QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
AUDITING SLOWDOWNS

A lecture given on
19 June 1961

Okay, this is what, the 19th of June? It was a few minutes ago.

I want to welcome the new students here. I hope that you make it. It's probably doubtful. You see, most people won't put forth the effort to make it. And most everybody has come to us too late.

Now that we've got the psychiatric clichés off the line that have been extant for the last few thousand years, let's get down to business.

Now, I usually ask for questions at this period, so are there any questions? Thank you. So, what's the question?

Female voice: Which is the senior – or is it known which is senior at the moment – Opening Procedure by Duplication or the duplicate level of the Prehav? And which one will run the other out if it's unflat?

Which is senior: Op Pro by Dup or the duplication level of the Prehav? What's very interesting is when Op Pro by Dup is left unflat, there isn't anything that will flatten it. No thought process will flatten a CCH-type process. And if you've got somebody that Op Pro by Dup isn't flat on, it'd be a good thing to flatten it.

However, the two things are not particularly related, since on the one hand the individual is trying to do a think duplication, you see, and the other he's getting an actual physical CCH duplication.

And you find Op Pro by Dup is pretty marvelous and it's still very extant and many hours should be run on a new student in an Academy. But they usually don't flatten it. And if it bites it bites, and it bites hard and actually should be flattened.

It's quite an interesting rigor. But being a CCH-type process it, of course, falls into the lineup of CCH 1, 2, 3 and 4. If you were going to flatten Op Pro by Dup on a Routine 1, you would simply add it somewhat in the vicinity of CCH 2, making it halfway between CCH 2

and CCH 3. Put it into that lineup, rather than try to flatten it all by itself and it'll flatten faster.

It isn't also necessary to run Op Pro by Dup in just one session. That is not necessarily necessary. It is a good thing to do and it's a good test of an auditor and so on to be able to do so, but it is not a vital thing. If it is unflat, it can be picked up later.

Now, the reason we saw Op Pro by Dup fade out, apparently, between two sessions – in its effectiveness – was usually the rudiments went out. And of course, this is in view of the fact you weren't handling the case with rudiments and that sort of thing. So it appeared to be flat next session when it was not finished biting in the last session you ran. And that's true of all CCHs.

And the best way to get around this is not handle rudiments, but to put it into Routine 1, if you're going to use it. And put it in between CCH 2, CCH 3 and just flatten it as you come around and so on – which, of course, would give you five CCHs in CCH 1.

You'd only do that if somebody'd had some Op Pro by Dup run on them and it wasn't flat and you wished to flatten Op Pro by Dup on somebody you're running CCHs on. Just put it in that slot and carry on with it.

Run it, again, by the rules of the CCHs. Which again, run it only so long as it is producing change and run it as long as it is producing change and cease to run it when it no longer produces change for twenty minutes. That would be the actual proper way to handle the thing.

It's rather been – you see, it was a – it's hung with its own postulate, which is to say, it was developed to get students to duplicate auditing commands. And so, it stayed that way, as a process, ever since. And it's never been added into the routines, but there's where it belongs. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Female voice: Yes, I – I can understand when you assess for a goal and get a terminal; it's quite sufficient just to read through the Prehav levels. But suppose you assess for a long term PTP? Now, suppose you got Mary and her trouble is she can't have an effect on Joe, who has Faith, or something.

Uh-huh.

Female voice: Now, if Joe's the terminal, do you want the No Effect, or do you want the Faith?

Now, let's go over this again. Give me that question again.

Female voice: Look, suppose you've got Mary whose trouble is . . .

Yes.

Female voice: . . . Joe.

Yes.

Female voice: Now, Joe has Faith, but Mary has a No Effect on Joe.

Right.

Female voice: Now, which is the level that – that you're looking for? The Faith or the No Effect?

Oh, you're trying to do a Goals Assessment on a PTP by doing both ends of the PTP. Is that right?

Female voice: Yeah, well, which do you want? Which – which should you go with?

Well, you want the one that falls the hardest.

Female voice: I see, so you . . .

You want the most meter reaction. Run by the meter, always.

You would do a real Terminals Assessment, in order to isolate a long-term PTP. That's a real Terminals Assessment, you find both ends of this goal. You assess it. You take the one that falls the hardest, if you were doing a thorough, 100 percent assessment.

And then, you would assess *that* terminal on the Prehav Scale. And, of course, it is going to fall only on one level of the Prehav Scale. And actually, there's only going to be one terminal that falls hard on this long-term PTP. Okay?

Female voice: Hm-hm. So you wouldn't bother to ask the question. You'd just say – you'd find the terminal was Joe, and you'd just say, "Cause, Failed . . . "

That's it. Well, let's – the reason you've got a question, is because you're not looking at, perhaps, a Terminals Assessment as a thoroughgoing thing to do with a long-term PTP.

Now, when you've got a long-term PTP, it isn't up to the auditor to say what the terminal was. It's up to the E-Meter to register it.

And when it's a long-term PTP, you would get the thing stated as to what it exactly was. And then, having gotten this statement – you see, it's sort of a Goals Assessment on difficulty, is what it really is.

You get the same thing as, you say, "Well, just what is your difficulty?" You know? And make a list of the person's difficulties with regard to a certain thing, if you want to just go at it ad nauseam, the final ne plus ultra.

And then, having found that, then you would go ahead and do a Terminals Assessment on this goal just as stated. And you'd get the cause-and-effect end of the difficulty.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

And you'd take those two ends of the difficulty. You would get terminals lists for each one. Then you would get the – by this time, probably, your PTP has disappeared, but you'd – you'd assess the thing down. You'd finally get one terminal that fell on it, and then you would assess that one terminal on your Prehav Scale.

Now, it's very possible I have missed and haven't answered your question.

Female voice: No, you have answered it and that brings up the other thing. Suppose – the two terminals in it – one of them is herself? Now, would you ever assess on self ?

Oh. Well, yes. You run into this problem though: "Who is this person?" And you have to assess it on that basis.

And whenever anybody comes up with self as a terminal – you can, of course, run in some kind of a sloppy fashion – you can run O/W on self. As a matter of fact, we just did this afternoon.

We can run almost anything on self. You can get a Dynamic Assessment and find the first dynamic is the only one that falls. All right, well, you can run self. It's sort of a sloppy way to go about it. But that's pre-SOP Goals, you see?

Now that you've got SOP Goals, one of these terminals is self. Now, you would Q-and-A off into the long, far horizon as to "Who is self?" And very often the person's main terminal will fall out of the assessment. Got the idea?

Female voice: Hm.

And you won't be able to get rid of the fall, and you'll find yourself sitting there – I did this identical assessment down in Greece. And the goal the fellow had was so-and-so and so-and-so, and "self." And it was something like he wanted to improve himself. And it fell off the meter and it wouldn't go away and so on. So, this left me with a Terminals Assessment of *he* wanted to improve *himself*. You get the circularization here? It's like a closed circuit.

Well, all right, you ask – for the beginning and end, you're asking the same question "Who is he?" and "Who is self?" You see?

But you – I sorted this thing out, and the fellow came up with this preponderous – well, this actually creaking statement that, well, he didn't know and – and so on. And he got to thinking it over and all of a sudden, his eyes lit up and went round as lighthouses. And he says, "I'm a seeker." And that was what really fell. I got a lot of terminals, but then "I'm a seeker." And this explained, actually, everything this butterfly was doing, you see? He was

going around and lighting on all the philosophies he could find, one after the other, you see? And he was a seeker.

It was a very applicable terminal. As far as I – I don't know whether it ever got run or not. I simply assessed him. The other fellow that was in the area was having a great deal of trouble, one way or the other, and I don't think they ever got down to any serious auditing. All he had to do was assess "seeker" on a Prehav Scale and he would have been off like a rocket.

But that was his PTP. That was his basic goal. It wasn't really assessed as a PTP, but his PTP and the basic goal and the difficulties he was having improving himself and all of these things all fell out of the hamper. And his goal fell right in the middle of it.

So you could commonly suspect that one of two things will happen on a present time problem of long duration when assessed just like SOP Goals – arduously, arduously, arduously. And when this is assessed very, very arduously – and by that I mean just a routine, hammer and tongs, down-to-earth SOP Goals Assessment, even though this thing is only a little snivelling PI problem of long duration. You get the idea?

One of two things is going to happen. You're either going to blow it – if it isn't on his terminal line – and never run it. Because it'll blow in the process of locating it.

You just run "What is your problem?" or "What is your difficulty?" or "Explain that difficulty." And that, all by itself, keeps changing, changing, changing, changing. The person's various difficulties start getting as-ised, as-ised, as-ised. And you find yourself chasing all over the south pasture, you see, trying to look at this thing, and through the woods too.

All right, now you've finally got one that does stick, that does fall; he has defined it. Now you get both ends of the terminal on this, the causative and the effect terminal on the thing, and you sort that on down to this PT problem. It's – it's liable to blow.

Or you've got his goals terminal. It's not a waste of time.

One – one of two things will happen: It will cease to exist, or you do have the fellow's goals terminal. Well, you've been assessing for goals all the time, although you've been calling them difficulties. Got the rundown on this?

So there is no difference in the assessment for present time problem of long duration and the assessment of goals, except just this word, one word. You don't ask for goals, you ask for difficulties.

Female voice: Thanks.

And you get that assessed.

Never take the pc's statement and run it. That I've learned the hard way. Don't take the pc's statement that his back is his real difficulty, because you all too often start to assess "back" on the E-Meter and you find out it doesn't live on the E-Meter.

He has been told by his dentist he is having trouble with his back. And he – and actually, he's having trouble with a dentist, not a back. Get the idea? He doesn't know what his troubles are, but you can sort them out. And of course, this is terrific – I mean, this is terrific auditing.

The other day somebody said well, Goals Assessment had been going on for twelve hours. Person had a twelve and a half hour intensive, didn't get changed. And the D of P and the Assoc Sec were totally agreed that it wou – didn't change because they were only doing an assessment.

Hey, come off of it! Come off of it. How – how could you assess somebody for twelve and a half hours without a change? I don't think you could do it.

You'd have to really try, you know? You'd have to get in there and put both feet in the preclear's lap and smoke a cigar, knowing he was allergic to cigar smoke and go out of communication. Connect your E-Meter up to the radiator.

And then – now and then at random intervals, tell the pc that you're in a terrible hurry and you had a train to catch and couldn't possibly, really, finish up the session because you might have to go at any minute. So he was to be prepared for this, you see?

And then run it all by Pavlovian model session. Which is have some dog's saliva, "Here is a circle. Now we'll make you into canned meat." I think that's about the way that goes. Got the idea?

So there would be a tremendous change of case if you did this. And one of those two things will happen if you assessed a present time problem of long duration all the way to its ne plus ultra of an SOP Goals. Man, he wouldn't have a problem left on the track.

That's also, by the way, a method of finding out hidden standards. You see, the lower on the scale and the less prepared a case is before you start finding an assess – a goal and terminal, the lower, the more difficulty you're going to have and the more complications you have to go into to establish the person's goal. You got the idea? In other words, the sooner you do it, you might say, earlier in the case – let's say you took a case that isn't necessarily a low-scale case that must be run on CCHs or Routine 2. But let us say you took this case, felt very uncertain, very queasy, had a lot of present time problems, rudiments were all out, CCHs would bite like mad, all kinds of complications are occurring between sessions, you see? The normal things. Because a person that's having a hard time in life, adds to the hard time they're having in life practically every moment they live outside the auditing room, you see? And it just gets more and more complicated.

And supposing, however, you just took that case and you said, "Well now, we're not going to do it the fast way. We're going to do it the – by SOP Goals."

You see, any one of these three routines can be run on any case. Except a totally unconscious person. Only the CCHs would work on that. But any one of these. It's just a question of how fast.

Well, supposing we said we were going to do an SOP Goals Assessment on this case and we did it the right way, you see? If we did, you'd probably get farther if you started assessing it sort of halfway between difficulties and goals. Because you're going to find this person with hidden standards. And the test of such a case is – whether or not a case should have been run, actually, on the CCHs – is whether the case does have hidden standards. That's a pretty good test. That's a safe test.

Not all cases that have hidden standards should be run on the CCHs, but it's a good test. One of these off-the-bat tests, you see? You say, "Well, I wonder what we ought to run on this person."

"Well, what would have to happen for you to find out that Scientology worked?"

And he says, "Well, my right ear would have to stop burning. Uh and uh, my eh – neighbor would have to get along better with his wife."

And you say, "Are they Scientologists?"

And he says, "No." And "My son would have to stop stealing chickens and uh . . ."

Doesn't even have personal goals. I mean, this person – if you audit this person, somebody else gets well. I mean, wow! I mean, the pc's never even in the auditing room. And the fastest progress you'll make will be CCHs, see?

Now let's take a – a flip of the coin. Let's say to this individual, "Have you got any hidden standards about the thing?" Only, we say it in a different way. We say, "What would have to happen in order for you to know Scientology was working on you? What do you want to really have done? What do you want, really, Scientology to fix up in your life?"

And he says, "Well, uh. . . I don't know, nothing, nothing, no, nothing."

And you'd say, "Well, what do you consult to find out if the last session worked?"

And he says, "My left foot."

And you say, "Well, what has to happen to your left foot for a session to work?"

And he says, "Oh, has to stop burning. It burns, you see, all the time and if it – the burning increases then I know the processing didn't work. And if it decreases then I know it did work. And if it just remains the same, why, I know it didn't work." The person says,

"You know, it's kind of funny, I nev – hadn't really thought of it that way before. But that's what I test it on."

Well, this person would be an awful good bet for Routine 2. Or CCHs, you see? That's just, a – you know, an off-the-bat; you haven't got the guy's graph, anything of this sort. That – that's a good one for general runs, just starting out with. Why?

Well, actually, you make a little more progress, a little faster and you'll be able to do a faster Goals Assessment when you get around to it. All right. Oh, faster by about a tenth.

Nevertheless, on – on both of these cases you can do an SOP Goals. But on either of these two cases, you would do well to ask for difficulties as well as goals. In other words, particularly on the first one I mentioned that had to have their neighbor grow purple hair in order for him to work – Scientology worked. You'd better ask for difficulties.

You see, the rougher it is for the person to concentrate and the less a person remembers about his life, the harder it is to assess him and the more expertness and the more vias and the more twists you've got to employ in order to assess him for SOP Goals. Now, any auditor that is well trained in the assessment for SOP Goals, and so forth, would – would be able to get around all these humps. It would op – would not operate as an insuperable barrier. You would be able to get over that.

But you – you've got another problem, here. You – you know you've got complications in the lineup. And you know you're going to have to be much brighter and you're going to have to be much more alert. You're going to have to keep your rudiments in much harder. You'll find yourself occupying a tremendous amount of time with PTPs and ARC breaks and things like this in the session. You – you won't get as much goals running done, don't you see? All of these things tend to barrier, which simply stretches out the amount of time necessary.

Yet, frankly my attitude toward SOP Goals is simply monitored by what I have seen auditors doing. It isn't monitored by my own experience.

My own experience is, you take this fellow, his tongue is hanging out, he keeps tripping in it – over it as he comes in the door. His eyes are looking north, east, south and west. He has little spurts of fire come out of his temples occasionally. And he sits down, says he feels very repressed, and all three of him are having trouble.

I'm sufficiently insouciant about it all to know that I can assess him on SOP Goals. And practically, at that case level, have done so very successfully, without too much time. So, my attitude on it is just a little bit different than the put-out attitude.

But I have seen people flubbing on this. And I have seen them getting

incredible goals. They get impatient with the pc. I'm talking about a relatively untrained person, see? And he gets impatient about it, and he feeds the pc goals. And he puts his own aberrations in there. And he – he isn't content with the pc's goals, because they don't fit what his goals would be. And I've seen various things like this happening Well, the best action that can be taken there, rather routinely, is for the person who is auditing them to do them on CCH 1 or CCH 2 and prepare them for assessment. And they would have more success. They would do it more accurately. They'd improve the case more per unit hour of auditing All of these other considerations enter into the thing.

On the other hand – on the other hand – if I were to see that a case, in eighty-nine hundred thousand hours, or whatever poor old Joe said that he had had, in terms of auditing. He spent two hours in the auditing chair for every three hours he committed overts against the organization. And didn't ever seem to add up with him. This boy – I'd look at this tremendous backlog of auditing, you know? And I would see that nothing much had happened during that period of time. And I would say, "Well, what's the most economical, easiest, surest, surest route on this thing? *Heah*, let's get the CCHs. Let's break them out."

"Give me that hand."

And now, we'd know we were going someplace. You got the idea?

I suppose I, myself, would do that. But at the same time, I don't doubt my ability to get the present time problem of long duration, the pc's goal, get all the terminals associated with it and get the correct ones out of it. I haven't any doubt about being able to do that, either. And I haven't any doubt about it that, if I hit it right on the button, everything that was wrong with this pc would fold up, too.

You're going on a basis here which has to do with the fact that any of the three routines can be run on any case. It's just what can you have the most luck with, and what do you get the most certainty out of. That's about what that amounts to. Okay?

Female voice: Yes, thank you.

You bet. Okay, good enough. Any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: How do you measure a Release? How do you test a person and know that they are a Release?

How do you test a person and know that they're a Release? That's very easy. You'd say the first consideration on the thing would be an E-Meter test, if the person is not reading weirdly on the E-Meter. By weirdly, I mean his sensitivity isn't up to 16 and – in order to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Something like that. Sensitivity is pretty reasonable.

In other words, the tone arm is down. The sensitivity knob would be down to zero. You got about a full-dial or two-dial drop. Something like this.

You got a heavy bang, you see, when the sensitivity is down to zero on a modern Mark IV British meter.

He would have to answer these questions, without getting an E-Meter reaction:

"Do you think you're getting any worse?" or "Do you think you will get any worse?" "Does Scientology work for you?"

And «'How do you feel about help?" without the thing falling off the pin.

"How do you feel about control?" without the thing falling off the pin.

If those considerations occurred and panned out, you for sure would have a Release.

This is, by the way, upgrading the state of Release quite considerably. The state of Release has always been defined exactly as follows: "Do you think you are getting any worse or going to continue to get worse or are liable to get worse in the future?"

And the person, with great honesty, could tell you, "No, I don't think I'm going to get worse now. I think I'll get better from here on." That was a Release.

Now, we have to make the Release testable – testable in HGCs, testable in HCOs. And so the considerations which I just now gave you would be the considerations that you would monitor a Release by. There are a tremendous lot of Releases in the world, only nobody ever bothers to check them out. Answer your question?

Male voice: Yeah.

Good.

Okay. Now, I've got a few things to tell you. There are four new additions to the Primary Scale. Another Primary Scale will be in your hands shortly.

The only additions that come to a Primary Scale are those things which are actually hanging up a case, that the case isn't likely to get to on a Secondary Scale very often. In other words, the determination of what is on a Primary Scale – is a button important enough to stop any of the advance of a case? You got the idea? Which would not necessarily check across from the old Primary Scale.

Other consideration is, I don't know that the misemotional scale shouldn't be on the Primary Scale. I still don't know that. I mean, the standard old Tone Scale of which we are greatly enamored from a long way back – I think, actually, it belongs on the Primary Scale. Because I see some people going around in anger. I see some people going around in resentment.

The Clear in – in South Africa there, probably wouldn't have made it if I hadn't taken a look at her. And I said, "Well, regardless of anything else, run 'resentment' on her in a few brackets." And it took off. And that was the end of that case hang-up.

This was simply an expressed emotional tone. And because you haven't got these emotional tones on the Primary Scale, you could miss this one. And I went at it half-heartedly and put shame, blame and regret into the Primary Scale and then took them out and put them under the heading of Misemotion and Emotion.

But I don't know now and probably will put back into the Primary Scale all of the old standards – you know, shame, blame, regret, grief. You know, the rest of'em – anger and fear, resentment, antagonism, boredom, enthusiasm.

By the way, did you ever see a needle on enthusiasm? It's quite interesting, the old Tone Scale. That's why it should be in the Primary Scale. You never fail to get a reaction someplace on that lineup. And it doesn't take too long to flatten those things off. But it's quite interesting.

There's another one that might belong on the old Primary Scale, by the way, is "Displease." Apparently, it's a very general button. "Approve" and "Displease" – they – they're apparently very powerful buttons, from way back. All we're doing is culling off of our experience, you see, of about eleven years now – culling back things that, generally would move cases and – though they become the Primary Scale.

You got some interesting things, though, on the old – the old Tone Scale. And one of them is, if you put somebody on the E-Meter – this won't happen with every case, I suppose. This only happened with those cases which I have put on the E-Meter when I happened to think about it and asked them about enthusiasm.

It's almost a rock slam question on almost any case, apparently. I mean, ask them about enthusiasm – their reaction to enthusiasm. I haven't put too many cases on, but I have noticed some odd needle responses to this single thing – enthusiasm.

It isn't the responses you would ordinarily believe should be, to enthusiasm. This is what's shocking about it, you see? This individual, apparently, responds very easily to enthusiasm – but gets a rock slam when you mention it to him, you see? But there are some oddball reactions on the old Tone Scale which, of course, do that.

And naturally, the Tone Scale is a denominator of human behavior. And we now have a great deal of technology on the old Tone Scale, and so forth.

And I don't see, in actual practice, the levels of Emotion and Misemotion leading very many cases off into the old Tone Scale. So it's not a very effective detour, you see. It's – the Tone Scale kind of would be a sub-Primary, not a Secondary, you know? I mean, it's – it falls in that category. Well, the easiest way to get it in there is just put it in the Primary.

I think the Primary Scale could probably get up to about three hundred words without getting too desperately in your hair. I would rather it stayed below a hundred. If you think

that this is getting terribly long, it's because you're taking too long – your comm lags are too long on reading the E-Meter.

For instance, Dick was watching me the other night run a Primary Scale assessment and it didn't take very long, did it? I let the pc respond, heavily. I gave the pc ample time to respond. Considered it from all angles. Actually gave the pc time to even have a secondary reaction. And ran a Primary Scale. I think the first run on the thing was probably something on the order of about oh, about 110 seconds for the whole run. And I was doing it slowly. Under two minutes, probably.

You see, if you don't get that needle reaction in a tenth of a second, you haven't got anything And the more you let your pc talk, the more body motion you have to sort out and the more latent reactions you get. So, apparently the best way to assess, when all is said and done, is the way I was doing it in the first place.

The pc sits down and – you're always doing that to me, making me detour off to something I know works for me. The pc sits down and you say, "Shut up!"

And you aren't talking to the pc anyhow, you're not assessing the pc, you're assessing a reactive bank, don't you see?

And you say, "Now shut up." Oh, you say it politely, of course. You say, "Now, you don't have to answer any of these questions I'm asking you or acknowledge any of these things. Just sit there and pay some attention to

what I'm saying and shut up!"

And then you go off, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, just reading your levels, at about that speed, you know? Bark, bark, bark. If you haven't got a reaction in a tenth of a second, you aren't going to get one anyhow. What takes you time is, having found a reaction, you have to make a notation on your paper.

Now, you read the whole thing, from the bottom to the top – Faith being at the bottom. And you go on up to the top of the scale and then you've made certain marks. Not "one and one-thousandth divisions fall," or anything like this. You've just made a pencil-touch.

You can use up an awful lot of mimeographed sheets like this, but who cares. I stretch a mimeographed sheet by going it over one time with dots. I'll assess a pc with dots and I'll notice that this sheet is pretty gummy with dots, so the next time I will assess the next pc with circles. Do you see?

When they react on a thing a second time, I put down a – first time, I put down a circle. When they react on the second time, I'll put down a circle. If they react a third time, I'll put down another circle after the level, you see?

And I notice this thing's getting gummy with dots and circles, so now I assess the next one with X's. The test of the sheet is, whether or not I can still read the scale itself. You don't get lost doing this.

So anyhow, you read them just from the bottom to the top. Of course, it's – the scale is arranged backwards, so that's easy to do, Faith being at the bottom. And you go bark, bark, bark. That one reacted so you put a dot. Bark, bark, bark – just reading your levels, you see?

By the way, you look at the sheet and pick up the word and then look at the meter and bark. You got the idea? See? You don't look at the sheet and read the level and then look at the meter to see if you get a reaction. Because, actually, the reactions you want will have probably be gone by the time you looked up.

You look at the sheet, you read the level to yourself and say it at the meter. Don't say it till your eyes are on the needle. It give you an odd sensation the first few times you do it, you know? You feel like you're double-duplicating a something or other, you know?

You read – you read "Faith" to yourself – you see, "Faith" to yourself and then you look at the meter and say "Faith," you know? "Cause." It's like reading elocution lessons to a fast-talker. Anyway, that's the fast way to do it. And don't say the word till you get your eye on the needle. And if it doesn't react within a tenth of a second, you simply read the next one.

If the needle agitates, however, on some secondary or latent reaction or something like that, why, you let it settle down again, which it'll do in a moment or two.

So what you really are doing – let me put this exactly straight. You look at the level, so that you know what level to say. And then you look at the meter, see that the needle is quiet or only rising Say the level. See if there's a reaction within a tenth of a second. And if there isn't one within three quarters of a second, look back at your paper, pick up the next level and so forth.

And if there is a reaction, you merely touch your pencil to the Prehav sheet that you are using at that point, making a dot, a circle, some other symbol that won't tangle you up.

When you get to the top of the list – remember you're assessing a reactive mind and boy, does a reactive mind react. Why does it react? Well, it reacts because there's no time in it, that's why. There's an electrical charge, but no time. Time is jammed in the reactive mind a hundred percent. All right.

So therefore, wait for a second, you'll get the latent read. You've now got a reading on something else! Now, you go chasing that down and we've just got a case that is going to take seventy-five hours on one Joburg. A seventy-five hour run on one time through on a Joburg. Now what is that auditor doing

Oh, yes, he's getting all, all kinds of things. And he isn't doing the case any harm. But he also is not following down the center of the road. He's driving over to see the outskirts. And he's looking at the cathedral. And he's looking at the place where the ashman was buried and, and that's where the witches were martyred and so on. And he – having a good time going down to the river to see what they're catching down there. And he hasn't anything to do with getting an assessment done. He's running a paid – or an unpaid tour of Irrevelancia, which is a country that auditors sometimes like to explore.

The latent read – the read that occurs within one second, or within three seconds, or within five seconds of after you say anything – whether a Security Check question or a level or a goal or anything else – is a related read. It is not a read on what you have said. It is a related read and it is only related. And no matter how many ways you slice the cake or crumble the cookie, it turns out that you have gone on a self-conducted tour of Irrevelancia.

Oh, it does a case a lot of good. You say, "Have you ever stolen any cats?" And the pc says, "Hmmmm..." – *clang*. You have now read an analytical response. The theft of cats is in the analytical sphere. Why explore it? Since it's explored! This is something like everybody going over the footsteps of Columbus to find out what he discovered, you know? The pc has already been there. There's probably not even much charge on it.

So Irrevelancia would now present this interesting scenery:

"Well, I had an aunt once who stole a cat."

"Oh. Oh, I see."

Now, if you're really in Irrevelancia, even wearing the uniform of the day in Irrevelancia, why you inevitably, of course, ask the next question, which is "Well, that – did that give you any idea that you had stolen any cats?" "What kind of cats were they that your aunt used to steal?" Or better still, "Did you know your aunt very well?"

Now you're not on even – you're not even in the State of Irrevelancia. You are over there beyond the border into nothing but Dispersal. And the State of Dispersal is poorly governed at best.

So, here is where you are – here's where you belong, is on that tenth of a second boulevard. And you'll find out, "Did you steal any cats?" . . . twitch. "What was that?"

"Well, I had an aunt once that stole some cats."

"Well, what was your aunt's name?"

Now, this is a 75-, 125-hour, one coverage of the Joburg. As compared to this:

"Have you stolen any cats?"

"Have you eaten any bonbons?"

And the pc says, "On the subject of cats . . ."

And you say, "Yes, what about cats?" Mustn't go out of two-way comm with your pc. Purely courtesy. "Yeah, what about cats?"

"I just happened to think, I haven't stolen any cats. It was my aunt that stole some cats."

You say, "Thank you. Thank you very much. Now about these bonbons. . . Good."

"Have you any illicit diamonds bought?"

Here we go, see? It's just bang – bang – bang. Wait for the needle to settle. Read the question – bang. Here's the question, question, question.

And you find, all of a sudden, the 199-pound wins are all in your lap. The State of Irrelevancy is not well explored and the State of Dispersal has been totally ignored and left to its own congress and president.

All right? You see how you do these things right? I don't know what got me started on that, but that's – you can get an awful lot of auditing done on instant needle response.

So get these two terms down, because you're going to have to criticize them in students left and right, center – HGC auditors left, right and center. When you see them again – Ds of Ps – sneer!

The person says, "Well, here's this case and he's been twenty-seven and a half hours here on this Joburg."

Seiten 68 und

69 fehlen!

away now. If I can just show him a few more fish underneath this bridge, we'll sit here a-a-all day!”

And an auditor is, actually, tremendously respected by a pc if he simply says, “Well, very good. How's that seem to you? All right. Is it all right if we go on with the session?”

“Yes. Well, I . . . it's all right.”

“Now, have you any illicit diamonds bought?” Obviously expecting this, you see? *Boom*!

Yeah, I was head of the ring for twelve years.

Now, you're getting auditing done, don't you see?

Every valence fights for survival. The pc can do nothing but survive. The valence can perish. And so, learneth and runneth the lesson of lifeth. And whenever you have anything struggling for survival, it is not the pc. It is the valence.

So, you have somebody saying, “Put me down, put me down, put me down. Because, if you – if you just ask two more questions, I'm getting off . . . And – and this pain um – and the head, y – is – ah – uh – gosh! Uh, you know? And – and uh, so forth and I just don't want . . .”

And when you get all these things, you couldn't possibly be looking at the pc. That's all there is to it. You're seeing a struggle for survival of aberration. Because nobody can stay around us very long without finding that willy-nilly, they do get better. And if they don't easily learn this lesson, why, it's just a valence struggling one way or the other.

I'm not now trying to give us anything that's self-congratulatory or an easy way out. We don't need any alibis. But where we see the red herrings being pitched, the pc is very often doing it against his will. And is saying to himself, “I really shouldn't be doing this to this auditor.”

But if the pc is a very clever pc and he is a very smart pc and this valence that he is wearing is notably well educated into the roads and byroads – in fact wrote the guidebook; wrote the guidebook for the State of I:>ispersal – he will take advantage of his auditor.

And sometimes he does it so persuasively and so convincingly that anybody is sidetracked. And it looks so good. And from the moment that this occurs, on through, you don't get any auditing done. And it's just a waste of time, even though it seems like something's going on.

And there's where your Releases and Clears are going. It's just on that one basis. And on that one basis only. The auditor is being taken advantage of by a reactive valence which is struggling for survival.

Now, there is a very interesting thing about auditing: is you must keep the reactive valence quiet enough and give it no motivators by which it can object. That is the rest of the game. And the Auditor's Code is totally devoted to keeping the valence unwarned, giving it no motivators, so that its survival does not feel challenged. You got it?

And if you do that, all of a sudden the fellow says, "What am I doing sitting here wearing this trash heap? That's an interesting thing to be wearing! How fascinating. By golly, I've gone along for the last several million years wearing a trash heap and everybody said it was a Paris hat."

So, here's the conflict that is going on all the time. It looks so very funny, but actually the pc gets most upset by the auditor's failure to take care of – bulldoze through the case. And that is where a pc's real upset with an auditor occurs. It's something to remember. If you're going to get a pc that's going to be ARC breaky, it is because the pc has lost confidence.

In other words, the valence sat up and said, "Red herrings, red herrings, red herrings. Look under the bridge, look under the bridge," and the auditor looked under the bridge.

And the pc says, "Oh, God, am I going to spend another eight hundred trillion years in this ash heap?" See? And that's the ARC break.

You watch it. The auditor fails to push the pc through something. And then, you just watch that pc for the next few sessions. And it may take him a few sessions to become unmanageable, but he will.

Why don't I get in more trouble with pcs? When I audit pcs who are recalcitrant – I don't advise you to do this sort of thing, but the pc blew the session and was *en route* to the door – did you ever see one of these adagio dances? Well, I didn't bother to get out of my chair. I just reached up, grabbed the pc, whirled the pc around once. The pc went back in the chair, *crash*. And I repeated the auditing question and never mentioned the incident.

The pc went square into session again, answered the question and we went on as before and we didn't hear any more talk about blowing. And quite in addition to that, the pc made a real gain in that session.

I didn't even say, "Hey, you, come back here." I didn't even validate the valence that much, you see? I just reached out with my right hand, grabbed the pc, spun the pc around once and sat her back in the chair – boom! And asked the next auditing question. Wasn't even any misemotion involved with it. And the valence sort of said, "Well, send for the stonecutters. I's gonna need a tomb. I has met mah match." And that was it.

But supposing I had let the pc get out the door. The pc would have been mad at me from there on. Because I pulled an ARC break? No, because there was no ARC break. Nothing caused this but my insistence that the pc answer an auditing command, which was highly uncomfortable. I wasn't even insisting. I just gave the pc the auditing command.

The auditing command was very uncomfortable and the pc said, *"Nyah-nyah-nyah-yap-yap-yap-yap."*

And I said, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

And the pc flung herself out of the chair, went to the door, found herself back in the chair again. I repeated the auditing command. The pc answered it. And the session went on and all was beautiful. And there was no three hours and seventy-five minutes devoted to clearing up the ARC break with the pc.

I cleared the ARC break up with the pc by giving the next auditing question, by showing that as an auditor I was perfectly willing to handle the situation and take responsibility for my environment and see that the pc got some auditing. And that was what I was there for and that's what I did, see? Without any apologies.

And you'll find out, this approach to auditing has a certain deadly certitude about it which penetrates through the most knuckleheaded valences, but which must never happen with any misemotion. It's just positiveness. It's just certainty. You want the pc to do that. You are certain the pc is going to do that. And when the pc does that and the pc makes a gain, the valence loses.

And when you don't approach it with certainty and when you don't approach it with – well, you sort of approach it nebulously and, "I'm going to patch it all up. And I'm going to be very, very careful here. And I – I hope I didn't offend you terribly by – by throwing you halfway across the room while you were trying to get away under 8-C. And – and I – I hope not and – and so – so forth . . ." You're "kinding" the pc to death.

And you're just patting that valence on the head and saying, "Good valence, you're dangerous. Good valence, you're dangerous. You know, I think you really should survive, valence, because you're so dangerous. And it's very difficult, you know, to handle you, valence. And you're very, very difficult to handle."

And I never believed this. So the valence never gets a chance to believe it. The valence says, "Well, I've had it!" And the pc says, "Well, thank God!" It's just a difference of auditing certainty.

And you'll find this instant-readed approach boosts up that appearance of certainty. And the valence sits up and says, "Oh, no! Here I've been out of this bottle for eighteen trillion years and nobody's found me out yet. And here is a guy and there – he just keeps sawing away chunks of smoke. Do you suppose this fellow I have overwhumped here, totally and one hundred percent, is actually going to get away from me? Hmm!" Valence ceases to activate.

The more you audit apologetically, the more weakly, the less certainly you audit, the more you validate the pc's circuits and their power. And if you know what you are doing, if

you know your business, you don't have to be rough and tough. It simply communicates to the pc, while you are auditing the pc, in terms of certainty. And when that certainty goes through, it goes straight through to the pc. And the valences he's got and all this nonsense – they're just invalidated like mad. You're trying to validate the pc and invalidate the valences. And that's all there is to good auditing.

I've seen occasionally, in an ACC, I all of a sudden will get very enthusiastic. And I'll go around and hit all the auditors in the back of the head, practically – you've seen me do it – and say, "Go on in there. Go on in there. Ask him now and don't pay any attention to that. Just ride that thing through. Come on," and that sort of thing.

And the auditors sit up and start to audit for blood, you know? Just real, dripping gore. They – they want raw meat. And the valences all say, "Well, we've been sitting here getting away with this – God! Look what's happen – *uhngh*!"

And they just start running up little dirty handkerchiefs, you see, as white flags and so forth. And you don't even pay any attention to that. Don't even let them surrender. Just blow the fort apart. It's very unnerving to a valence.

And all of a sudden we've got tremendous case changes. We just get a tremendous resurge of cases and so forth, as long as we persuade through that attitude of auditing. "Go to it, terrier! We know it's a long deep hole, but you can make it."

And all of a sudden, the auditor sits right there, you see, and the pc's been saying, "Well, that's – these chairs are awfully hard and the cats are crawling all over the roof. And you keep answering – asking these embarrassing questions," and all of this sort of thing.

And the auditor keeps saying, "Well, I'm awfully sorry, but you see, I'm being made to do it. And I'm not taking any real responsibility for the session here, because they're forcing me to do it. And the Instructor is really auditing you. I am not."

No gains occur. Why? Because the whole thing is devoted to the validation of a false valence which is interested in survival. Okay?

All right. There being no other questions before the house, I think we had better abscond. Thank you very much.