upset. But find out the charge reason first. Cure these ARC breaks before running a process.

Now, there's the trouble you is havin' – if you have any trouble with pcs, and if you have any trouble running banks; it all comes under that one heading of bypassed charge. You're going to have ARC breaks and no rocket reads. Everybody was sitting marveling at the big rocket reads I was getting on that TV demonstration. Well, it might strike you as very interesting that it was one of the most difficult sessions I have given for a very long time and those were the smallest rocket reads I have had for a long time. It was very difficult. The pc was very restimulated by the amount of electronic hum on the television cameras, because she was going through an electronic implant that hummed. Therefore wasn't firing very well. And I fought that on down the line and there was a bypassed charge of a cognition which almost caused an ARC break, and finally gave you the cognition, only it had been bypassed. And
then you saw some rocket reads that were really rocket reads. You saw a lot of rocket reads; those things were clean.

There's way... many ways to blow RIs. This is not a lecture on how to blow RIs. But let me tell you that if you start bypassing charge early on, you're going to find no charge later. And let me tell you something else: Don't buy an RI that doesn't rocket read a full dial. Got it? Just don't buy them. Let's see that thing fire, man! Let's see it really fire. There isn't a pc made that won't give you a dial rocket read per item. Now, how much charge do you think you've left on the bank? How long do you think your pc will remain ARC unbroken?

All right. Now, I told you you wouldn't like this lecture, but there it is.

Thank you very much.
PROGRAMMING CASES

PART 1

A lecture given on 29 May 1963

All right. This is what, the 29th? Twenty-nine May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This is a lecture on programming cases – a subject that you don't know anything about, never heard of before. Oddly enough, it's the least understood – you've heard of it, but it's the least understood activity in Dianetics or Scientology.

The antiquity of this subject is as antique as the discovery of the engram, because there's hardly any time at all intervened between the original discovery of the engram and the discovery of the mechanism of basic. So these are hand in glove. But because nobody's called it something different, nobody really separates it out or pays enough attention to it.

Programming is the overall action taken to resolve the case, regulated by the state of the case and the necessary steps. Possibly not a very neat definition – I could get you a neater one, and probably will.

Let me expand it a little bit more; a guy has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him assist. You get those steps now. He has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him an assist. You got that? All right. The stubbed toe is what you're directing the auditing toward in order to release it or benefit the case. The fact that you said, "I'm going to give him an assist" is the totality of programming. See, all of the steps of programming are inherent in that one little statement, "I'm going to give him an assist." And then you give him an assist and that is auditing. And you must separate programming out from auditing. And if you don't understand these as separate subjects, you're going to lay some ostrich eggs, and it's very hard to support ostriches.

Now, what goes into this statement, "I'm going to give him an assist"? How much adjudication goes into it? Well, one of the first adjudications is time. Time. You only got a half an hour to audit him, see.

Your next adjudication is "What will he stand for?" That is, "What will the case accept as auditing?"

Your next is "What will the case progress on as auditing?" In other words, "What auditing will make this case progress?"
Your next one is, is your order of actions. And it comes back again to time – "When are you going to start the auditing?"

Now, programming could be relegated to this dismal a cutback: "I start my sessions at two and end them at four. Now I have programmed the case."

Well, you'd be amazed how often that is the totality of programming. Just time alone, that's all. "I've only got a half an hour to audit him, so I will..." See, totality of programming. Time limits it so that you can't do very much. So that's the monitoring factor in programming and so on.

Well, all this is all very well, but before you're going to make any Clears, you have to have a very good grip on programming and there's a lot to this business of programming. It's all right to have a technique that will make a Clear. If you don't program it, it won't make a Clear.

People can walk up the front steps of Central Organizations, all be run on the exact technology; if programming is omitted for each case, you're going to get yourself 60, 70, 80 percent, and you're going to lose 20, 30 percent of the cases on gains.

Simple. This is a simple fact. This is one of these idiot facts – "I mean, everybody knows there is such a thing as pavement, so you walk on the pavement." Because it's an "everybody knows," the next thing you know there's no pavement and you're not walking on anything. You see? It has to be put there. The programming has to be put there. And one of the primary jobs of a Director of Processing is programming, not yakking with the auditor on what technique is going to be used.

Now, the funny part of it is, it tends to stay on automatic, because I know this subject so well, handle it's factors so rapidly, that I've never bothered to put a sidewalk there for you where you don't know of it. It's one of these things that's very easy to do. You, too, will find it easy to do. But unless you know it's there to do, you won't do it. And therefore, you will miss on a lot of cases and you'll say, "Well, technique XZ 77-HUP doesn't work." Why? "Well, we ran it on eighteen cases and it only fixed up about fourteen of them and that's not good enough," and so forth. But was it programmed? There's the question to ask: "Was it programmed for the case it was being run on?"

Now, that's very important. This is something on the order of saying, "Aircraft. Aircraft. We're going to fly aircraft, and so forth," and we just take for granted forever that there's a sky. So we don't bother to learn anything about the sky. Sooner or later we get into space opera, and we find out we've run into the limitations of that, and ho-ho-holy cats now, we'd better know about the sky! See, we've got to know a lot about the sky now.

Orville and Wilbur,14 fresh out of the last space opera society they were with, and anxious to get up in the air again – having been well restimulated by theta traps, which has the basic symbol, an airplane… Oh, you didn't know that? I thought that was interesting. See, an airplane carries the symbolic message that a thetan needs mass to rise, which is a lot of...

---

14 Editor's note: The brothers Orville (1871-1948) and Wilbur Wright (1867-1912), American aircraft pioneers who on 17 December 1903 made what are generally regarded as the first powered, sustained and controlled flights at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina.
Well it's... [laughs] So the airplane becomes a symbol of gravity, having to bear on a thetan. Do you ever notice how fly boys tend to put on mass when they get up around their thirties, and so forth? It's quite an interesting fact, but it's just that the airplane is a symbol of theta traps.

All right. So they fly around in the sky, and they go out and they make a flight of a hundred yards, or something like that, and it's all up in the air, and they don't crash when they landed, and they must come down in a place which is not lower than the place they took off from. In other words, they made a flight. And believe me, they sure took the sky for granted.

And boys have been going on, now, taking the sky for granted, and so forth, and they just – it got this far – they program to this degree: "It's raining and cloudy, so we won't fly." Get that as World War I programming for flight. Idiocy, see.

All right. They get up to World War II, why, they're flying above the weather, and they're doing all sorts of interesting things, so they have to have a prediction of what the weather is going to be. Taking off and landing in rain didn't bother them so much anymore. But targets and that sort of thing – they got more and more involved in what they laughingly call meteorology here on this planet. The prediction of tomorrow's Weather Bureau mistakes. [laughter] Actually, this whole subject is not in its infancy; it hasn't been born yet on this planet.

I can take a look at my desk barometer any day of the week and get a better weather forecast than I get over the Telephone. The... I'm being hard on the boys. Every year they get a little bit better. They're finding the sky, too.

And then all of a sudden we get into passenger traffic left and right across the Atlantic, and we hear "above-the-weather flight," "radar-spotted weather," you see, and so on. They're still finding clouds. They haven't found the sky yet, see. Then they shot off a few cosmonauts, who became naught in Russia with great rapidity, and they found a great deal there called "the sky." And five dead cosmonauts later, the Russians must have decided that they should know something about it. But because they had lots of cosmonauts they probably haven't bothered.

But the point is, they send people up into the Van Allen belt – named after Van Allen. Who the hell heard of him? And – I don't know, maybe he was the fellow who invented radiation fallout or something. In other words, they shoot people up into these areas, and they get scorched or something happens or something of that sort, and they're in the big vagueness of "There is a sky." They're still on this thing here, see.

In other words, they're just gradually, one by one as they run into this, getting aware of the fact that there's something out there called "sky," and there's a lot to know about it. And actually, they haven't even got the seven-year-old-child's version of crime detection textbooks, you know, or something like that. It's just from nowhere yet. It's a tremendous amount of technology. Yet they might know how to fly airplanes, see. They might do a pretty good job.

These cosmonauts or astronauts – you notice all of them are getting slack-jawed, you know, from this spinning around. Watch the pictures of them. They spin them around in circles until they get slack-jawed. How do you become a space jockey? Well, you spin a guy
enough in a wide circle to accustom him to being slack-jawed, that's as near as I can figure out what man was about there.

Everybody knows he'll get terribly sick unless you make him sick. You see, they're well up on this kind of thing. And they can fly these little capsules and jet planes, and guided missiles are beginning to land here and there, and so forth, so they probably think they're pretty sharp.

But what sky are they flying in? What about this sky?

And that's just about the same relationship that auditing has with programming. You can fly the pc through most anything, see. But is there any sky? And if you don't know there's none there, you're going to have an awful time. And a perfectly simple case is just going to go bzzt in your hands, because it isn't programmed.

And you can take this bird; he's sitting right there. You can get almost anything to fire. You can get almost anything to run, and at the end of fifty hours of auditing, you've got a pile of junk on your hands. Something went wrong. What went wrong? You did all of your auditing perfectly. You did it exactly the way you were supposed to be taught and yet the pc crashed. Why? Programming, programming. It's a fine art. It's based on rather fantastic principles, and it isn't any guesswork. It's based on some of the oldest auditing principles we have, and the most neglected.

It's very doubtful if there are very many auditors present who know these data, and yet they're some of the most aged data we have. It's – some of this data is onward to sixteen years old. Pretty creaky.

But these are the criteria. "Yes," you say, "I've run into that in Book One, and I've run into it here," and so forth. But you haven't run into it as a huge beacon in the middle of the sky. You've run into it as a little fact you might trip across, and that's this: The behavior of the time track and the disabilities of pcs in relationship thereto and the abilities of pcs in relationship to the time track. And that is what forms the bulk of programming. It's just contained in those little data right there.

What is the time track? Well, there's a long bulletin on this subject. Most – I've spoken to you about it recently. Actually, it's a lineal 3-D record of all the activities of a thetan, potentially in 3-D, full color, with fifty-two perceptions. It's a long movie. And as the film goes through, some of it you could call an engram, and some of it you could call a lock, and some of it you could call a secondary, and some of it you could call this. But it's all the same movie, but some of these incidents are more powerful than others and some of them have a capability of destroying the movie or appearing to destroy the movie. So that you pick up reel sixteen and apparently the next consecutive picture is reel eighty. What the hell goes on between reel sixteen and reel eighty? This is no way to conduct an entertainment, everything missing between those two points. And yet with improper programming you will never find sixteen to eighty. You go ahead and audit with great industry reel eighty, reel sixteen; where's the rest of it?

Well, just ignore that and don't undertake any programming that will arrive at that. He – your pc – somehow or another he's getting lots of auditing, but nothing is happening to
his case because the programming is missing. Why is it – why this tremendous effect? Well, actually what's wrong with him is between reel sixteen and reel eighty. And you're assiduously auditing, let us say, reel eighty to reel one hundred, and you only audit reel eighty to reel one hundred. Quite interesting.

Well, the word "programming" is something you should remember, because a time track can be likened to a very long motion-picture show. So therefore, there's nothing better than calling it programming.

But how do you get this thing exhibited? Now, if it was just a piece of film that you put in a projector and ran through and you only had to patch it up occasionally, you'd be in clover. But that isn't the kind of film it is. This film can have a total effect on the pc. He lives this movie. When somebody gets shot in the picture, he feels the bullet.

Well, this is really a very fantastically personal sort of motion picture that you're running. There's nothing impersonal about it unless the pc is halfway around the bend, and then he can be so detached, you see, that it doesn't have any effect on him. He doesn't get well either.

In fact, it goes so far as you can only run those portions of this motion picture which are totally personal to the pc. And the moment you start to run things which are too impersonal to the pc, you have a hard time of it. And that's what is known – "You run the pc at his reality."

Well, you'd be surprised how far you can exceed the pc's reality and get something run. You grab a Helatrobus Implant and start running it – glugh! He's got no reality. He's lived but once, see. Here he is living but once, huh-ha!

Every life he kicks the bucket and lives but once again, and blind as a bat on the subject of what he's done yesterday and can't do tomorrow. And oh, he's having a hell of a time, you see. Here he goes.

And sometimes a pc absolutely gets down and pounds the desk. See, he's so infuriated at your terrible doctrine that people have lived before and something Scientologists "believe," you know, that sort of thing. You could take this character and throw him into the middle of a Helatrobus Implant; start running the implant. Some time later (however fast you run the RIs), he suddenly looks up and says, "I've got news for you. This didn't happen this lifetime, and it happened to me." And that's what's so interesting about the Helatrobus Implants – the personalness of them.

So your program is not monitored – this is the other mistake you can make – the program is not monitored on what the pc has a reality on before you audit the pc, but is monitored by what the pc can obtain a reality on during auditing. And that's what we call the reality factor of programming. What can you run on him that he can obtain a reality on during auditing? Not, what is real to this lunk... this guy? You know, he's been going around saying, "Well, everybody is a machine. And if I don't implant this pc in present time, then he won't be able to run back to early incidents, you see, because he'll have no impulse to do so."

In other words, you omit the volitional factor. You omit the factor of change in the pc. See, you say, "The pc can't change. The pc can't assume a new viewpoint. And the pc has very
little volition in which to assume a new viewpoint," and so forth. Well, if you neglect all of those things, – then you would only run what the college faculties on this planet at the moment would permit. See, I know what they would permit. They would permit the student life of the student body to be audited. See, that's all. They would only permit to be audited on the pc that which they themselves fully and thoroughly agreed to be reality.

So never fall for that trap in programming. You want to audit in the direction that the pc can obtain a reality. But you always want a new reality on the part of the pc, not the reality the pc has.

Well, it does you no good, actually, to say, "Well, the pc has a very good reality on this carpet, so therefore we will audit him on this carpet for the next four or five intensives." You see, that's idiocy.

No, let's audit the pc – well, let's just make a forward program on this. Let's audit the pc up to being able to have a reality on the composition of mest into carpets. Ah well, that would be a different trick, wouldn't it? Oh! Just look at the number of complexities you'd have to run into to get a total reality on a carpet. And you probably could devote four or five intensives to it. See?

Now, we don't, then, take off with the pc's reality as an accomplished fact. This is – yesterday's mental sciences made this mistake all the time, all the time in their programming; made this mistake continuously and they shouldn't have made this mistake. They audited or processed or treated from the viewpoint of their own immediate reality and on no other viewpoint and therefore came to the conclusion nobody could change.

It's something like tying a horse up and tying every hoof to the ground and then announcing to one and all that horses won't run. And stand there and beat the horse, and the horse doesn't run, and you say, "You see, it proves itself. The horse can't run."

You've audited the pc, then, only and totally from the platform of the pc's current or extant reality and have not permitted the pc to exceed that in any way. Bum programming, absolutely backwards.

Now, a lot of remarks could be made along in this particular direction on mistakes that could be made in programming, but it is not quite as esoteric even yet as you might think. It is much more concise and much more scientific.

Programming is based one hundred percent upon these exact things: The capability of the auditor (that is number one, not number two), the capability of the pc to receive auditing, the amount of time available in the auditing and the maximum result to be obtained – given those upper factors that I just gave you – the maximum result to be thereby attained. That's programming.

In other words, it takes into effect what can be accomplished. And you can add one more line to that end one that you put down: Increase of A, R and C. In other words, that's the maximum result that can be obtained is always measured in increase of A, R and C, not just in the increase of ARC. Increase of A, increase of R and increase of C. That's different, isn't it?
See, we've gotten so portmanteau with ARC, we forget that it's a highly technical action. In other words, given those earlier factors that I gave you there – the capability of the auditor, the capability of the pc and the amount of time available – we can then determine the last factor, which will be an increase of affinity.

Now, what the hell is an increase of affinity? Well, there's the Gno [Know] to Mystery Scale, and the wusser [worse] somebody is off, the lower he is on the scale. The whole Tone Scale is part of the Know to Mystery Scale. That's why I use the Know to Mystery Scale rather than say Tone Scale. The whole middle guts where it says "emotion" and so forth, and so forth, that's actually your forty tones in there and it goes below those, see?

This you should know about the Tone Scale: That a person has no personal reality, but may have an intellectual reality, on those tones above his position. He has reality only on those tones below his position. That's – his tone is known as chronic tone.

Now, there can be chronic tone as a body plus thetan, or there can be chronic tone as a thetan. And chronic tone of body plus thetan can be apparently at enthusiasm, whereas tone of thetan is at unconsciousness and is off the Tone Scale. Do you get these data?

This is not brand-new data, but it's quite interesting because I'm punching it up to you hard. This is not just nonsense data that it's nice to know; this is the breath of life when it comes to programming.

Any level above the chronic tone is susceptible of being dramatized. Dramatization is a thetan or thetan plus body performing evolutions not under the thetan or thetan plus body's control. Nonvolitional action.

Older mental studies so concentrated on nonvolitional actions they thought there was nothing else but nonvolitional actions. So you just have to omit those particular studies because there are volitional actions and they lie below the chronic tone of the individual on the Tone Scale.

Now, you've got the volitional actions, then, of body plus thetan – see, a chronic tone of body plus thetan. And then you've got another position which is the chronic tone of the thetan which is lower than that of the body plus thetan. So that tells you very often that you have to process the body plus thetan like mad to finally bring the thetan off the launching pad.

And they dramatize... the body plus thetan is susceptible of dramatizing any level above the chronic tone, but is most susceptible to the half-tone above. That goes in harmonics as you go on up.

A – we have just covered A. See, that's A: affinity of the A, R and C, in that last one. What do you mean, then, by "increasing the affinity"? Well, you mean definitely raising the person so that he is less susceptible to dramatization and has a reality on more tone levels below him. See, if you raise him up one tone level, then you've added one more level on which he has reality and you've subtracted one level that he may dramatize.

See, so he'll dramatize one tone level less, and he'll have reality on one tone level more. You get the idea? He's just gone up one slot on the ladder, so therefore, you've put an-
other rung under him. He won't dramatize the rung where he is, and previously he was the effect of this rung.

Now, are you processing a body plus thetan? All right. If you're processing a body plus thetan, then this gain is on the old finite scale that only goes up to about four. Body plus thetans never cycle above four. That's apparent tone. Apparent tone.

That means that someday you're going to get an awful surprise. You're going to have this boy really flying, man! Just flying. His affinity is way up there at four, see. Affinity right up there at four, enthusiasm; everything's fine. Rah! Rah! you know. Get the show on the road. Bang! And all of a sudden he comes down and he crashes – apparently crashes – and drags himself into session man. "Trrrah!" Tone arm hasn't even gone up. Nothing happened between sessions. Had a good sleep last night and yet you can practically see the degradation dripping off of him.

Degradation is kind of oily and greasy. And you can practically see it drip off of him. And he may go along like this for a little while and then he may realize or you may realize – he'll get, eventually, reality on it – you've processed a thetan up to degradation. And maybe there were some intervening levels, but he didn't notice and you didn't notice. You processed him from unconsciousness to degradation. Only degradation is so spectacular that somebody noticed. You're now processing a thetan; you're no longer processing a body plus thetan. There's where he takes off if you're eventually going to go in for Route One.

How far up that scale does he have to go to perform Route One? Well, he has to go as far up that scale as the chronic tone of the thetan has to go up that scale. You see that?

So there is your portmanteau picture, just an offhand sort of picture, of an increase or gain of case as you call it – case gain in terms of affinity.

That's a case gain. So given those earlier three factors I gave you, why, you've got him up along as best you could there to that. But you did not achieve a case gain unless you did something with A. Got it?

Body plus thetan had to come up in tone or a thetan had to appear or something had to happen here, don't you see? That's a case gain. That's a real case gain.

R – reality. Well, everything was pretty unreal to this fellow. What do we mean, "unreal"? Oh well, that's a nice, wonderful word – unreal. That's just a dirty word. Undefined and unclassified in any way, it's just a dirty word.

You know, you can measure the reality of a person so fast it'd make your head swim. There is matter, energy, space, time and significance. Those are the five elements which really compose a universe. And you can always use significance as a measure. Even though you haven't affected the matter, energy, space and time, you can tell the – I mean, you haven't observed them as changing – you can tell an observation of the significance.

This person, when you start to process him, cannot understand. His life and conversation is full of "cannot understand," see. He cannot assume any viewpoint but his own and his own is nonextant. He's... easily gets very reasonable about the most unreasonable things. You can test somebody's reality rather easily, simply in a solution of problems. All of psychologi-
cal testing is directed, whether they know it or not, in the direction of observation of significance, the realities of significance, and they measure their changes that way.

It's at that little bridge point where these two subjects collide that we can thereon use this, because it is a measure of the significance. You'll find out this fellow is capable of understanding a little more. Now, this is measured, sometimes, in terms of appearing overt. His overt will appear. He'll realize that certain things he did were overt. Well, why is this? Well, that's because his understanding has increased. He is more capable of taking the other fellow's viewpoint. And taking the other fellow's viewpoint, he realizes his overt can now knock his own block off. See? And therefore, one of the symptoms of this is a fellow begins to suffer. An increase of reality – the fellow begins to suffer from his overt. He suddenly realizes that something he never thought was so bad before was not quite so good!

You know, that's a big gain, see. That's a big – that's a reality gain. Get the idea? So you know he had a reality increase because he can understand more, and the mechanism of understanding more, of course, puts him into the line of being more responsible, and he's got a different view of things. And he'll cognite on this and that.

Now, cognition is actually the process of a changing reality of significance, and that is what a cognition is and why a cognition is so necessary to a case gain. You yourself know by experience that that pc that doesn't cognite, doesn't make a case gain. Well, why – what's the cognition? You think it's properly quantity of cognitions. It isn't quantity of cognitions at all. It isn't that. He's simply giving you a dress parade of significant reality changes, see – the reality of significance.

"I never realized before…" "Say, what do you…" "Say, uh-huh!" you know.

Well, I'll give you an example: I had one black... last night, I said, "You know, the reason black mass affects a thetan is because he's never taken responsibility for creating it. What thetan would ever want to create black mass?" See, I was trying to get rid of some black mass, and I suddenly take a look at it and it sort of faded away with that, see.

But from such an observation – although that seems to be a very – actually, is a more fundamental observation than just a cognition, because I've been trying to get at what the hell black mass is for a long time as a technical fact. But the auditor could have said at that point, "I have just made a case gain," see. Now, you put down the goals and gains of the pc at the end of session. Did you ever look on it that you were doing a sort of a psychometric test at that moment? It's all contained in the significance of reality.

And the pc's few cognitions he's had in the session, that's fine, but he himself understands something more or sees something more or sees that he might or the future may be or – you know, something. That's measured your case gain for you.

You see what that is? So you don't have to say, "He can see MEST better. The room all looks brilliantly bright to him, so he has had a case gain." See, you don't have to look at it like that. As a matter of fact, I had people turn brilliantly bright to me one time. I was over in New York in 1950, I was doing quite a bit of research and I hadn't been getting any sleep to amount to anything. And it didn't have any great importance to it, but I stepped off a bus and all of a sudden people went bright as could be. They got awfully solid and awfully bright.
Well, an auditor, if he'd been using that to measure whether or not there was a case gain in progress, would have made a hell of a mistake. What I had had happen was a key-in of the Helatrobus Implants! It was the action of getting off the bus. And for a moment everybody looked terribly bright – I didn't like it. And it went away in the next few minutes. You get the idea though?

That wasn't a case gain, and that, therefore, isn't what we mean by reality. That will come in due course – the ability to mock things up and that sort of thing – but now you're talking about high-scale theta abilities and those are pretty obvious.

You're going to get most of your reality changes on a pc, at the level you're operating in, are going to be at the level of significance and are going to turn out as case gains or cognitions. And don't expect the pc to say, "I have had a wonderful session," and expect that to be a case gain because it is not – the pc might have been audited down to propitiation.

But the pc all of a sudden says, "You know, I think my mother must have had a hard time." Ahh! Ahh! Not because he realizes he is now guilty or something of the sort, but because he is now a little more capable of assuming the viewpoint of his mother. And you say, "Hey, you know, we've made quite a gain in this session here, quite a gain right there," see.

Now let's take up C. That's pretty obvious; the pc won't talk to you at the beginning of session, will talk to you at the end of session. I mean, that's so obvious that you almost specialize in it. Pc will talk to people; pc will communicate better. And there's where you get your solid walls. Actually, it doesn't belong under reality, it belongs in communication. He's more willing to communicate, so he can see better. It's not that he finds reality more palatable that he can see better; it's just simply his communication is better.

Sight, sound, touch – all of these various things, one right after the other are phenomena of communication. See, the phenomena of reach and withdraw: It's the reach and withdraw of the light particle. It's the reach and withdraw of this and that. It's the ability and willingness to receive. All of this sort of thing adds up into this factor of communication. See, reality can be reality even if you can't see it.

I think you've got a pretty good idea right now that Saint Paul's is pretty solid. Hm? Therefore, you can conceive of the reality of Saint Paul's – see, that it's solid. All right, that's fine. That isn't a case gain. Well, why isn't it a case gain? Well, you just conceived of the reality of Saint Paul's and Saint Paul's is solid. And – but if you could see Saint Paul right now or if you got a mock-up of Saint Paul's or if you could just look at Saint Paul's right now or see Saint Paul's right now and see how solid it was and feel how solid it was, that's a communication gain. See that?

Now, that can be a fantastic thing. You're taking off, perhaps, with a totally delusory case. He thinks the room is full of polar bears. Well, at the end of session can he see them better? Have they cleaned up any? I'm afraid that would be a case gain. But if you're operating from the platform of reality that the room is not full of polar bears (circa Freud, you see), so therefore you must get rid of the polar bears out of the room, you, of course, have dropped his communication. He can't communicate with you, but he can communicate with these polar bears.
Now, if he could communicate with the polar bears well enough, he wouldn't have to communicate with the polar bears and they'd depart. That's the way to get rid of polar bears.

It's horrible, some psychiatrist picking bugs off of some patient on the basis that the patient doesn't have any bugs and therefore, before he's got the bugs he must get rid of the bugs. See, that's operating from the platform of reality of there must only be this reality, and unless we can hold the status quo of this reality, we have not won in processing.

And I stress that – not because it's funny or that I want to clobber our poor, sick brothers – because it has been the criteria in all mental activities for the many trillennia. And an auditor may be holding on to it with both fists and not realize it, see, that our only gain would be from the platform of where we are. See, if we can continue the alteration to making things more like they are, here, now, then we're getting case gains. I'm sure that's the wonderful way to clobber people. See, because then one of the things you're doing is holding him on the time track.

Now, I am afraid the other side of where you're going and the other side of the coin lies through a lot of hell and a lot of dark canyons. It's whether or not the pc can get a reality and can get reality enough on those dark canyons in order to get through them. In other words, whether his communication factor rises sufficiently to go through. Can he communicate with these things? Well, it requires quite a bit of him. So there's your communication factor all contained in that fourth one that I just gave you.

Now, that's long and lugubrious, and this is a long and difficult subject, programming. It's not something that you could wind up. But there's what you're trying to achieve by programming. And if I just tell you "Well, program everything," you know, and then not give you anything you're trying to achieve in programming, why, it'd be almost as bad as barking and condemning at you, you see, left and right, for not doing something you're not told what it is.

See, here's what you're trying to achieve: You're trying to achieve a case gain. Therefore, I've gone at long length to tell you what's a case gain. How do you achieve that gain? Well, the technical facts that have existed over these long and many years are very few. You can almost put them in a thimble. They're outside of the technology of auditing and therefore get forgotten, overlooked, because they belong in the subject of programming.

And that is these hard, fast, technical data, and they are: Unburdening. Basics. And disentangling basics. And it's in those actions that programming is done. Unburdening. Now, I'll amplify it a little bit. Discovery of basics and eradication of the basic by discovering what basics can be found before basic that disentangled the basic you're trying to untangle. Ah, I thought you'd wake up.

Basic on a chain contains in it elements which are not basic to the basic.

You've got the basic engram that gives you the absolute basis of all laryngitis or FDA-osis or something. I'd better be careful to use healing things because they don't want...

By the way, you know, we're going to have to have the FDA arrested. Do you know why? They're the only people in the United States that are claiming that an E-Meter can heal and cure things. [laughter] And they mustn't maintain those things, you see. It's a criminal
offense. So we're going to have to have them arrested, since they are the only ones maintain-
ing it. Poor old FDA. Remember to whisper a little prayer as you... that they all go to heaven at the time... [laughter, laughs]

Now, you're running this basic and you run it as an engram. It is basic on the chain that you're running. Let's say it's automobile accidents, and goddamn, it's got an elephant in it! Well, it is the basic on the chain for automobile accidents and will release and everything in it will release except this confounded elephant! So what are you going to do, run this engram and leave an elephant sitting there, saying, "Well, that's not part of the basic, boy, so we can't have anything to do with that. You just go on and live with this elephant"? Is that what you're going to do? Your pc's going to ARC break. Why? Because when you found the elephant you found a more basic chain, not on automobile accidents but on elephants.

So you're running the engram through quite happily and then you run into an ele-
phant – you've got to slip this elephant's basic. That could be done rather readily. You can do it almost with dating. You can find the first elephant. And the amazing part of it is, is the ele-
phant will disappear out of the basic that you're running. You've gotten rid of him, he's gone. Do you understand?

The actual operation of running basics is not the same operation as running any other engram. You run a basic by finding everything basic to the basic. And by the time you've got through, you've practically cleared somebody, unless you've got him so tangled up and lost your place in the book! But you take a basic apart in terms of basics, if you really want to take it apart.

Oh yes, it's basic on the chain of automobile accidents. Yes, that's fine, but it happens to have a wife in it and an elephant and a motorcycle. Now, it's less complicated than it looks, because it's also got pavement in it, and it's got emotion in it, and it's got suppresses in it, and it's got everything else. And if you went ne plus ultra ad absurdum on the whole thing you'd find a basic for everything that was contained in the engram. But even if you did and even if you found the basic for each one of those basics it would blow up! It isn't that you can go too far, it's just simply that you can sometimes become too ridiculous.

By the time you've found basic on motorcycles and basic on a wife and basic on an elephant, this thing has went. Run what engram? See, it's too in... it, as a basic, will blow if the basics are blown of it. Do you understand? Because a basic will almost blow by inspection unless it's held down by an earlier basic. But an earlier basic on what? On something con-
tained in the basic. Oh yes, you can get the basic theta trap, but it's got particles of energy in it and the pc goes nattering about these particles of energy. You haven't got basics on particles of energy. Well, you go, bzzzz, bzzzz, clip, tip, pow, pow... The pc's very interested in it, is your test of whether or not you'd handle it. And you go sloop, doop, bang, "Basics on parti-
cles of energy?"

"Oh, yeah, here's a big overt in glare fight, and I go brzzzz, maw, glu. Good God! Yeah, what do you know about that! Well, how terrible! Yeah, well, that's it and so forth. Yeah, well, all right."

And you say, "Okay, now let's go back and run some more of that basic," and by the way, he isn't bothered this time by the particles of energy. That's gone.
In other words, you slipped the basics out of the basic, and this takes some very slippy engram running. Very interesting. If you can keep track of it, you are very successful; if you can't, why, the whole track collapses and the pc goes mad, but that's all right because you've still got another action.

Now, the first action that you should undertake on a case is the most advanced action—this is in programming—is the most advanced action which can be undertaken in your estimation. In other words, always enter a case more boldly than you think is absolutely necessary, and you will nearly always be right. Just enter a case more boldly than you think is wise. Got that?

Otherwise, if you don't maintain that point of view, you will never find the ceiling at which the pc can operate because you'll go at it at such graduals, and your underestimations will cost so much time. Because going at it more boldly, if you get away with it, you're just fine. If you get away with it, you're way into it now, man, and you're all set. And you're doing that with the Helatrobus Implants. A guy can run an implant; hmmm, go man go. The pc falls on his head and can't manage it and so forth, pull back. Run some implants later. And that doesn't even really depend on whether or not the pc could run the implant. It's—remember it's regulated by these other things; could the auditor run the implant, see, and that sort of thing. It's just those little factors I gave you there on programming are all relative to this.

But always go in a little more boldly! Give the auditor a little more process than you think he can handle if you have to. Always run the case just a little steeper than you think is absolutely wise and you'll head for more gains faster, see. You can always pull back today. You don't sacrifice a case. The case isn't "ruined forever!"

Now, these technical facts—I'll go over them again—are simply unburdening and running basics and taking basics apart. Now, you could say unburdening, finding a chain—and you'd probably be more subtle about this, more orderly—unburdening, finding the chain you want, finding the first basic of that chain and then slipping the first basic to pieces by finding some basics for that basic. You understand?

Now, that's programming. I don't care what case you're handling or if you're using CCHs, you're still on that program. Now, it's "What part of that program can you enter?" Now, let me be a little more concise, although I will give you a full lecture on it tomorrow.

What part of that can you skimp and what can you press home on? How many corners can you turn sharply?—all within the reality of the factors of the auditor, the pc and the ARC gains the pc makes. You got it?

But actually, don't think there is more to auditing than unburdening, finding a chain, finding the basic on the chain and taking apart a basic, because there is no more to auditing than that. I don't care what process you're using. Pat-a-cake—famous process; used to be run in the Foundation by people who couldn't audit. Sitting there having a conversation with the pc, being very careful—everybody being very careful, not to go anywhere near an engram. Its old name they used to give it was "pat-a-cake."

All right. They still—they still have some programming. Their program is not to unburden because it's too dangerous. They didn't even think about going to engrams. See, they
just wouldn't even unburden, because there's no telling what you might find underneath that rock, see. "Don't pick up any rocks, man! That's dangerous!"

Now, what does it essentially consist of? It essentially consists of taking off charge. And the reason I gave you the first time, unburdening, finding basic and so forth. Because ordinarily you run back a chain and run enough off a chain – run enough off of it so that you can get earlier on it, so that you can run enough off of it, so that you can get earlier on it so that you could lay your paws on the basic. And if the basic is too pistol-hot and the pc can't sit there, well, just indicate that you're going to take care of this shortly and then you go forward from basic very ra... I mean, go later than basic, see, very rapidly and you strip the charge off after basic.

Now let me give you an idea. You find the first GPM implant – here's programming: to find the first implant – that's your goal, see – and to strip it down and knock it out. That's what you're trying to do. Find the first GPM. I don't care what else you think you're trying to do; that's what you're trying to do.

And you get landed with a pc that can't – you can't get a single RI or goal to fire on of any kind whatsoever. What do you do? Well, you have to make – the fact that he might not have the Helatrobus Implants, according to the estimation of how goosey he is as a case. You know, "Can you remember yesterday? What did you have for breakfast this morning? Oh, that makes you nervous?" Well, he's got the Helatrobus Implants. You get it? Not that "he was nervous" gave him the Helatrobus Implants, but this guy has just got such a heavily burdened case that he's just too goosey to go anywhere near anything dynamitey like that, see.

So you see, you have to unburden this to get to the implants. Well, how long do you unburden? Well, you unburden until you can get your hands on an implant and not one second longer. And as soon as you get your hands on an implant, we don't care if it's the last one, you run it. How thoroughly do you run it? Well, you run it thoroughly enough to blow charge of it off. At least one dial wide disintegrating RR per item, and that is the absolute minimum that you can run one.

Grinding out the engram... Well, you haven't got basic if you have to grind, grind. It isn't releasing and nothing's releasing and you grind and you call items. And urrrrr! nothing happening and so forth and nothing RR. (And the pc is awake; that's necessary to the auditing!) What do you do? Well, you've probably got too early an implant. You say, "Hey, we're trying to go early." No, no you're trying to unburden. Well, let's pick up the last one in the second chain if we know what it is and let's run that one with a fast pass. Or let's do something with some Straightwire that gives him some locks, or let's find overts on this thing, don't you see? Let's see if we can chase him earlier and find the first contact. That's all unburdening, don't you see.

Well, let's run the "three command process" for a while and see if we can dish this out and lay open some other things. We're just trying to get our hands on an implant. Why are we trying to get our hands on an implant? So we can run some charge of it off so we can find an
earlier implant. Why are we trying to get that implant? So we can run some charge of it off and find some earlier implant. Why are we trying to run that implant? So we can find basic!

Well, what's basic? That's the first implant. What do you do when you get your hands on it? Sometimes it's so pistol-hot you can't run it. You have to come running later and run some charge off some of them later and then lay your hands on it again. You sometimes have to go later than basic, not earlier.

Why? You're asking a pc to walk through a wall of fire back to an area he's never been at before. Between basic and present time there's this wall of fire, and you're saying, "Well, go on through."

And he says, "But I can't find anything in here!"

And you say, "Oh, you idiot, go on," and so forth. What are you going to do? Just spend the rest of session after session after session, well knowing your pc's not getting any gains in ARC, trying to push him through this wall of fire. Why try to push him through the wall of fire? It's the wrong mission. You're trying to get him through the wall of fire. Hoo-hoo. How do you get him through the wall of fire? Well, put some fire out, of course!

How do you put some fire out? Well, you just – let's get back here where the heat can be felt and let's get some of that pawed off, and then let's get him a little closer and let's get some charge off a little closer. Finally, he's got a living flame in his hands and says, "Ho, ho! There it is, there it goes, there's another one and so forth and... I wonder what's back there?" you know. Scorch! [laughs] And retreats, and so forth, and you just take a little more fire off the track. It's all a quantitative charge. It isn't what the pc can confront; it's how much you can get discharged. It's a mechanical fact.

And you get him back through the wall of fire and he finds the fifteenth goal. And you think it's the first one and so does he. But then you get that discharged and you'll get the fifteenth [fourteenth] goal. And you get that one out and then you get that discharged. And then you can find the thirteenth, and then you can find the tenth, and then you can find the fifth. And he knows he's got the first goal now because – nothing before it. So you get that discharged. Discharge it RIs. And you move up, and all of a sudden you find yourself sitting there with the front goal, and this is hotter than a pistol! And it's got basics.

And you have to take everything out of it that is a basic. There's a theta trap in it that doesn't belong in it. Well, let's put it back on the track where it belongs, see. Let's date it and smooth it up. And let's clean this area out! By taking off prior charge to the basic, all of a sudden the basic collapses and what do you see next? Oh, you may have to run these implants but, heh! It's something on the basis of bzzzt! "Well, that's that one run." Get the idea? Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow! "Yes, I've got that one."

It's tearing up, don't you see? It can't stay there if the basic is still in... is not in place. Basic can't stay there if it doesn't have certain basics holding it in place – basic elements, not basic engrams but basic elements holding it in place. Basic can't stay there without those basic elements. With those basic elements gone, basic can't stay there. If basic is gone, the rest of the chain can't stay there. You're walking a track backwards that can't be walked backwards, and that's why Scientology is magic.
But it's always done in a programming which will accomplish those ends. Unburden, find the chain you're looking for, unburden that chain, get the basic you're looking for, and then run back the elements in that basic, clip those basics out, that will disappear and the whole thing blows clean.

And that's what you're trying to do. You're not trying to run 8,765 GPMs because George has got that many. You're running enough GPM to let the pc earlier. And you — you'll underestimate how much charge you've gotten off, and you very often are wrong. You have to discharge another GPM before you can move up earlier again. And everything, now, is going creak! — the pc can just barely make it, barely hold his position and so forth. That's good enough. Got it?

That's what you're trying to do. Those are technical facts that have to do with the track, and they fit in with programming, not with auditing, because they tell you what you audit. You've always been wondering what you audit. You audit what you have to program. And how do you program? Just like I've been telling you.

And you're going to find some cases — put them down, they go halfway into the bank; you unburden four or five GPMs in the middle of the bank; you can move it earlier. "Ho! That's easy. Why didn't I go up here in the first place?" Well, of course, you couldn't have. Take that one apart, move a little earlier. That's easy. That's easy. Find the first one, bang! That's out, gone, boom! "What's these Helatrobus Implants? What are they making so much fuss about?" Well, that's just part of his communication and reality factors which I gave you in the first schedule of programming.

See how it's done? Without programming, you can do nothing.

That's the "pill system": no programming. That's the dream of every army in the world. This fellow walks up, puts out his hand, they put a pill in it, fellow takes pill — brilliant, trained fighter. Dream of every army in the world. Dream of every civilization that has ever existed.

Let me point something gruesome out to you: Those armies have all lost and those civilizations are no longer here.

Thank you.
PROGRAMMING CASES

PART II

A lecture given on 30 May 1963

Thank you.
Okay. How are you today?

Audience: Fine. Good.

You look slightly less human! ... Boy, you've got an awful comm lag. Since you've been over here in England, you know, this humor – my jokes have a harder time getting forward. Because you're developing this sense of humor, you know, that's got a comm lag, and you've got to stop that. I mean…

What's the date?

Audience: Thirtieth.

Thirtieth of May.

All right, 30 May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I'm going to talk to you today from the viewpoint of treating a GPM as an engram and treating the time track in general and handling cases in general.

Now, I think you'll find it rather interesting, because the data is very fundamental. This is actually a continuation of yesterday's lecture.

First thing that you should know on the subject of cases is a scale which will assist your reality on the reality of cases.* A scale. Now, this scale is not complete. Only the major points of this scale are mentioned. And there are interim points on this scale which are not mentioned. So you realize that you're looking at a scale which is a gradient scale, which has midpoints between the major levels given.

All right. Your lowest level on this scale – the out-the-bottom aspect of the scale – is just total unawareness. That's your bottom.

Your next level on this scale is the level of awareness of own evaluations. Now, that's quite an important level. It's a lot more to that level than you would at first look at. This is mental science as it has long existed. People are aware of their own evaluations. In other words, what they perceive is their own evaluation of what they perceive. You got that? And
you say that's an awful short look, man. But that psychiatrist walking around with somebody chattering about something or other and he becomes aware of his own evaluation of that person. That's what the psychiatrist becomes aware at, and that's what's held up psychiatric research. He has evaluated that person as crazy. So he is aware of his own evaluation of the person. See, he's aware of the fact this fellow is crazy. Now, that spreads over to such a degree that whenever he examines a patient, the patient is crazy, don't you see?

See, it's an incapability of observation, because it's an observation of one's own evaluation. And you see some of this in sciences. But you see it most flagrantly in the field of arts and aesthetics. And there it is really rampant. And you can say the less that is known of a subject, the more that subject has authority or evaluation as its sole reality or adjudication. See, the less that is known, the more that level, that I've just given you, is practiced. People become aware of their own evaluation and that is it!

This, by the way, is... material is utterly priceless when it comes to talking to somebody about Scientology. It's priceless, because you could break their backs with it. And it – they try to put up a fight on this subject and you're in amongst them so fast it makes your head swim, you see. I mean, it makes their head swim.

You realize that you say to somebody, "Well, we could make you feel better, and Scientology is such-and-so, don't you see."

And they say, "Well, I had an uncle once that didn't think you should ever examine the human mind." That's his opinion of Scientology, don't you see? Or "Anybody who is interested in the mind must have something wrong with them." See, you've heard all these various arguments, you see? Well, realize what you are looking at. Because look at where this level lies.

Now let's go to the next level. This is the next major level on this scale, which is dub-in of dub-in. And that produces a real ball. That level of reality produces a real ball. The guy has dub-in of his own nightmares, you see. Something like this, you know? He dubs in – he dubs in the facsimiles that he got while asleep. See, he dubs in the dub-in, you know. He's got dub-in already, see, but he – well, all he sees is a dub-in of the dub-in. And that is a ball, that one. That is a ball. That's like somebody forming his opinion from newspaper articles. You see how common this is? See, that's already dub-in.

Well, actually that's all – that possibly even could be called dub-in of dub-in of dub-in, because you've got this kind of a condition: The newspaper reporter was talking to somebody who wasn't informed. That's dub-in of dub-in, see? Then, of course, if you had somebody who dubbed in on everything he observed, his version of the newspaper article would be so fantastic as not to be recognizable. And that would give you a dub-in of dub-in of dub-in.

The person interviewed was dubbing – you know, like the AMA; an AMA authority speaking, you see? The reporter, he can't duplicate, so he gives some wild, hopped-up version of what this AMA spokesman said. All right, that's dub-in of dub-in.

* Editor's note: The scale referred to by Ron in this lecture was issued as part of HCOB 8 June 63, "The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains". 
And then, of course, if you – this becomes ridiculous – this is your substratas of it – if somebody came along and read this article, who also dubbed in – "AMA spokesman says men from Mars must not land." I mean, that's about the story you would get from the dub-in, dub-in, dub-in, see? And the AMA authority was talking about the fact that doctors must have more money. You see?

Now, try to follow down a line of evidence at this level, this dub-in of dub-in. Just try to follow a line of evidence at this and you get about the wildest thing, you see? You get somebody who hates to eat taking cooking from a bad teacher. Boy, this leads to more "Boston stomachs" than you can count.

All right. We are just now approaching unconsciousness as a thetan manifestation – as a thetan manifestation. The body plus thetan can go lower scale than a thetan. And a thetan's unconsciousness lies just above this dub-in of dub-in. That's a thetan's unconsciousness. See, a body plus thetan can stay conscious longer, apparently, than a thetan, you see, as far as awareness of being a thetan. Do you understand that?

All right. Regardless of the complications involved in that, you'll find somebody goes through a lot of boil-off above this point. And he gets some of the wildest stuff you ever heard of. This stuff is pretty wild. He can get everything pretty well combined into God-elp-us.

Now, our next level up is simply dub-in of the track. We're not too much interested in dub-in of the physical universe around us, but it gives us a test of what this pc or person is doing. But we're interested in it as auditors from the viewpoint of dub-in of the track. There is the facsimile – the facsimile is there. You must know this: the facsimile does exist. But what the person sees is a dub-in of the facsimile that is there. Sees a second facsimile, you see? Quite intriguing.

And now you get, as the next major point on this particular scale, a nonperception. We know this more generally as the level at black five, we used to speak of it. But it's a level of nonperception. Whether the person is seeing blackness or invisibility or small rockets or something of the sort, it doesn't matter – you know, little specks traveling across in the darkness or something like that. It doesn't matter what this visibility is, as long as it's a nonvisibility. See, what's the field there that expresses this nonvisibility, you see. Well, it's just an absence of time track, however that absence is created.

And then above this level, we get our next major level. We get a spotty, partial – perceptive glimpses of the time track. The person may have only visio on, or may have something else on, or may have something else on, but the rest of it is off, don't you see – and sees two pictures of the engram, but sees no connecting pictures in between those two pictures, and doesn't have any tactile or doesn't have any sonic or something like that. That's your partial perception of the time track – once more has to be mentioned.

And there is visible track. And that is your next-to-the-highest level – visible track. And as you can see, that is a gradient, because you actually got a state of Clear there or, that is – oh, I don't know how many goal Clear – fifty- or sixty-goal Clear, something like this. There's no interruptions of the track. Doesn't all go black on him. If it's black – if the period on the track is black, why, the person sees blackness, you see, but otherwise doesn't. Some of the perceptions may shut down occasionally and turn on again, but only shut down when
person isn't paying attention to them. Monitors the time track something like monitoring the physical environment. You're not necessarily aware of all of the noises that – or sights or perceptions or sensations that are taking place in the physical environment, don't you see?

Now, there's one level above that, and that's that there's no track. Now, you can see in looking at this scale that your "no track" becomes a mockery – lower-scale mockery. See, your "no track" becomes a lower-scale mockery there several times. So the first two levels of no track and visible track interchange as harmonics on down the line. So this makes it very easy for somebody casually observing this thing to make some rather horrendous errors in the pc. You can get yourself all tangled up as to exactly where this pc sits on this scale unless you yourself get some practical experience with this scale.

Now, that is the scale and that is a scale of perception of the time track. And these are the different varieties or the different aspects of that perception. One case perceives at one level, another case perceives at another level, another case perceives at another level. And that is what makes cases different. That is what makes cases different, one case to the next, and could to some degree be said what makes one case require longer in auditing than another case. So any estimate of the length of time a case would require in auditing should, in actual honesty, be made off that scale I have just given you.

Now, how would you determine levels on that scale? Now, you probably could work out a very rapid testing mechanism to recognize these various levels by using the physical universe. That's quite interesting. Use the physical universe. You'd have the pc look at a wall with a picture on it and then close his eyes and see a picture of the wall. What's he got? Well, what he's got is actually an upgraded aspect – upgraded – of that scale I just gave you. It's an upgraded aspect of it. It's better than that scale, but not much. See, the error is that the case looks better than it is.

So you tell a pc, "All right, look at that wall. Shut your eyes. Do you see a picture of the wall? What is the picture like?" And he'll put himself on the scale. And he actually puts himself on the scale about half a tone or a tone higher; because it's present time, he's not under duress for other reasons, and closer to PT, they very often are able to handle their track better. Don't you see? So your estimate after the pc has done this is still taken conservatively. But within that comment you will find that is pretty reliable. The person says, "What – what wall?" You know? Takes a picture of the wall – "What wall? Well, I don't have any picture of the wall." Well, that level tends to be more accurate than the other levels. Because you can spot him right there on invisible track. Just like that, see, with some fair accuracy. But at the same time, be prepared to have that case slip on the actual time track one half to one lower, see? The case does see a picture, and so forth, it's more likely to be a dub, see.

All right. Now, this is quite amusing, and this is an amusing exercise, because everybody tends to slightly alter the proceedings. Now, this gives everybody the feeling, when they first try this sort of thing, that they're much worse off than they are. Actually, none of these conditions are terribly serious, until you get down to that evaluation one.

When you get as far south as that, or into the next one, unawareness – and when you get down to those, that's pretty serious. That's pretty serious. Because you can't communicate with the bloke. He's sitting there wondering whether or not Scientology would meet the ap-
proval of his grandmother, and you're trying to run a case. I mean, a totally silly situation, you see? You're trying to audit and he's viewing his own evaluations. And I don't know if you have ever tried to run a pc who was totally unconscious – I mean totally unconscious: in a coma, lying in a bed someplace or something like that – it's quite remarkable, but all you can do is – you can do it – but all you can do is establish communication. You eventually can establish communication. But that is your first point.

Now, the establishment of communication at this particular level moves the person up to the next level. They think you are not going to do them well or something. They're, they're more impressed with their own evaluation of why you are trying to help them, something like that, you see, than they are in actually being helped. And they'll move up into dub-in of dub, and they'll move up into dub-in of track; they'll move up to invisibility; they will move up from invisibility into sporadic track and so forth. But it all depends on how you handle the case in order to get it moved up.

But let me assure you that the earliest stages there, the lowest levels of that, are not to be adventured upon with a happy smile and a jaunty cock of the hat. That's not something that you flick your lapels off neatly and say "Well, we'll knock this off in an afternoon." Now, knowing this, knowing this, I can save you a few loses based on an overoptimism. You'll occasionally... you'll, by and large, in the majority of the cases that you have anything to do with, be dealing with invisibility and sporadic track. That happens to be a very large number of the cases you'll be dealing with – invisibility and sporadic track. And that's very fortunate.

But you slip downsca... there on this case, you know, this case a... you know, and you look at this same case and because you've just had some magnificent wins on somebody who was – well, he couldn't see a thing, and you eventually got his facsimiles on and that sort of thing, and gave you a nice win. And you grab the next fellow and this fellow is saying, "I wonder if I really shouldn't have listened to my wife about being processed. I've – I've had some misgivings about it. You see, in my early life I had a great deal of religious training, and it has seemed to me, it has seemed to me that tampering with the soul..." Well, base your conclusions accordingly. You're not going to get the same win that you just got on the person you just processed. It's a rocky road from that point up to no track.

Now, I can't give you any fancy mathematical figure that gives you the multiple number of hours – and the figure would not be based on any real data and so would have no great value – but I can give you an educated guess and so on, that it goes by times from sporadic track. If you considered sporadic track one, your auditing time value – and this is just an educated guess – is, you see, twice for the total invisibility. You see that? And I would go so far as to say four for the dub-in of actual track, eight for dub-in of dub-in, sixteen for your evaluation, and thirty-two or thereabouts for your unconsciousness. All those numbers, what? Times as long to get a result.

Multiply thirty-two times – well, let's say it takes you – it's going to take you 150 hours to run out twenty implants – that's, well, that's number one. Let's say it's very clumsy and so forth, that would be terribly slow running and all that, and allows for all sorts of things, and an uneducated pc and I don't know what all, don't you see. But, going to take you
150 hours. Well, how long is it going to take you to handle an unconscious case up through the same thing. Well, that's thirty-two times 150. You see what I mean?

Now of course, what are we talking about? What case result are we talking about? That's the other thing that figures into this. Well of course, you're not going to hear me, from here on, talking about anything but OT – the only case result I'm interested in. We've already, we've already got the fait accompli on clearing and all that sort of thing and you can let somebody else talk about that, and you can beat the drum for it and you can pat people on the back for it and so forth. And just realize that that is not necessarily a rocky road and not necessarily an unactual road; you've all of a sudden taken off on a new line. And this line is, is we've got that level whipped. And you can talk about it all you want to to people and the public and that sort of thing, but realize that any effort to approach an ultimate in processing leads you straight toward OT and that's where it goes.

You're going to be throwing anvils over your shoulder as a thetan before you're through with this, so why worry about it? Of course, that upgrades the number of hours to such a result. And I'm looking at about five hundred hours to OT or something like that right about now. That's not an educated guess. But for what case? For what case? It's that case with the sporadic track – about five hundred hours. Because a person would be awful close to OT if they had a totally visible actual track, don't you see?

All right. Now, you've got this gradients of cases. You got that. I don't want to labor this because it's actually not a subject that you can labor very hard because it is based on very crude levels. These levels are quite crude. They're quite factual, but they're very broad. And they have lots of interims, don't you see. So there is the person who only half dubs in, don't you see, a dub-in, you know? And there's a person who sometimes can talk sensibly and the rest of the time talks in terms of his own evaluations, you see. And there's interim areas there. But somebody can have a lot of fun with that as a system of classification because it gives you a classification, and is interesting to you mainly in a crude estimate of the number of hours of what you can do. It's the number of hours that are required to do what you can do, but we have to say to what or to whom. And if all cases look alike to you, you've just been reading too much Thomas Jefferson. Nothing wrong with old Tom, but I'm afraid he didn't know too much about the mind. There's differences and those are the differences.

Now, do you notice that insanity and neurosis play no part whatsoever in that scale of case estimate? Ability to respond to a communication and all of that sort of thing play no part in that. There is no estimate there at all. No part of that. Well, why this sudden skip of what man fondly calls his fondest divisions of case? This fellow is insane and that fellow is neurotic and this other fellow is something else and so forth. And man is marvelous on this subject; he just thinks this is gorgeous. He never had such a time as classifications in these lines. Well, those classifications have no bearing in fact of any kind whatsoever, and are adjudications all from one level of that scale! See? So you have a much broader field of classification the moment that you step outside of observation of own evaluations, the second you stay out of that.

Now mental science, unfortunately, or perhaps necessarily, has been in that particular state for a very long time, and therefore you'll find most of its literature and so on is dreamed
up from that particular level and therefore is not factual. So that you get observational tests as being considered totally valid tests. Well, any test that has a human observer connected with it to adjudicate whether somebody passed it or didn't pass it and so forth is bound to be a bad test. Just bound to be.

How many times have you been flunked on TR 1, for instance, in the old days by a coach that couldn't coach? See? Well now, there it was a pass or a flunk by unedu... not even educated opinion, don't you see, that has a terrific variability and a terrific invalidity. And that was the reason for these new TRs which you are using. See, it just removes all TRs from coaching from that level of the scale. So therefore, you're free to make further progress than you were before.

Well, one of the things that knocks out insanity and neurosis as a proper evaluation of a state of case on anybody is because these are contained as goals in the Helatrobus Implants. And I think any wisdom that is based on the Helatrobus Implants is sort of – sort of headed for the junk heap.

The goals in there are quite alarming. I found a goal on my pc last night, "To get it." It's there! Interesting goal, isn't it? "To get it." Well, what does it – what does it refer to? What does it modify? Sickness? Havingness? Being unlucky? See, it's just one of those portmanteau things. But you don't have to have that type of goal, which is untranslatable or undeterminable. There's goals in that lineup that are quite determinable, such as "To be sick"! It's there. "To die." That's there. "To move," "To escape."

Nearly every one – any one of these implants has at some time or another been the source of the most learned treatises which explain all of man's ills. How many articles and things have you seen on "escapism"? So it's not valid material on which to adjudicate such things. And I'm afraid this whole subject of insanity is just about as valid as a Helatrobus Implant as a source of philosophy.

No, there's something else. There are the mechanics of livingness. And we have had these nailed down for a long time, and I'm rather proud of the fact that they have minimally been influenced by these implants. Here and there I have found an implant where something gave us a bad twist. For instance, there are several incidents in What To Audit, or A History of Man, that are taken from an implant given about four galaxies over. It starts with a goal, oddly enough, and then doesn't consist of a GPM type thing. They lay you down and show you endless pictures on a motion-picture screen. I just mentioned it the other day. Well actually, these – the actual engrams of these things can be found on the time track. The actual engrams, they do exist. But this was – the implant is what picked them up and restimulated them and kept them all in a bunch, you see. And What to Audit was influenced by that implant. But the remainder of our material is remarkably uninfluenced by this.

We have moved toward the Helatrobus Implants because they were trying to find something that would really aberrate somebody, and sooner or later we certainly would collide with the very best – the very, very best authoritarian minds on the whole track on how to do somebody in if we were trying to pick people up out of the mud. Sooner or later we'd cross – we'd do a crossroads with somebody who had been on an opposite tack. And that was
what happened there with the Helatrobus Implants. No, that's quite remarkable that we've escaped it to the degree that we have.

Now what, then, determines a person's level on that scale? And that is a point that philosophers could sit down and philosophize over for a very, very long, long time. You could start with the basis of the inequality of thetan power. One thetan has less thetan power than another thetan, see? You could theorize on the subject of "Well, this person's overts are different than that person's overts." You could have various reasons why they wind up at different positions on the scale. I don't necessarily pay much attention to these that I've just mentioned. But there is another one that you might pay attention to, is length of time in the universe. The older a person is in the universe, the further they are down that scale – which gives you some kind of a weird theory about – it obviates the idea or throws aside the idea that the universe was created by a sneeze at the same exact instant, you see, but predicates a cumulative universe that picks up the home universes of thetans at different times on the track. And people in better shape have been less long in the universe than people who are in terrible shape. Then this, of course, could be monitored by the number of overts committed, and the amount of overwhelm and it could be monitored this way and that way. But also could be monitored by a different status of thetan at the time of entrance into the universe. You could figure out a lot of things around this way. But you don't have to go into this line, because you're asking why. And we're not interested too much in why, because why has no bearing on it to solve it. We don't have to have why in order to solve it. And it's a good thing. It's just how do they get there in those different levels, see? And that's only one short answer. It's contained in one word: Charge.

Now, this is very lucky for you that this can be stated as easily as it can be stated. Very lucky for me, too. It makes a good communication level and so forth. But it's very simple. Charge is a quantitative thing like buckets of water. Let's say we could take all the charge off of a case and run it through an ohm meter and put up its additive. You know, I mean, put up the total amount run off. You know, your house uses – one house uses so much electricity and another house uses a different quantity, but they send you a bill. Well, that's based on the amount of electricity pumped into the joint by the light company. Or what their meter says is pumped in.

Well, you take the eighteen buttons, principally, and you keep pumping charge into a case by these buttons going out. You know, the case suppresses, asserts, protests, invalidates – you know, this is life. And button by button by button, why, this case is getting charge stacked up on him. It's residual charge. If you could… A thetan, however, is not a condenser. If a thetan were a condenser or something like that, you could discharge it with one short circuit. The psychiatrist's fond hope. That, unfortunately, can't be done because charge is built up on a case by intelligence, understanding, or lack of it, and therefore has to be taken off a case the same way.

And you see, if life consisted of matter, energy, space and time, without the additive of thought, all this would probably be very easy. You just pull so much mass off a thetan and so much space off a thetan and so much energy off a thetan and so much time off a thetan and you'd stack them all up and lay them over there. It probably all could be done mechanically.
But actually, unfortunately, there's this thing called thought. And thought is composed of many things, including volition.

And as a result, as the universe pumps the charge in on a thetan, he starts pumping the charge into others and into other things, inhibits himself from doing so, and you get the overts that cause withholds, and you get the charge encysted (c-y-s-t), and the composite picture of the number of things done to the being, held in place by the number of things done by the being as overts – that's what wraps them up and keeps them on the case, you see – and you get X amount of charge.

Now, you might make it a constant per case, except that it's growing all the time. It's a progressive constant. For instance, this year, why, he has "A" number of "spluggits" of charge, and next year, why, he'll have "A" plus one year's spluggits of charge, you see. And – this is the way it'll go – and then he gets into bad company the next year after and decides to join the FDA or do some other criminal action. And he'll suddenly add onto his case, you see, at an accelerated rate. It isn't just the amount of time a person lives, you see; it's also the person has volition. And he could speed this up and he could slow it down. And he does something like – criminal, like joining the FDA or something like that, you know, just completely sells out the human race and there he is. In the course of the next few years, he runs up as much charge as he's run in the last two lifetimes. So you have that much more charge per case, don't you see? And then he decides that he doesn't feel very strong these days, so he's going to sit the next few out, and he goes out, and – or he decides he's going to be... do good works or something and maybe he lives for several lifetimes without accumulating much more than just a few little ergs incidental to being in the universe, don't you see. He isn't viciously accumulating charge, in other words.

Well, that's the way it goes. It ebbs and flows. He gets active and charge accumulates more, and he gets inactive and accumulates less, and he runs up a lot of overts, you see, and he accumulates charge like mad, and he tries to do some good and maybe even gets rid of a little charge and various things happen. But it's always plus, always plus, always plus, always plus. And it wouldn't matter if it took a hundred trillion years to get one more erg plus, it will be plus. See, charge is always additive in the absence of Scientology. Charge is always additive.

That's the trick of this universe. That's the only thing that makes it a bad universe. You overcome that, you got it made, see? Then all the work somebody went to to put it here, you see, to be a trap in the first place, ha! You've had him, you see! You've got the universe and it's not a trap.

I think it'd be an awfully good joke. I'm in a very good frame of mind to just pull that joke, too. But the universe, basically, doesn't have to be aberrative, and isn't – if you just go out and admire it and so forth, you'll find it's therapeutic. In other words, you could drift along for quite a while, and do quite all right. But it's not going to drop charge off of you. It might make you volitionally feel better about the charge that is on you already because you can also have an attitude toward the charge. It doesn't vary the amount of charge, but you can have an attitude toward it.
Now, in view of the fact that an OT can kick out more "megatrons" than little boy Jack or Khrushki's legions could, this is very funny that charge would bother him till we figure out the basic overt of the thetan. Any overt a thetan commits is also mixed up with the energy a thetan is emitting. So all of his overts have particles connected with the overt. So the only way to really get him is to hit him with particles. See, it's the path of his overts. So naturally, you find these implants are mostly connected with particles. Particle flow of various types.

Now, what's this amount to? In the final analysis, we have a person who has "A" amount of charge – that quantity "A" – and quantity "B" and quantity "C" and another person quantity "D" and another person with quantity... see? We don't care – we don't care so much why they got this charge or what is the source of all of this charge. But we do care about the fact that they do have different amounts. And this rule is operative: The more charge a person has, the more difficult it is to release it. That quantitative rule applies. That's a gruesome fact, but that's what gives you your numerical relationship in "How long does it take to process somebody?" And that's why I've showed you there going up progressively on the scale. A person that's unconscious – how much charge? Unless this unconsciousness is caused by some artificial means, such as a pressure on the brain or something like this, which the moment it's relieved will relieve the unconsciousness, you then have a temporary condition, don't you see.

You have to differentiate between a temporary condition and a chronic condition. Duration of time – how long does a temporary condition have to continue in order to become a chronic condition? Well, ordinarily it's measured within the finite limits of one lifetime – temporary conditions – finite limits in one lifetime. When you exceed the limits of one lifetime, you get a chronic condition, if you figure it that way. So that ten minutes is part of a lifetime, see, and eighty-eight years for a person that ordinarily only lives only seventy, you see, is not part of a lifetime, so that becomes chronic.

And if you get your divisional line between chronic and that... not on man's viewpoint, which only gives you about sixty, seventy years to work with, or something like that, which is just a sneeze in eternity – you start working out on some more practical basis, such as, well, a much more practical basis to work with is a billion years. That's a little long. That's a little long. It's a nice span of time, though. It's a good, good healthy span of time. Half a billion years, well, I don't know. It's pretty hard to complete a cycle in a half a billion years. You can try. And you get it down to a million years, and of course, heh-heh! to get anything done in a million years and make it stick – that's really going some, man; you're really on your way; that's tearing the ground up in all directions.

The length of time since the birth of Chr... the alleged birth of Christ is so short – is so short, that before you've gone very long on the road to OT, you could probably remember what you had for breakfast in the year 2, and the... during the third day of the Saturnalia or something like that. Not that you would – probably cause you as much work to remember what you had for breakfast that morning as it does now to remember what you had for breakfast yesterday right now.
So that is a very finite period of time. That's a very short period of time. A couple of 
thousand years – nothing. I'd like a couple of thousand years just to sit on a rock and look at 
the scenery – one of my ambitions. Take off a nice vacation. I consider a nice, quick, short 
vacation about ten thousand years. I think that would be – that's nice. That would be nice, see. 
Give you a time to get fully accustomed to the view. [laughter, laughs] Catch your breath, you 
know. Or catch your beams. Get your beams untangled.

No, finite – finite or temporary conditions do result from a physiological error in the 
mock-up the person is packing around. See, the guy can't walk because he's got a broken leg, 
you see? Well, this can carry over to some degree in that he's liable to have a somatic in the 
next body's leg. But it doesn't carry over into the next lifetime he has a broken leg. So if you 
just consider a one-lifetime situation, or any fragment of a one-lifetime situation, as tempo-
rary, and things which extend over the period of one lifetime as chronic, then we're talking the 
same language. Not that you have to consider it this way at all, but it's a good language divi-
sion.

This guy is chronically something or other. Well, you're liable to hear some medico 
say he's chronically lame. And we get to the next change of case – the next differences of 
cases: Is this person always going to be a spastic no matter what body he picks up? Or is this 
person merely a spastic because of the condition of the body he picked up? See? Now, that 
makes a difference in your processing of that spastic, and enters in to an estimate of the 
amount of time a person is going to require in processing. Is this spasticity a chronic con-
dition or a temporary condition, by which we mean, is it just going to last this lifetime, or is it 
going to keep on going with this poor thetan, see?

Now, if it is so built and it is so strong as to be a chronic condition that goes on and on 
and on and on, lifetime after lifetime after lifetime, don't throw up your hands in horror and 
say nothing can be done about it, but just realize you're looking at a much greater span of 
time. A much greater span of time.

Now, how would you find that out? Well, you might put somebody on an E-Meter and 
say, "Well, were you deaf in your last life?" And it bangs, and you say, "All right, were you 
deaf in the life before that?" And it bangs. Well, you've all – you've made your estimate of the 
situation: This is a deaf thetan. Get the di fference between that and a body, you see, a thetan 
just occupying a body that happens to be deaf. Now, that's – that's all part of adjudications of 
the amount of time in processing.

It is not necessarily part of that scale, but causes you to make a closer examination of 
the person with regard to that scale. Because the more... you remember the old Tone Scale 
had neurological ills and that sort of thing on it and so forth. Well, they were simply to give 
you a tone level. It wasn't because the neurological ills were of any importance. The individ-
ual, who was susceptible to these things over a long period of time, of course, was lower on 
that scale I've given you. All this thing adds up then about eighteen dozen ways from the 
middle, and you can make a lot of figure-figure on this thing and you can get yourself a lot of 
answers. I'm just showing you some various ways of use of the thing.

But charge is what causes the scale basically to be that way. Now, you mustn't always 
be deluded into believing that because a thetan plus body is in a certain condition that the
thetan is necessarily low on that scale. I had a person who was absolutely sure they were psychotic one time, and I made some tests of this particular character, and that person was dead-on. And more – more definitely, that person could hold a position of two objects in space. *Hah-hah,* that person wasn't nuts. That person was simply in disagreement with the family and environment and they thought he was nuts. See? This was actually a very simple case. The person very easily belonged into the classification of a sporadic track; and therefore would have flown.

Going to make – you're going to make mistakes on this until you finally accustom yourself to it because it determines what you do with the person. And therefore, it's an essential part of programming to be able to estimate what you are going to program. And what you're going to program is the person's case. Therefore, you have to have some estimate of the case in order to program the case. And frankly, in going for OT, we have just left aside practically every method of measurement of cases we have for estimates in processing. See, we've just more or less thrown them all away because we've got a different target. Therefore, we have to make a reevaluation of cases. We have to have a new scale for cases.

Now, unless you can do this thing I've just given you here, unless you can, you know, add a case up in there and understand this one way or the other, then how are you going to program this case? Because a case is programmed in relationship to the amount of charge on the case. Now, I gave you some factors yesterday that also influenced programming as to who is going to audit this case and that sort of thing. They also influence programming. But basically, there is "B" units of charge on this case, and programming is simply how we're going to take the charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that it requires the cooperation of the thetan we are processing – if it weren't for that, it'd be easy, you see – it requires the cooperation of this being, no matter how faint that cooperation is, then an estimate of his ability as a case is also pertinent. But that's contained in the same package of scale I've just given you. Because each one of those levels has certain definite abilities and adjudications. They have very definite abilities, level by level by level and they just rattle off one, two, three, four. If you want to get a job done, don't give it to somebody who's unconscious. In other words, it's a direct relationship.

Now, if you want to find out something, don't send somebody who dubs in dub-in, see? So all of those things have direct relationships to the amount of time the case is going to spend, but that time depends on the programming. And the reason it makes it time is because the programming has to be different case to case, and the longer the period of time going to be spent, the more programming is called for here.

I can give you some very, very fast programs, one way or the other. You will see quite a few of these. I'll give you a sample program. We got a case who dubs in track. We found this out. Track doesn't seem to match up. Now, we can still run charge off of this case. We get big, dial-wide RRs on the Helatrobus Implants even though they're seeing the wrong scene and all this sort of thing. Well, if they can run it, run it. See? But that's sort of running with – well, that's sort of going for a swim in a shark-infested pool with no shark oil, because this case can go to smithereens very easily.
Programming for the case would at least consist of pulling the overts – this lifetime or any stretch of track in which they have any reality. Certainly would consider that. Making awful sure that the case had no withholds from the auditor, about this lifetime particularly. Making very, very sure that the case was audited in a pretty muzzled fashion and wasn't driven very hard. Don't ever force that case, man. That case says, "I don't – I don't – I just don't think I can face that next RI. Because all of a sudden, all of a sudden it's grown green whiskers," or something. "I don't think I can face it." No, I'm afraid that would be a case you would not say, "Say it again." That wouldn't be such a case. You'd just hit the silk, right there. You'd just hit the silk. And you return to an ARC break type process.

You'd run implants if you could get them to rocket read, but only so long as they were run easily. And you would fall back with great speed to patching up and putting together any roughed-up track because of running the implants. You'd always use "Since the last time I audited you…?" Get the idea? You'd always use this kind of thing. Make sure that you're not running a session with a withhold on it.

But that's dangerous. And you should realize that running that case that way is dangerous. And that would be a very extreme programming for the case, to actually run implants off this case. Very extreme programming. Now, you could do it; it's the fastest way; it's the quickest way to knock down the case condition and move them up a scale as a case, but it's one of these things, you know, that's right on the edge. Right on the edge.

And you'd also run the case this way: If you got your hands on a goal, you would run all the charge off the goal before you did anything else. And you couldn't run the case back too far without running them early. You know, you'd never pull such a trick as finding a goal and then trying to find a couple earlier than it. See, you'd never scatter around. You wouldn't drive the case hard to pull all of the charge off of the implant, you'd just be content with one long rocket read and then you would get out of there. Get that type of approach? In other words, this is all kid-glove stuff, see.

All right, let's take this – let's take this case with the sporadic, now. Let's take this case with the sporadic view of the time track. It's pretty accurate, that sort of thing.

Now, you can stack that case up awful hard. You can stack that case up awful tight. You can run – you can run a bank, and then you can move bank – you can move two, three banks forward, and then run back to the bank you've read – you just found, you see? I mean, you run all the RIs back to the bank you've already got clean. Then you could move him six goals forward from where you were. Just overtly, and find the tops of those GPMs, you see; run them through, crash. See, run them right back to the last one that you'd cleaned. You get the idea? In other words, going forward several goals and sweeping back to the clean area. And jumping forward several more goals. You could even go worse than this. You can even leave goals undone. The case is now starting to get pretty uncomfortable, but the case can do it. The case gets ARC breaks, but case can do it, do you understand? Because you're not running any danger. It's almost impossible to run this case into danger. The case could be pushed, hard. Get the idea?
The case that is an invisibility case can't be pushed anywhere near that hard. But still can't really be gotten into severe danger. It's not a – not a case of being able to knock them off and have them spin for a day or something like that. You get the difference of programming?

Now, you get this dub-in case – a safe way to program such a case is lots of track cleanup, lots of Straightwire, lots of pulling missed withholds, lots of straightening up track, you see, lots of havingness. And then we find and run an implant. Ready to cut and run and hit the silk any time the pc starts going this way, see? Get the difference of case handling?

Of course, doing something like that, look at the amount of time it costs you over and above just sitting there running implants, see.

All right. Dub-in of dub, that level of case – aw! Are you kidding? You let him near an implant? Oh, no, man. They would get so involved and they would spin so fast and they would spin so hard that you'd be hard put to put them back together again. Fortunately, the case isn't very general. No, that case is handled with Straightwire, ARC break processes, and build it up, man, keep going, give the case – never give the case a lose, give it nothing but wins, run it very lightly, very mildly, and run it just at that level where it gets session wins. Gets a win in session, a win in a session, a win in a session, a win in a session. You'll be surprised how tiny some of these wins are. They're wins. And you know that you're doing it too steep when they don't get a session win. That's too steep, and you drop right back down scale.

This is true of all cases, but particularly that case. No, it's not true of a person who has sporadically visible, correct track. He can have half a dozen sessions with no damn win at all, and you've gotten charge off all the way and he comes out of it. See, and he's had wins, see? But this case – you don't depend on that case that I just mentioned saying he has had wins. You couldn't care less whether he says he has wins or not. But this case – unless this case recognizes wins, this case's reality is not coming up.

Now, let's go a little bit further downscale and let's take the person who has own evaluations of own evaluations, and boy, you're sure getting toward a case that can only stand havingness. That's how extreme this is getting at this point. It's getting awfully extreme. So you're looking at CCHs. You're looking at – you're looking at various types of room-contact, present-time-contact processes. So some fellow says, "Well, I don't know. I've often thought you Scientologists might possibly have something, because I had a patient once who thought that you possibly might have something." What you going to do? Well, of course, if he has certain professional connections it might be a great temptation to say, you know, "All right, let's pick up 'die,' and 'nix die,' and oh-hah-hah!" and fire away. It might be a great temptation. But if you're going to help this case out, man, you're not going to run him anywhere near track. Because he doesn't know – he doesn't know what he's had for breakfast. He cannot differentiate an overt. His level of responsibility is incapable of detecting an overt. This kind of a case, by the way, can go down and rob a shop and then tell you all about it in session, but it never comes off as an overt. You've seen this type of response to Security Checking.

Well, there's where that case stands with relationship to implants. That's CCHs, and your risk is Straightwire. Now we're – we're really going to take a big risk with this case, see? We're going to run some Straightwire. Get the – get the different view.
And the case that's unconscious, of course, merely establish communication. If you can eventually establish communication, well, "Touch that pillow. Touch the bed," and move their hand accordingly – any type of communication or reach that you can establish that way (it's a sort of a downgraded CCH), you'll get to such a case.

Animal processing and so forth doesn't necessarily follow this, but again – follow on that scale – but it's again a question of establishing communication. And if you can get the animal to reach, why, he'll come up the line. I told you one time I gave up on a cat, just out of pure laziness and so forth, but I never did get the cat up to talking. I didn't spend many hours on the cat, but the cat got awful bright. A very brilliant cat after a while. There was no time in processing. Now, if I'd set – if I'd programmed that the way you should, why, the cat would come way up the line.

Now, I don't know how you'd process a beetle; at the moment I really don't know. Because his reality would be if you were going to squash him or that you're some kind of a giant or something. He wouldn't have any kind of a reality at all on the situation.

But there's cases. And there's how they – there is the data on which you program. That's how to establish the data from which you program. And in using the scale, in using the scale, use it adventurously. Always establish somebody's level on the scale optimistically, and fall back if you have to. Always be a little optimistic.

Now, there are lots of tests for this kind of thing. I'm sure a lot of tests will be developed along this basic line by which you can establish this much more easily. And probably these tests can be coordinated against the old OCAs and that sort of thing – against the behavior and the security. The old auditor's reports should be able to – you know, you've got the person's OCA, and you've got the auditor's report that had that OCA, and if we had enough time and so forth, we could undoubtedly get an OCA coordinated against this, but that will probably happen, too.

Now, the programming, then, is "How much charge?" And the reason for programming is to get as much charge off as can be gotten off with the pc winning. You get as much charge off as you can get off with the pc winning. And it's all a quantitative proposition, and you see this charge – you see charge coming off a case with the old meter. Every time that needle goes on a big downsurge or throws off a cracking big rocket read, or something of that sort, and every time you get – particularly, you get a blowdown of your TA – that's a big one; that's big stuff, you see – that's charge off the case. That's charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that all the charge isn't in restimulation at the same time, fortunately, you see this charge come off one rocket read and so forth and one blowdown at a time, but it's all adding up. Even though the TA tends to remain high on the case, you're still blowing charge off of the case, you see? And gradually, as you go along, if you added up the amount of charge for each RR and the relative number of dials of charge that went off for every blowdown – you got the idea – how many... how far do you have to put this tone arm down, and that actually is so many ohms; a rocket read is a registration of so many ohms of release of charge. If you went to all of this trouble, you actually would come up with a mathematical figure. See? And you could say, "We have taken..." At the end of two or three
intensives, we could say, "We have removed five volts," see, [laughter] or something like that, "from the pc."

But it's that precise, and that's what we mean by charge. Every time you see that thing blow down, that's just that many more microamps that have been registered and no longer apply.

Now, why is charge important? Why is it important? Well, that's answered very, very briefly. It's important because it's what restimulates when he tries to outflow and therefore prevents his outflow. So you see, charge on the case does not, then, give him something that he can release in a sudden zap, or something like that. That isn't it. The charge that he has to release that way is actually created by him at the moment of release. That's the creation of charge. It has nothing to do with residual charge. But if he tries to put out any kind of an outflow or tries to reach out, he's reaching out through this charge, and the charge reactivates because of his reach, and knocks his ruddy head off. Charge is what educates him not to reach.

Now, it has numerous reactions upon the thetan such as somatics, pain, pressure and all that sort of thing, but these things do not exist in the absence of charge. When the charge is gone, these things do not then activate. So a person can reach and he can do.

Processing, then, becomes a rather simple subject, if you look at it, there's just so much charge on this case, and you've got to release that charge. And we know the identity of some of the things the case has that does have a maximum charge on it, regardless of the significance. And then we're going to release that much charge off the case. That case, then, will get that much better. I mean, it's just a one-two-three-four proposition like that. Nothing very esoteric, so that "If we can teach this case to think pure thoughts, then at the end of that time he will be able to sit and regard his navel and bother nobody." See, we're not – we're not after that particular target.

We have found that if a person cannot reach, cannot communicate and cannot be active on their own self-determinism, that that person is ill, and more than that, is quite a menace to himself. And he does himself in; all kinds of things are going on that he has no control over; things look pretty awful.

Now, if you were to measure self-determinism on the scale I have given you, of course, total self-determinism is only present in the highest level I gave you. That's the only place total self-determinism is present. Because if a person were totally self-determined, he wouldn't have any automaticities and therefore he'd have no time track. So therefore, there'd be no charge on the case, so you have unlimited reach. And that's what we's heading fo' these days. So brethren, get off dat charge! [laughter]

Thank you.
Engram Chain Running

A lecture given on 11 June 1963

Thank you.
Well, how are you?
_Audience_: Fine. Thank you.
Good. This is what?
_Audience_: June the 11th.
June 10th.
_Audience_: 11th.
Eleventh? I lost a day. All right, 11 June AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Part missing

Now, this lecture today – this lecture today – reminds me very interestingly of 42 Aberdeen Road, and Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1949, Bay Head, New Jersey. Quite reminiscent, because this lecture concerns engrams. And I finally found out why you can't run engrams. That's an awful slow take on my part. There's been something wrong with the communication; the communication of the matter. And I finally found out you've been trying to run engrams. And you never run engrams; you run chains of engrams. So we'll call this technology which I'm giving you Engram Running by Chains, well understanding that nobody ever successfully ran engrams any other way.

This is the way I ran engrams back in 1949. Let me tell you where it got crossed up. Oh, I fancied this up; this is very simple these days because we've got tremendous technology. I can give you a very close-to-rote series of actions that are very easy to do. Let me tell you where this got fancied up. You got it crossed up with repetitive processing: "Flatten the process." So, naturally, you have to flatten the engram, don't you? Hmmm! No, you only have to flatten the chain. You don't have to flatten the engram, you flatten the chain. But repetitive processing is what raised its ugly head and got you all mixed up on running engrams. "Flatten that process!" "The way out is the way through!" You know? That kind of thing.

So you apply that to a single engram; you're in a mess promptly for several reasons. Because it is only part of a chain of similar incidents, which in itself is only part of a time track which has all sorts of incidents on it. And you're essentially running a time track – not a stick, not a chunk of something. These things are all related. So therefore, all engrams are handled as parts of a chain of similar incidents. And you never handle an engram all by itself. Because they don't exist all by themselves. I've already said it's part of a chain and the chain is
part of a time track; how can you handle it all by itself? It's too closely related to these other two things to be handled.

Now, if it were just one item like a hunk of mud or something, you could bring it in and mix it in water and precipitate it and so forth, and then you'd pick up another hunk of mud, and handle it in some particular way, and then pick up another hunk of mud and handle it in some particular way. Well, that would be relatively easy. But unfortunately, the "hunk of mud" is a chain of engrams, is never a single engram. You've got to handle this thing as a chain and part of a chain.

Now, if you are a skilled auditor, you can pick up bypassed charge; you know why the pc is ARC breaking. You can find it out in a fast hurry. Pc ARC breaks, bang! Either you know what you're doing – know what just must have happened – or you can shake it out of the meter in an awful hurry and locate it and indicate it and the ARC break will cease. And until you have a reality on being able to do this as an auditor, you're going to have very upset sessions because the pc will ARC break inexplicably. You won't ever be able to find out why he's ARC breaking.

You'll have the trouble that we used to have in the old days where we had to have a process for an ARC break. Well, it might have gotten to it and it might not have gotten to it, and it was random. But now we could immediately and directly locate the bypassed charge that is causing the pc to ARC break. Now, that's very, very important to engram running because the bypassed charge is always the earlier incident on the engram chain, and you bypass the earlier incident on the engram chain, you get an ARC break. This is elementary, my dear Watson.

Charge. There, by the way, will be quite a few bulletins out on this; two have already been written – enormous things – and there'll be another bulletin on the material I'm giving you today. And these will be dressed up and put out into a new book on the subject. This lecture is the first release of this material. Therefore, I'm not releasing all of this material. I'm not telling you that in order to run an engram – I can tell you this, but not elaborate on it; let me say that – in order to run an engram you've got to know what the time track is and be able to handle the time track. You should know what you're trying to handle in terms of charge. What is charge?

Now, the charge, of course, is that electronic ping-bang that hits the pc in the blank and causes him to go bunk, or blows and causes him to get better. See, you pays your money and you takes your chance on charge. You either release the charge and the pc gets better or you encyst and stir up the charge and the pc blows his stack. You get the... there's two roads by which you can travel on charge, and there's no middle ground; there isn't any middle ground. Just forget the fact that you could go on and grind for eighteen years and get no change on the pc. The pc will either get better or get worse. He won't remain the same.

Now, what do we mean by getting worse? Actually, he might think better, and feel worse. You get the idea? His knowledge has increased, but the charge is still knocking his 'ead off. Now, you can get into that situation in engram running. You can lay open a tremendous amount of engram – engramic information. He can get all kinds of information – you
never blow any charge off of it anyplace. Well, that's because you weren't looking for basic; you were looking for information.

Many an auditor falls for this because the pc wants to know how come he was on the planet Yuk-zuk in a railway conductor's uniform, you see? What was he doing there? And that's all very interesting and we can assuage his curiosity to some degree, but if we go in for just assuaging the curiosity of the thing – dramatizing watching TV or something like that, you see – we unfortunately get into the situation where we're not following down an engramic chain.

So here, you see, is another great liability in running engrams. We get so absorbed in *dramatis personae* and that sort of thing, that we actually aren't running the chain of engrams at all, we are simply trying to find out. See, get that as a liability, because it is a liability. You actually can find out all about what this pc was doing on the planet Uk-zuk – you could find out all about it. The only trouble is the basic on it was on the planet Pan-wan, which was a trillion years earlier. You see?

So, engram handling is engram handling in that you want the chain of engrams which lead to the basic of that chain; you want to go down that chain and get the basic of the chain. Why? Well, every time you run an engram, you open up a little valve. We have a big joke around Saint Hill about the "weather valves." Workmen and I are always talking about these weather valves. And they get stuck open and they get stuck shut and various other things happen. We have our opinions as to who's doing it. We think it's Profumo now, [laughter] and so forth.

Well, if you could imagine an equally hypothetical series of valves: one between each pair of engrams, see? So let's take basic on the chain; that's engram 1. And then we get 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 – a little valve between each one of these pairs, see? All right, you run number 20 on the chain and you unwittingly open the valve from number 19. And the charge contained in number 19 restimulates and leaks, to some degree, into 20. So you're trying to run the charge out of 19, by running 20. The charge is coming from 19; after a certain – a very short period of time, it's all coming from 19 now.

Well, now this is very interesting because it poses this kind of a condition: Number 20, if you continue to run it, gets sticky, solid; E-Meter action ceases; no tone arm action on running it. There's nothing on it, you see, it's just gum. Or it's getting more and more solid and it'll eventually collapse on the pc. What's making it collapse? Well, it's the charge in 19. And you could run 20 *endlessly* without ever taking any charge off 19. But this makes 19 potential bypassed charge so the pc will ARC break. Do you see that now? You opened the valve and then didn't do anything about it. So, the thing to do is to find out – by the way, you don't have to find 19, which is quite interesting; you can sometimes find 16. But let us just keep it in an orderly progression here, and we find 19.

Now, oddly enough, until we found 20, we couldn't have found 19 because it's as though we had a big barrier across the track. It's all the charge there in 20, don't you see, prevents us from seeing 19. And this is a very funny thing: We can say, "Give us the earliest engram on this chain" – this is inevitable – and they give you number 20, see? And the E-Meter only registers on 20 and 20 will register that this is the earliest incident on this line. It'll do
this consistently, you see, because the track is bariered. The E-Meter, the reality, nothing else can get back of 20.

So you – although you've asked for the earliest, that's true of the earliest part of the incident, you see? You always get more first part of the incident, you see; you can always find a few minutes earlier on an incident. Well, similarly, right on down to basic, why, you can always find an earlier engram.

See, even though your meter kept saying that it was the earliest engram, or even though the pc and the meter said that it was the earliest part of the engram – that nothing like this ever happened before – as soon as we sweep some of this debris away, well, we find out we're looking at number 19. It's now the earliest, see? And it'll continue to be the earliest till we clean it up a bit. And as soon as we've cleaned it up a bit, we've got number 18. And as soon as we cleaned 18 up, we now find the absolutely, regrettable first incident on this line. And what do we find? We find 17. And that is absolutely the first incident on this line; and we get 16. You see what I mean?

Now, if you recognize some of these – they're terribly interesting, but awfully simple, idiotic points. If you could take a hose – if you could take a piece of garden hose, or something of the sort, and put clamps on it, see, and put a block of wood across it, and say this is an engram, number 20, you see? Now run this engram and then loosen up this little clamp, and you will see that the water pressure which you've gotten into the hose, you see – it is in each one of these balloons along in the hose sections – will go into 20, from 19, see? It's just as fluidly and fundamental as that, you know? It's like pouring beer steins back and forth into one or the other… But the charge always flows late; charge always goes later, doesn't go earlier.

Now, it's quite interesting, many of these manifestations, but if two things come together, two pictures come together, then there is bypassed charge. In other words, if two engrams collapse or two pictures collapse – no matter what you're running in auditing. This is true of all auditing, by the way; it isn't a specialized subject. You got this bypassed charge, it'll cause two pictures to come together. For instance, you're looking there – a pc is looking at a lamppost. And all of a sudden there's another lamppost standing alongside it, and he knows they're not the same picture because they have different periods of architecture and so forth, and he says, "There's two lampposts here." The first thing the auditor knows is that charge has been bypassed. See? That's what causes the collapse. Got that? Now, that's the first thing he knows. See? Whatever else he knows, he knows that. Now, if charge has been bypassed, what's the pc going to do in the next few minutes? He's going to ARC break. Yeah. Sun rises – sun sets, bypassed charge – pc ARC breaks. Okay? Very inevitable.

So this tells you why some auditors – some auditors are capable of running smooth sessions and some auditors are... have ARC-breaky sessions. Well, it's just to the degree that some auditors pick up bypassed charge and some auditors don't pick up bypassed charge, see. That's the difference between this ARC break and no ARC break session.

All right. Now, out-of-valenceness – you know, "That's me over there" – is also a problem in bypassed charge. You will get this in running an engram. And you shouldn't make a mistake, because this out-of-valenceness is quite interesting. The engram he is in, if an ear-
lier engram is tapped – you see, he's in engram 20 and you've just clipped or tapped number 19, and it's bled charge now into 20 – it will simply cause a beef-up of the mass, you see, and it'll cause a strengthening of the somatic and that sort of thing. But it probably won't cause an out-of-valenceness.

An out-of-valenceness is a missing earlier portion of the same engram you are working. See? He starts getting two-pictureness. He's getting two pictures, that sort of thing: that's probably out of 19. You understand? But it also may be in 20. But for sure, if he goes out of valence, you haven't picked up the beginning of 20. There's another five days at the start of 20.

We know it was the beginning because the pc said so in 20. We know that was the start of 20 because we sent the pc to the beginning of it. And he takes a look at himself, and he says, "I'm way out of valence here." That is to say, "I'm over there." Well, he didn't go to the beginning of it, that's all. There's more beginning on this engram than he has suspected. And that's what – that's the charge that normally throws them out of valence. But that out-of-valenceness is also assisted by bleeding charge up from 19.

You understand what I mean by out-of-valenceness? That's very simple; that's very elementary: just as though you were four feet over, looking at your body sitting in the chair. That is the position the pc is running from. And you find some pcs are totally in this, all up and down this lifetime. They never can have any picture in which they are (quote) in their own valence (unquote). See, they're always out of valence all the way up and down the line. This case, by the way, also falls too low on the Reality Scale to run engrams.

But this happens to any pc: They flip out of valence. Well, what happened? Well, there's another earlier piece of this same engram is missing. And the pc gets a couple of pictures collapsed on one another, or pictures collapsing, well, you've opened the valve on 19 without finding 19.

Actually, all this sounds very complicated, but actually isn't complicated. You're dealing with charge, and if you regard charge as water or cream, or something like that, it behaves in exactly the same way: It flows, and it always flows later. Charge doesn't run back down the track, it runs up the track. Water falls; charge rises. About the only difference.

All right, now, let's look at this. We've got a pc. 'e 'its his 'ead. It gives him a 'eadache. So we run the engram – now let's take an elementary thing, see? We're bugged, see, on the subject that if you get your hands on something, you must flatten it, see; if you get your hands on an engram you must rub it out, see; all mixed up with "flatten the process," don't you see? They won't recognize that this…

Well now, let's look what happens here. So he 'it his 'ead, so we find out we'd better run this engram in which he 'it his 'ead. So we roll up our sleeves and we start in. Eighteen hours later we're still getting him walking into the cupboard and raising up too suddenly and banging his head on the door. And for some reason or other the pc is getting very unhappy and the cupboard is getting more and more solid in the picture and then it gets gummier and gummier, and then it's collapsing and so on – the pc is pretty natty – but you say, "No, look, I've got to run this incident," and the pc finally goes into apathy, gets too far downscale to have a headache and you've "cured his headache." [laughter]
Now, get that approach – get that approach. Now compare it to this approach: Pe 'as 'it 'is 'ead, and 'e 'as a 'eadache. You say, "All right. Good. Good." We block this incident out. He walked into the pantry and hit his head on the cupboard. All right. Fine. We start him into the pantry; we bring him through the moment he hit his head, and for some reason or another he just skips that whole section. His head comes nowhere near the cupboard, but we get him afterwards holding his head.

Now, what's this all about? Well, this means you've hit a chain of engrams called "'it on the 'ead." And why is that area where he can't hit his head – why is that missing? Well, the prior charge on being hit in the head is too great, that's all. That's simple. So you don't try to force him through and you don't need any interesting tricks to push him through it.

You find that was 20, see? Just find 19 and block 19 out, and we find out that he was working in the carpentry shop and raised up too suddenly one day and 'it his 'ead. There's no somatic there either, see? I mean, it's just all sort of, you know, thud. And then we find – we just get that, bang, and we get that – run him through it.

This is all done very formally, it isn't asking any questions like Straightwire, see? We zip him through it; we're moving the time track – dress-parade situation, see?

We get him there to 18. We find at 19 that there's an 18 and there – 18 there's a 17. That's the first time he ever hit his head, see, was 17. And then we find 16 and then we find – see? And we're lucky and we actually do find all the way down the chain – we find it's in this lifetime. That's why we were lucky, because we just started out to cure a headache.

And, by golly, we find him falling out of his perambulator with a dull thud, see? And it runs with full somatics, full perceptions. And we run it through and we run it through and we run it through and we run it through and we run it through. And it's all getting thinner and thinner, and it's less and less, and it's disappearing, disappearing. Nothing is toughening up, and with a clank, that's the end of that chain of being hit on the head.

Well, what happens? The engram disappears, we bring him back up to present time, all these other head-hits – you could touch on each one of those, too, if you wanted to. He'd get the clonk from each one of them. You hit him on the head all the way to present time. Every one of them would hit, see? And that's the end of this chain, and that's the end of his headache. See that?

Now, if we tried to approach it: "We are going to run the engram of him hitting his head," we have made an error by saying the engram. We have to say the engrams of him hitting his head. Now, a great deal can be said, snarlingly and meanly and viciously and so forth, about what terrible things auditors have done with running engrams, but the truth of the matter is I take full responsibility on the matter. I've pretty well desensitized that goal in the Hela-trobus Implants, "To be responsible."

But I actually hadn't made an adequate communication. You'll find all about basics, you'll find all about this type of mechanics in other material on engrams, but you won't find this differentiation: Repetitive processes? Ah, yes. Flatten them always. An engram? The only way to flatten an engram is to flatten the chain of engrams. So the communication factor is, is you don't run an engram, you run an engrams. See, you've got to run a chain every time.
Now, if you've done any Sec Checking and had any difficulty sec checking at all, it's because you weren't running on the basis of the earlier overt. Now, overts will follow this, and it's very good training finding overts; very good training. But the second that we lay a training restriction on it of "run only overts in this lifetime," we, of course, have inhibited the possibility of picking up the complete overt chain.

Well, "this lifetime," of course, is the biggest lie of all. A person's life is quite consecutive. And the first time you may find actually a basic on the fact of him hitting a mule over the head as his overt on the fifth dynamic, and you find the basic on this thing at two hundred and eighty-five trillion. Well, you will get, then, all aversion to mules tearing up. The overt chain, don't you see?

Now, that's not an engramic chain, that's just a chain of overt acts. But there are overt engrams. So there's two types of chains: there's the motivator series and the overt series. And oddly enough, it doesn't matter which you run, because the overt-motivator sequence is itself an installed sequence.

Oh, yes, that's a big swindle. But everybody is obedient to this particular swindle, and they behave that way below a certain particular level, so it's operable. So you can use it in processing; you can relieve things. And actually it is so operable, that if you don't get the overts off they don't progress. In other words, it's sort of the overts they have committed obscure the overt-motivator sequence as an installed mechanism.

You won't run into this overt-motivator sequence or undo it for – oh, my God – that's way back, and way deep, see? That's quite fundamental in livingness. There are other things like obsessive creation, and that sort of thing, they're equally... well, the overt-motivator sequence isn't as deeply laid in as obsessive create and that sort of thing. You think you've got it time after time, and there's still an earlier impulse to create, you see. And they're all engramic of one kind or another. They contain pain and unconsciousness and implantations and so forth.

But an overt chain is handled exactly the same way as a motivator chain. We couldn't care which we're running, except on a motivator [overt] chain you have to keep calling for an overt of this type, you see? And on a motivator chain you have to keep calling for whatever follows its line – identifies it.

Oddly enough, however, you can switch over from a motivator line to an overt line. You can switch from an overt line to a motivator line – doesn't matter which. But I personally would never bother to run the two at once unless the pc came up with it. Pc suddenly looks at
you studiously and says, "You know, I've got a lot of overts against hitting people on the heads." Well, all right. Fire away. But you're now going down an overt chain, don't you see? You'll get the same type of hit on the head. But unfortunately, you've also got to clean up the motivator chain of the same thing.

Now, what point am I making here? That engram running handles the most elementary laws of livingness and thinkingness, follows the most elementary rules itself and is terribly, fantastically uncomplicated. It is so uncomplicated that you're going to overshoot it every time. You'll never add anything to engram running but complication. Isn't that an interesting observation? It's awful simple. If I ever show you a demonstration of running engrams without giving you any reasons why, and so forth, you'd wonder how the hell this was happening, because apparently nothing was happening in the session. You'd say, "What's going on?"

The way I used to run engrams – the way I still run them and so forth – runs something like this: Crude date. Very crude date. Order of magnitude, you know? Eighty-nine trillion, something like that, you know. A little greater than eighty-nine trillion, that's the date, see? Takes you how long to get that, see? "Return to this incident at eighty-nine-plus trillion. All right. What are you looking at? Okay, thank you. How long is this incident? Minutes? Hours? Days? Weeks? Weeks. Good. Two weeks? Greater than two weeks, less than two weeks? Greater than four weeks, less than four weeks? Greater than six weeks, less than six weeks? Five weeks? Five weeks. All right, it's five weeks long. Very good. Now, just move on through this to the end." Pc, ten minutes later, comes up and says, "All right, I did."

"What's it all about?"

"Well, I don't know. I get something or other something or other something or other."

"All right, fine. All right, now is there any slightly earlier beginning on this?"

"Yeah, there's a little bit earlier beginning on it."

"Is it a day before? Two days before? Day before? Hour before? Hours before? Four hours before? Five hours before? All right. I want you to go about five hours earlier this time, all right? – for the beginning of the incident. Move to the beginning of the incident. Okay. All right, move on through the incident."

Five minutes later, pc says, "I'm there."

You say, "All right, what you got now?"

"Oh, it's a sort of a thrashing machine. And there's this long blue-and-white thing and it goes..." and so on, and so forth. "And somewhere – somewhere I must have run into machinery. I must have had something to do with machinery – this kind of machinery. Makes me dizzy. Just like this one; just like all these do – dizzy."

"All right, very good. We're now going to date an earlier incident in which you get dizzy with machinery. All right. Is it greater than ninety trillion, less than ninety trillion?"

Here we go. "All right, I got ninety-three trillion – not quite ninety-three trillion. All right, move to the beginning of the ninety-three trillion incident. Okay. What have you got there?"

"Oh, I'm just looking at this thing that's all black."
"All right. Okay. How long is this incident? Days? Weeks? Months?"

"Incident is five minutes long."

"Okay, fine. Fine. All right, move through to the end of this incident." "Okay. What's it all about?"

"I don't know, it's a machine. Roars! That's all. I'm scared by the roar of the thing, so I dump it off a cliff."

"Oh. All right. Now this – is there any earlier moment there on the beginning of this?"

Tick.

"How much earlier does this go?"

"Oh, it goes three days earlier."

"All right, that's fine. That's fine. All right, now that three-day point, now move to the beginning we now have there." "All right. Good! Now what are you looking at?"

"Oh, my God! There's acres of machines. They're all over the place here; they're all over the thing here."

"All right. Thank you. Move through this incident, tell me when you've reached the end."

I sit there and try to make as little noise as possible and pc finally comes up in the middle of it and says, "Ha-ha-ha! Took the thing and busted it – grrkk! – like a big water-melon."

I say, "Okay. Okay, continue." "All right, go back to the beginning of this incident now. Go to the beginning of this incident."

He says, "You know, you know, I don't think this is basic on this chain."

"Oh, all right! Good. Good. Good, machines that make you dizzy" you see? "All right, that's fine."

"A machine that makes you dizzy – no, I guess it's just machines. It's actually not machines that make you dizzy; it's machines that catch you."

"Oh, all right. All right. Let's get an earlier incident here. Now, is this earlier incident on machines that catch you, later than ninety-five trillion, earlier than ninety-five trillion?"

And you find out it's only a billion years earlier than the one you got before. Same procedure, same action, on and on and on. Pc comes to the next session, you say, "All right, now let's pick up this – we're going to pick up this ninety-five trillion year incident and run it now again – run it this time."

Pc says, "I-why-I- I don-don-I-don-I don't know, I don't get anything," and so forth, and so on. And so on, "I don't get the picture that I had before," and so on, so on, so on.

So you say, "All right, okay. Thank you. Thank you. Now, since the last time I audited you, is there anything you weren't willing to duplicate?" "No? Thank you. Last time I audited you, is there anything you weren't willing to duplicate? Thank you. Since the last time I au-
dited you, is there anything you weren't willing to duplicate? All right, that seems clean. All right, return to the beginning of the ninety-five trillion year incident. How's the picture now?"

"Well, that picture's perfect, thank you."

"All right. Very good. Move on through to the end of this incident, tell me when you get there."

You say, "Where's all this hepcat stuff," see? Where's all this – you know, and bing, and "What are you looking at?" and "Well, is there blue sky or a pink sky there? Well, where – what are you doing now? What are you doing? What are you looking at there? Where – where – have you seen anything? Oh, can't you see anything more than a house? Well, what's in back of the house? Is there anything in the basement of the house?" "What's in the center of the planet there?" Where's all this? It isn't there. There's nothing there except just these little elementary actions. Pc runs like a baby carriage.

Now, why won't pcs do this when they don't do it? Well, they're at the wrong place on the program scale I gave you. But you can even take a dub-in case and run them early enough to get before the dub. But that's asking for it, so you've got your ARC processes. And lower than that you've got your MEST universe processes; you've got these various things that can straighten up a pc and put him into a situation. Because let me tell you this, engram running is important for this reason: You aren't going to make an OT without it. See, it's that important. And we now have the underpinnings that we can move any case into a situation where it can run engrams.

Now, all this fancy stuff developed trying to run dub-ins of dubs on engrams; cases that were too heavily charged to run engrams. What's the common denominator of that program case scale that runs from no time track down to total unawareness? What's the common denominator of that thing? The common denominator of that thing is "no duplicate." It's right in the middle of the old communication formula.

Years ago I used to run into a case occasionally, you'd run him on an – you'd run him on process Z on Monday and it wouldn't bite on Tuesday, but another process would bite on Tuesday and on Wednesday another process would bite and on Thursday another process would bite. What was going on with this character? Well, I finally understood what was going on with him: The duplication was missing from the communication formula. He would not duplicate. It was dangerous to duplicate. And that actually is the swan song of this universe: That which you're unwilling to duplicate tends to go on automatic.

You could clean up somebody's auditing in a rather rudimentary fashion. Of course, this is like all high-level processes, it's not applicable because it's insufficiently fundamental to reach the reality of the pc in many cases. But sometime when you've given or had a rough session, something like that, or your pc has given or had a rough session somewhere else or something like this, just take a crack at cleaning up the auditing on this basis: "Since (you know, day before that session occurred) what were – have you been unwilling to duplicate?" "What have you been willing to duplicate?" "What have you been unwilling to duplicate?" And just run the process flat, and you'll all of a sudden find all the ARC breaks and everything else torn out.
We can show you a bad demonstration of auditing, a very bad demonstration of auditing on the TV screen, you're unwilling to duplicate that, and you fumble the first five minutes of your next session. You get the... see? That's showing the bad example. Get the idea? "Unwilling to duplicate" is the only thing it says, see?

All right. You get the idea that you can't duplicate MEST, you can't duplicate engrams, you can't duplicate this action, you won't duplicate that continuous state of being a tree, let us say, or something like that. This becomes very obsessive, begins to wear on you and you just start refusing the idea of duplicating a tree and the next thing you know, there you are, obsessively duplicating a tree because that resistance to duplication can be caved in.

Now, a person's ability to duplicate is what determines their ability to run engrams because the engram itself is a duplication of the actual event. And where they didn't duplicate the actual event – where they duplicated the actual event but then the picture they're running is an altered copy of the picture of the actual event, that is dub-in. So, they'll run through the engram, and it's this way, and they run through it that way. All engrams develop materials. All engrams develop surprising changes. And all engrams have a little bit of dub-in in one place or another. You get in the middle of this thing, you wonder, "What's the surgeon got in his hands? He can't possibly have a water gun, you know? Looks like a water gun, you know? What on earth is it?" It finally turns into a spoon or something else he's taking your guts out with. Anyhow... [laughter]

In other words, things look a little bit different. And particularly dangerous things – people don't want to duplicate dangerous things. Very easy on this planet to give somebody a bad name, you know, the public in general. All they got to do is start riding a saw and say so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good, so-and-so is no good. Don't you see? And everybody – nobody must duplicate this person, you see, nobody must duplicate him. They all do it obsessively after a while. It's a sure mechanism of making bogeymen and then making everybody into bogeymen that didn't exist in the first place. You see, you can think up a lot of things and there's a lot of philosophy connected with this duplication, but just add it up to what engram running is all about.

A series of tests need to be developed for this sort of thing, of whether somebody can run engrams or not. The easiest way to find out whether somebody can run engrams or not is to try to run an engram on them. Now – and if they can't run one, why, you'd better uncork the ARC triangle, that's all.

But there's another way to do it. You say to some person, "One, two, three, nine, seven. What did I say?" And he says "You said uh – p – popcorn? Uh..." Aw, skip it, man. Of course, it's a possibility that you didn't speak loud enough for him to hear you, but if you spoke loud enough and you said, "One, two, three, seven, nine," and he said, "Popcorn? Popcorn? What's popcorn got to do with it?" Well, you'd better not try to run engrams on that person.

Now, the person who is totally unaware has tried to whip the mechanism of obsessively duplicating everything. That's his final answer, don't you see? Only trouble is his duplications then go on total automatic. And you'll find people around who have very, very heavy engrams indeed; they are all very heavy and they have no control over them of any
kind whatsoever and so forth. And the engrams also are very inaccurate. All life is an engram. Anything is an engram, so forth. But then the engram isn't the engram. They stub their toe and they go down the street and they've got a picture of being run into by a truck – in full 3-D, utterly overwhelming. Gruesome.

Now, you try to run an engram of stubbing their toe, it isn't there. They run this engram of being hit by a truck. Well, that's great, because if you run the engram of being hit by a truck, you unfortunately aren't doing the case a bit of good. You're just running off a copy of the copy of the copy of the copy, you see? I mean, you could get into that kind of nonsense.

Now, because there are such incredible things on the track anyway – such as the Helatrobus Implants, and all sorts of things – that people get huuuh! Tell some bud of the Freudian school about these things, he'd become very puzzled about this whole thing. As a matter of fact, in the second series there are some tumbler devices – tubes, in the second series – where the thetan on the pole is locked up in a sort of a curled-up position in the middle of a tube, with a lot of lights hitting him from one quarter or another. It's the perfect fetal position. And that's basic on the prenatals which we used to find. And those prenatals all fly to pieces if you hit this basic on the thing, you see? But there's so much incredible material that it would be very, very dangerous to determine on a pc whether or not he could run engrams by what was the fact of the case, see? This is very dangerous. We've tried this and it doesn't work. So, therefore, you need a better test and that test would be simple duplication.

You'd give him a series of questions of one kind or another. The old attitude [aptitude] test – our old driving test – is a doll because that gives you too little to understand and too much to understand, and so forth. That's a lovely test. A person who got a very bad score on that probably couldn't run engrams, you see, because it's a duplication test. That's how you'd find – not by the material the person runs, but by the person's ability to duplicate.

Now, another test of a person's ability to duplicate is on Monday, did they get beautiful rocket reads on a GPM, and on Tuesday, you couldn't get the needle to squick. That's an interesting condition. Well, they've hit something they're unwilling to duplicate, that's for sure; and you could probably turn it back on, that's for sure; and you can probably handle it, that's for sure. But you also are running somebody over their heads, that's for sure!

Well, what are we running over their heads? We're just running the ARC on this case. This case is too queasy to approach a whole lump of experience. They want to sniff around the edges of life, you know? You let them around the edges of life; don't let them around one concrete experience of being hit on the head with a cleaver, see. Let them sniff around the edges and find out if they're alive, you know? Let them run this thing way off, and their track will straighten out and become factual.

That doesn't mean that you're only using the ARC processes to improve somebody's reality. That isn't their only use. It just happens to be a very good shotgun process. It works at every quarter on almost anything, don't you see? It cleans up all kinds of things. It'll clean up

---

15 Editor's note: refers to the processes given in HCOB 27 May 1963, "Cause of ARC Breaks", in the section "ARC Break Processes"
auditing and it'll clean up track and it'll do this and it'll do that. And it can be phrased in different ways in order to meet different levels of case and you could do all kinds of things with this process – this new ARC setup that you have.

You can also do some interesting things with this duplication process. But you do the best in this physical environment. What part of this physical environment, what action or motion in this physical environment can the guy safely duplicate? When he finds out he can safely duplicate something, you've got the CCHs in a nutshell. That's the only thing you're trying to show him. That's why the CCHs have such a heavy power, when rightly used and such a weird effect when wrongly used. You make somebody feel like he's being punished for duplication, you run the CCHs wrong way to.

All right. So much for all that. We're talking about running engrams. Well, who can run engrams? Well, it's somebody who can get a picture of the actual event.

Now, how serious is this to you? Well, it's only serious to this degree: That if the case is not being successful in running engrams, you probably shouldn't be running them. Now, that I think is the most elementary adjudication that you can possibly make. But let's add to this adjudication, this one: Running them right; as long as you're running them right. If the case just doesn't seem to grapple with this at all and you just don't seem to do anything about it, or something of that sort, well, you're probably running the case too steep. That's the most elementary adjudication that can be made on the subject.

Now, engram running becomes very, very, very important to you because the Helatrobus Implants are actually a long chain of engrams which themselves have, each one, basics. And they tend to grab the whole track together at one point. You will only be able to run on some cases as few as six GPMs before you have to start running engrams, because the RR will shut off. The things are getting too solid; thing is getting too solid. In other words, charge is bleeding.

So let's get what determines – what determines when to go earlier? First, it's the auditor's observation that they ought to go earlier – that's always first. But the second one – and this must never be violated – is the pc's recognition that there is something earlier that tells you the curtain has lifted. And this you never ignore, and I do mean never.

Pc can state this in a thousand different ways and it all adds up to the same thing: There's something earlier. Pc says, "You know, I think there's another pole trap incident ahead of this." Now, that's very blunt, isn't it? All right, let's just find the other pole trap incident ahead of this, see? Simple. Pc says, "I don't think this could be the last one on the chain. It's too late." Well, go earlier. Pc says, "Where did I get the idea that I couldn't hold onto things?" Go earlier.

You're trying to get through these – you're trying to get from 20 to 19, and what is the last signal? What is the last signal – the signal that you just must not go beyond in running number 20 or number 19 or number 18 in its turn? The signal that you must not ignore is the inference that there's something earlier. Because if you ignore this and continue to scrub away on the one you are on, you are ignoring the fact that something went down there and opened that little valve and that charge is coming up here from now on.
And that charge is going to make the engram that you are trying so arduously to rub out more and more solid, more and more arduous, less and less runnable.

You've got to get back here and find number 19. Now, the second you find number 19, the charge that was leaking up goes *ffttt!* That's charge off, don't you see? But the later an engram is on the track, the less charge you can bleed out of it itself. Now, charge of course is a registry of the E-Meter. What is the registry on the E-Meter? Well, it's the motion of your tone arm, the motion of your needle. You're getting tone arm motion running these engrams – if you're not getting any tone arm motion running these engrams, just hope you can get back early enough to get some tone arm motion. If you never get any tone arm motion on it, all the way back, brother, you're taking no charge off the line at all; you are just restimulating mass and charge. You're just restimulating; you're not blowing anything. That condition, I don't think, however, will obtain very usually with you. You will – you will get little blows of one kind or another.

Those portions of the time track which have had the individual so much at effect that the person could not at all be cause, and attended by pain and unconsciousness, are called engrams. And the only way an engram is ever torn up is by relieving the thing which holds it in place. And the thing that holds it in place is always number 1.

There's 20 engrams in a chain, if you can't find number 1 – and you can find number 1 if you go down the chain – but if you don't even try to find number 1, and then don't erase number 1, then that chain will not blow up. But you'll see some of the funniest concatenations of charge release you ever wanted to see when you finally put your paws on number 1 and scrub it out good. Number 1 erases. The rest do not.

Now, because of the complex nature of the time track, there will be some portion of number 1, addressed to something else or some other subject, which may in itself not erase. Now you've got a new chain of engrams running back from number 1. Well, go ahead, run it back.

Don't get the idea of an *absolute* basic. There's only one absolute basic on the time track and that is called basic-basic, and it's going to take you a long time to find that one. That's... basic-basic is unburdened with steam shovels and gangs of coolies and working for Lord knows how long. The ants that were emptying that granary – that's a very good example. Fortunately, if you go ahead at it in a very businesslike fashion, you will eventually find basic-basic. The character of basic-basic is something I needn't go into at the present moment, but it contains these impulses which eventually became aberration.

Now, I want to call to your attention just rapidly here, some data. There are two things you can do with dating. You can relieve charge or just identify something. Now, if you get a total dating, it goes on down to the second. It's how many, you know, trillions, hundreds of billions, hundreds of millions, hundreds of thousands, thousands, hundreds, days, minutes, seconds ago. And if you get that accurately, and in no argument with your pc, you're going to have a pc there who *uhwuhh!* He gets somatics and the thing rights itself on the time track, and that's all very interesting. That's that type of dating; it's to relieve charge. You put something accurately on the time track and you'll get charge off.
Well, that's fine, and as an activity is quite an interesting activity in itself, but remember that dating also contains identification. You want to know about the incident that was eighty-nine trillion, four hundred and fifty million years ago. So you say plus or minus. And you've got one that was almost — almost, see — eighty-nine trillion four hundred and fifty million — you've got one that was slightly more than eighty-nine million and four hundred and fifty billion, or something like that, see.

And you just identify it. And sometimes your identification is as clumsy as "that — that ninety-trillion-year incident." Of course you're only hung when there's eight in a row. So then you have to get into ninety trillion, and you have to date these into the hundred millions or something like that (sometimes you have to date them into the hundred thousands), but that's differentiation. Mostly, mostly, you will be satisfied with your trillions. See, you say, "Well, that incident that was not quite eighty-nine trillion years ago." That's dating. That's sufficient. That identified it, don't you see? Fine, nothing wrong with that.

Now, let me give you this operation of blocking it out. This is known as blocking out an incident and it has just exactly these steps. It's a very precise action. You identify it by date. That's — you get the approximate date of the thing. See, that's an identification by date. You move the time track to that date (but of course your dating has already moved it there). You ask the pc what's there and the pc says, "Nothing. I can't see nothing." Pc says, "Green cats." Pc says, "Solid black automobiles are stacked around. Their license plates are number 869, 942, 747, 815. And there's a DC plate over on the other side," and so forth. "And that's there; that's what's there." And you say, in every case, regardless of what the pc said — and hear me now, hear me — in every case you say, "Good." You understand? You don't say anything else.

It's very interesting. The pc can say, "But it's all black and I can't see a thing!" and so forth. And you say, "Well, there's no reason to go on with that." He's there; he's there. So it's all black? So he doesn't know what it's all about? Well, hell, he didn't know what it was all about a few minutes ago either. Funny part of it is, time you run him through a couple of times — I've even seen a pc blow grief charge through something they didn't know what it was all about, cry all the way through the whole thing, and come back to the beginning and begin to find what it was all about. Do all some — sorts of weird things happening like this, don't you see?

So it doesn't matter what they say. This has no tendency on that; that does not influence the auditor's action at that point. Next thing you do: Find its duration. You know? "Is this incident minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, years?" Find its duration. Block its duration out fairly accurately, you know? If the answer is days, well, just get the number of days, don't you see? Don't go down to hours, minutes and split instants and galactic microseconds, you know? I mean, this is — this wastes time.

Find its duration, move the pc through it. Through. Get the difference of to and through. To get a pc at a point of the track you say, "Move to," and to get them to go through something, you say "through." If you want them to go through something, say through. Don't say, "Go to the end of the incident," because, of course, the pc just goes bang! and he's at the end of the incident. "Yeah, all right. I'm here at the end of the incident. What do you want?"
can see auditors now – I've already seen an auditor do this idiotic thing – said, "Well, go to the beginning of the incident." (snap)

"All right. Well, I'm here. What do you want?"

"All right. Now move to the end of the incident." (snap) Bang!

"I'm here. What do you want?" [laughter]

That's pure idiocy, see? You want the pc to pick up the incident, you had better move them through it. And let me assure you, that if it's forty days long, I normally say, "Move rapidly through the incident." [laughter, laughs] I like to be able to end my sessions on schedule.

But you move them through to the end, then establish what was there. Just ask the pc, "Well, what happened?" you know, when they come to the end of the thing. Anytime the pc says anything while they're going through the thing, you say, "Good," and one more word: "Continue." You want them to realize that auditing effect... command is still in effect.

When they get to the end of the thing – you've moved it through it once – you say, "What's it all about?" Funny thing – the pc doesn't talk to you; it's all right. Okay. Move them to the beginning of it; move them through to the end again. Simple as that. Never move them backwards through one. When they get to the end of the thing, why ask them again.

I've seen a pc go through one several times before they could tell me anything about it. Thing wasn't beefing up at all. Just, you know, "What's this?" It's a solid mystery. Don't be impatient, in other words. You don't vary this routine. Pc says, "I don't think I left." I'm afraid I'd be more prone to say, "You left all right. Run through it." See?

Now, if the pc keeps saying, "I'm stuck," and all that sort of thing, just forget the bouncers and deniers, man. You're just running somebody over his head, and you get them out of it any way you can and revert to ARC processes. Any time the pc is that much at effect, where the auditor has got to kick him around inside the incident and do all sorts of weird things and that sort of thing, you're simply running engrams on somebody who can't run engrams. There's no sense in my developing a technology for somebody who can't run engrams, for you not to run engrams with. You get the difference?

All right. Now, when he's told you all about it at the end, your next step is simply to find out if anything is a little bit earlier. You know? "Is there a little..." because the end always remains the end. You don't have to vary the end. If there's anything more they'll eventually tell you; but you don't care about it because the charge is always earlier, you see? But always suspect the beginning.

Pc says, "Well, I just got off the train and there they were, you know?" Aw, it's all right. Buy it. Sounds all right, and so forth. But ask before you send them through again, "Now is there any earlier beginning on this incident?" and so forth. Yeah, he was shooting at them out the window for a half an hour, you see, before he got off the train, you see? There's always that little, little tag beginning. And sometimes you're lucky and there is none, but it just doesn't matter; it's whether it registers or not. Send them back to that earlier bit and tell them to move through it again.
Now, up to the moment you tell them to move through it again, you've simply blocked the incident out. Now you know how long this incident is. The second time you tell them to move through it is, however, quite perfectly safe and can be included in blocking out an incident, but I just want you to know that it doesn't perfectly belong in blocking out an incident. You've actually blocked the incident out now.

But to finish this incident off, just move them through it again. They'll pick up some more stuff. That's the time they're going to tell you there's something earlier. And it doesn't much matter how many times you run them through an incident. Less than twice is suspect. That's maybe a little careless. But might very well – if the thing appeared to be awful gummy, and so forth, and messed up – once would be plenty. There's where judgment comes in. More than twice? Well, you're getting into questionable ground – very questionable ground. Trying to chug them into it and make them have more view of it or more picture or get more event out of it or do something else with it than they can do at that particular time? Nah! Verboten. It'll turn up in an earlier incident or you got no business running engrams. That's all there is to that.

Now, how long would you run one of these things? I think if a pc was terribly fascinated with the thing: "You know? You know, that's where I got shot, and that's where I shot Bill. Yes. That's right! And then this place id... hmmm – hmm – hmmm – hmmm. And I've often wondered whether or not, you know, hmm – hmm, this funny hole in my ear..." [laughter]

All right, that's dandy. That's dandy. I'm afraid I'd just go along with this as long as I was getting motion on my meter – getting some motion on my meter, had the thing going tick and tock and clock and bong, and he was still running through the thing and wasn't wandering off into the fields – I'm afraid I'd run that. But I would never run it longer than, "You know, I think we've had a fight before." All right. Hit the silk.

Now, if you do not bail out of an incident and find the earlier incident when the pc sights the earlier incident, you spoil the pc's ability to move back – you blunt it – and the pc will get tied up in this area of the track you're trying to run. And the only reason a pc gets tied up in an area of track is by insisting he stay there; you insist he stay there. He says, "Oh, God, I want out of this." Well, anybody who wants out of this, you've just – you've just gone near it and he sees that there's a whole bunch of threshing machines and they're cleaning up the wounded with these threshing machines, see? And he says, "Well, I – I can't have anything to do with that. That – that's – that's too much for me," and so forth. I'd say, "Okay." I let him bounce to present time and I run ARC processes.

In other words, I don't say, "Oh, come now. I'm sure that you could confront that part of the threshing machines," so forth.

But if a pc started telling me, "Eh, it's getting awful solid around here. Pressure is getting heavier! A little harder to run!" – I don't care if I was getting tone arm action or not – I'm afraid my action would always be "When did you spot something earlier?"

"Oh, well! Come to that, it was about an hour ago."
Yeah, he spotted an earlier incident. And I would realize that it was my fault, as the auditor, if the pc got tied up on the track that he couldn't get out of or was unable to run the chain, and so forth, because I would have refused to let him move earlier. That's the one cardinal rule of this.

Now, there are several things I've tried to teach you here today. And one of these: You're running an engram chain; you're never trying to run a single engram. The only reason you run basic, is not to get rid of basic. Sometimes basic is "I walked up and blew all of the powder out of the barrel." But nothing happened, see? "Yes, I walked up – well, of course they lost the battle is the reason for it – and I blew all the powder out of the barrel." That's basic, see? That's just bzz-bzz-bzz-bzzz-bzz-bzz-bzz-bz, it's gone. It's all the basic there was.

You look for basic to be the more powerful incident; it's never. It's the shorter incident, it's the simpler incident, but on that keystone – because the thetan never bothered to say that was important, you see – these other things built up, built up, tougher, tougher, bigger, bigger, bigger. You get that basic, the rest of them will tear right up. Just like one of these patent sacks, you know – a patent flour sack – you get the right – you get the right string? Well, here she goes.

All right. Now, you're running a chain. So don't think because you've read Book One or snapped your fingers over engrams you know how to run engrams.

Learn this as a brand-new skill. And it's a skill which we'll call engram chain running. And that is done by finding an incident, we don't care how. One of your best takeoff points – the Helatrobus Implants; run a few GPMs, then you're really making knots, you see? We don't care how we took off on this, whether we had to prepare the case for this or not, we got our paws on an engram. And then we block it out. And we get the earlier one and we block it out, and we get the earlier one and we block it out, we get the earlier one, we block it out. And eventually we've got nothing over here to block out. We then decide that we have our paws on a basic for this chain.

Now, as we now have a basic for this chain, this basic will erase. Okay? So we proceed to erase the basic and tear up the chain. Theoretically, if you kept wandering back, some of you could make an error of winding up eventually with basic-basic. Seemed like you never got your hands on a basic. Well, you eventually did get your hands on a basic, but this apparently is the first engram on the track or something like this. I would erase it and suspect that I had simply discovered a basic.

You see, when you discover basic-basic and erase it, all engrams and pictures disappear on the pc, so that is the clue to that.

Now, the next point is: Never under any circumstances prevent a pc from finding the earlier incident – never do it; that's courting disaster – even if you suspect the pc is telling you there is something earlier in order not to confront what he is going through. Because if he's trying to bail out of incidents because he's scared of them, I would watch this performance just once or twice and then I would decide that I was misguided to be running engrams on this case; and I'd prepare the case a little bit more and get him back into running engrams later, you understand?
Now, those are the cardinal points of running engrams and if you follow those things, you actually will be able to develop one fantastic amount of case gain because you'll be blowing charge all the way. It's the easiest running you ever did and the only mistake you're going to make with it is to depart from the little blocking-out routine which I have given you here; depart from the earlier routine, you fail to realize you're running a chain – you're not running a single incident – and preventing the pc from going earlier when the pc spots something earlier, or this mistake: just complicating it up, man. You know? The pc says, "I've got a picture here of a green house."

"Does it have gables?"

Blow your brains out, boy! You've done it; you've done it. You've finished it. You've wrecked the work. That's it. You've had it. You just opened your mouth once too often. Do you realize what happens? You've pointed the pc's attention to a large object, and the rule of the largest object goes into effect instantly at that point. And the pc will interiorize into that incident. Well, you didn't want him interiorized into it. What do you mean you didn't want him interiorized into it? You didn't want that incident all swelled up, fully charged, 3-D. How can you make an incident fully charged and 3-D? By making the pc look at it and look at it and look at it, and examine it and examine it; and then prevent the pc from going earlier and look at it and look at it, and look at the largest objects in it, and feel things in it, and so on. You're going to have a universe built around this pc to a point where you'll never get him out of it. Got it? Well, that isn't what you're trying to do.

If you were trying to discover the secret formulas of the Ka-bob civilization, and you got the pc into their formula security room, by all means follow this process! But make sure you don't do it with an OT, because he hasn't got any pictures to swell up. You actually could only do it safely with a Clear. And a Clear is so close to an OT if you've got him to a totality of Clear, you see – that's dead easy – that if you just made an OT out of him, he'd remember. You understand? So it becomes a very difficult thing to stay simple enough about.

I wanted you to get this data because actually there's never been a recapitulation of running engrams mostly because I never really had my fingers on why people had a hard time running engrams. And I find out there's a miscommunication concerning it, and I've given you that miscommunication, which is just the fact that people said, "Well, if you have to flatten the process you have to flatten every engram you laid your hands on." And I think that's where the whole thing broke down. Very easy to run them. I wish you lots of success with it. Thank you.

*Audience: Thank you.*

Thank you.