CHECKING CASE REPORTS

A lecture given on
8 November 1961

Now, this is what? The 8th of Nov. 61.

Yeah. A hundred years ago, man and boy, I was just getting out of VMI and joining the Confederate army as a young, dashing second lieutenant. Well, times change! Now, we are hitting a beachhead of a different character.

Okay, 8 November 61, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And you have never seen me do any of your case reports of one kind or another. And I'm going to go over these case reports. And that's going to step on some of your toes, and that's going to let your pc in on what I think of you as the auditor, and that's probably going to upset the pc because he will say in tomorrow's session, "Well, Ron said . . ."

But I think it might be a little bit educational to you if you saw how this was done and so I made up my mind that I had better make a lecture on this particular subject at this time. All right?

Okay. Now, usually these things have a Sec Check in them, but the Sec Checks have already been marked and so we're not going to do any Sec Checks because tonight's Sec Check has not yet been done. We are just going to do the daytime auditing.

And this is Routine 3A is what is being embarked upon here and we've got a Routine 3A started on many people whose goals have already been found but who have to yet have the modifier found which may mean some variation or change in terminal, but not necessarily.

Sometimes you get the modifier and you get the same terminal and sometimes you don't. But let's take up some of these reports and see what happened today.

Now, this is a report here, Fred Fairchild auditing Carl Wilson, and he says that, "This modifier was not checked out and the auditor didn't see the notice. And should it be checked straightaway. And pc's attention will now be on terminal."

Well, that all depends on whether or not it *is* the modifier. And as far as checking out is concerned, it's always a pretty good idea to get somebody else to check something out. See? It doesn't – you shouldn't get this down as a special Saint Hill routine that takes place nowhere else. If you find a goal or a terminal or a level or something like that – not so much a level, but certainly a goal, and in this particular case a goal, modifier, terminal – whether you get

them checked out every time you find each piece or before you start in desperation to do a run, get the goal, the modifier and the terminal checked out, all at one time; certainly get it checked out by somebody. It doesn't matter whether you are here or someplace else.

Why? It gives you a certain amount of confidence. Somebody else has taken a look at the thing. It has given you some sort of a feeling that you won't be going off the deep end when you start auditing it. It's a good thing to do, don't you agree?

Now, similarly, every time rudiments cross-checking, see, has been done, cases have made very nice progress. So in an HGC or a center where a great deal of this – of goals running particularly and that sort of thing is going on, if rudiments are cross-checked, why, that would be a very good idea. But to have the Director of Processing cross-check every rudiment on every pc every day is, unfortunately, already indicative of a mess, because the D of P, Director of Processing, never gets a chance to do anything else.

Now, we've already had one tied up in Washington, DC. I didn't realize that they had him strapped to the chair checking rudiments, strapped to the chair checking rudiments. He never got anything else checked. Never got any cases run or anything important like that and his administration dropped behind gorgeously. Well, a much better solution was just to have staff auditors check staff auditors' rudiments, that's all.

The best time to check rudiments, by the way, is midday – not beginning of the day. Why? Well, it works like this: The first auditor the fellow gets that day. . . See, he's all grogged up, and his basal metabolism is by the boards, and he has got eighteen present time problems, and he is anxious to unload his case, and he hasn't had much auditing lately anyhow – all these things in a sort of a monotone. He isn't too familiar with any of the auditors in this center anyway, and auditor Doakes walks in and sits down in the auditor's chair. That's the pc's auditor for the day, that's it.

Although he then gets up and leaves. You see? You get the idea? In other words, first crack out of the box, all of his anxieties and worries, that he's been thinking up all night are in – he wants to unload these things on the auditor and he's put on wait by another auditor so he can elect that auditor – he can elect that auditor his auditor, and all that auditor is doing is checking his rudiments.

So end of session, or in the middle of an auditing day, or something like that, is a better time to get a rudiments cross-check. In this particular case, the smartest thing to do here, of course, would be to go ahead and find the goal. See? We have no great suspicion of this particular auditor, and just let's let him go ahead. He's got the modifier, the pc's attention is now going to be on the goal – well, there's various reasons why the modifier might not get checked out properly – well, just let him go ahead and find the terminal. And now let's check out the goal, modifier and terminal. Let's get somebody else to check out goal, modifier and

terminal before we run anything on it and then we've got a sweeping checkout. That would save time anyway.

So, you could either check them out one at a time as they're found, which of course – if you're operating with very tyro auditors, who are – you know, they're looking at the meter and they say, "Now, let's see. This is the tone arm and when the word 'Hubbard' turns red . . ." It's a good idea to check out their rudiments three times every session, check out their E-Meter, set their E-Meter so it will read on the proper readings, and hold their hand while they audit. You see, all these things would be there. And to check out the goal when it is found, the modifier when it is found, the terminal when it is found, the Prehav level when it is found and the Prehav level checked every time it is changed. All of these things would be desirable.

But what are you doing? You're adjusting the amount of checking you are doing to the quality of the auditor. Right?

Well, the limiter on this is that before anybody runs anything desperate – you know he actually *runs* this terminal and so on; any auditor, even me – it would be a nice thing to have somebody else look it over, you know and say, "Well, it checks out! It checks out all the way with me too." Why? Well, actually, one auditor and another auditor can have different effects upon the pc that can throw the case one way or the other. You see?

Rudiments come under this heading exclusively. Rudiments. Well, rudiments can be in for Joe and out for Mary any day of the week, you see?

So if you have two auditors checking the rudiments of the pc, you know pretty well you're not going to be running the pc with rudiments out. So that has very little to do with auditing skill. It has a great deal to do with a pc's reaction to male, female, auditors with blond hair, auditors with green hair – all these differences, you see. Has a great deal to do with where the pc is being audited, too. It's always better to check a pc's rudiments in *another* auditing room; but this isn't convenient.

Sounds wild but it's true. It isn't convenient. Of course, you do get him set for the exact auditing room he is in if you check his rudiments *in* that auditing room where he is going to be audited. But of course, you would detect it much more rapidly that a case's havingness was by the boards if his havingness was out in *any* room. That point, you could labor far too much.

The point is that on the broad things, before you commit yourself to a long run, you should get checked out the things that have been assessed. Now, whether they're checked out one at a time or whether they're checked out all at once has very little to do with it except this: that inexperienced auditors – auditors who haven't got very much experience – will waste an awful lot of time on the wrong – on finding the modifier for the wrong goal, and then finding the wrong terminal for the wrong goal and modifier.

They waste a lot of time. And by the time they have found, then, the wrong Prehav Scale for the preclear – not the Prehav level but the Prehav Scale; they've got the . . . It can go pretty far wild. So whether you check them piece by piece is determined pretty well as to what auditor skill is present. And this auditor's skill, of course, is good. So we would just let it go, let him go ahead and find the terminal and go on. So I'll just mark this thing: "Find terminal and get goal, modifier, terminal checked out."

All right. Now, that's enough for that.

"And the modifier that dropped and react – or reacted most and stayed in: 'But it's someplace else.'" That's a doll. That's an absolute doll. That's a perfect type of modifier. That is a classic case. "But it's someplace else." Of course, a person goes down the line and he gets to this phrase "But it's someplace else" so he never enunciates it. See, that's a nice one.

That's interesting because I was interested in this particular case. I take an awful lot of interest in these cases as pure interest. If you don't mind. And I wondered and wondered what this particular goal . . . May I say what this goal is?

Male voice: Yes, go ahead.

But I wondered and wondered what was going to modify this particular goal, because every time the pc came toward this particular goal, he kind of – sparks flew out of his ears. He didn't like this one, see? And I wondered and wondered what it would be. It's "to work on radiant energy and field phenomena." And the modifier's – is – doesn't make too much – well, it makes sense, but it – "but it's someplace else." So, of course, you can't work on something that is someplace else. And that's apparently what has been falling and what's made this goal hang up. And you get this, that here you've got an ambition to work on radiant energy and field phenomena, which is counterbalanced with the fact that you can't because it's someplace else. So, of course, this locks up every place the goal is applied because it doesn't have anything to reach, but it is actually balanced. That's a textbook example. That's very nice.

And whether it's the right one or not *is* – whether it's the right one or not, he said, "He had been telling me that he didn't think anything would happen in the sessions, and I noticed this session he seemed to be more in-session and didn't say this." Okay. Interesting. Were you interested in that particularly?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Okay, regardless of all that, we've got a terminals list started on this and here we have – here we have now a goal, modifier, and we get a terminals list and we get all three of them checked out. So that's it.

The other thing I always look for: Was there any TA action? Now, you normally look for TA action on the thing during the run. you look down the line here and find out what the TA action was. And because he was too interested in the assessment the auditor, here, wasn't

putting down very much TA read. Ordinarily on a run you put down lots of TA read and on assessments you sometimes flub it. It's a good indicator. So put down lots of TA reads; only err on the side of – always put down enough tone arm reads.

Says, "It was varying from 2.5 to 2.0." The tone arm was varying from 2.0 to 2.25 on his – beginning of his Terminal Assessment. I guess that's what that is.

All right. Now, this general case run here appears to be all right. I was just looking here. you always look up at the top. you see "Goals: none," you know very well that a pc is running with rudiments a bit out, with withholds, with an ARC break – something like that. A pc who tells you they have no goals for a session, and so forth, they must be sitting in some kind of a bit of an ARC break. See, so on that adjudication I would write down here: "Get your rudiments in." See? It's very clever crystal-balling on my part. Pc has no goals for a session . . .

There's certain little rules that you follow along these lines. It's like reading profiles. I can look at a profile and tell you whether or not the pc's havingness is up or down, whether the pc has found the auditor or not. Has nothing to do with the textbook about the profiles. It has a great deal to do with something else.

Okay. The pc, of course, feels a little bit bounced around and is having a little bit of a rough time but I have every confidence that he'll straighten out on it and recover. Okay?

Okay. Mary Sue generally, lately – she used to do these mostly by herself And she'd sit up till four, five or six o'clock in the morning – that's an exaggeration; it was only three-thirty usually – and she would sit there and do these things all by herself And as soon as I spotted the fact that we did have a breakthrough here and I could shove your cases and your auditing much, much harder, I started to do these things individually a short time ago. I'd always been interested in them and spot-checked them and kept an eye on it and took them up with Mary Sue. But she lately has been relaxed enough to be able simply to hand me the folders. She's very good at that.

You know why she's very good at that? Because believe it or not, she can tell me the goal and the terminal and the levels run and what process is being run on and what Sec Check is being run on any case out of twenty-six just like that.

Female voice: Very good.

It's fantastic, you know. Almost as good as I used to be. I used to remember every engram verbatim that I ever ran off of a pc. And I could tell them years later, and they'd stagger, you know.

They'd come in and they'd – somebody I hadn't seen for years, you know, but I audited them years ago – and I'd say, "How are you getting along?"

"Oh, I'm getting along fine."

Say, "Well, did you ever hear any more about that birth sequence?"

"What birth sequence?"

"You know, the one that I audited, you know, where the doctor was wearing the green hat."

"By George! You know. . ." pc had forgotten it but I didn't.

All right. We had Doris Lambright being audited by Ellen Carter. Well, we've got goals here: "To blow off a headache and confusion blowing around my head," and so forth; and evidently they made the goal some better. "To be able to duplicate tapes on one hearing," "to pass tests quickly and easily," and so forth. Good. "To be Clear and finish the course," and "Finish course by January 1st and get back for the congress." Okay. Very good. Okay. I don't see what this is all about here. Apparently Wing Angel – apparently – audited this pc at some time or another and the pc was hung up in it in some fashion.

The way you'd get that, by the way, is to clip the prior confusion, not the auditing. What was the confusion that *preceded* this. you know, you find what's wrong with the pc and then you get the prior confusion. You know? You get the confusion before it. Don't go monkeying around too much with this sort of thing.

And I don't know whether the auditor did anything about this or not, but that would have been the proper thing to have done. May have started when this auditor was auditing her. Well, there might have – must have been a prior confusion to the turn-on. It might have been a minute before and it might have been five years before but it's *prior.* That you're sure of.

So spotting the prior confusion to that would have clipped it out. And you, at your stage of training, could consider this as a fairly routine activity. You find the pc is worried about something in the rudiments, and that sort of thing. And they've had some kind of a somatic and ever since, such-and-so. And ever since their great-grandmother died, and so forth, on the sacrificial altar, or whatever it is, why, they've had this somatic. You can get the prior confusion, you know. Well, what happened before that? Do a little tiny bang-bang-bang Sec Check on the thing and blow it. And you can get very clever at that and if you can get very clever at that, you will pull some miracles off that kind of look wild to other people.

By the way, it's – the British auditor is reaching a new low for me. Do you realize that Charlie Drake, the comedian, lost his memory a couple of weeks ago? Still lost!

Who hasn't been up knocking on his door and doing a Touch Assist on his skull? The easiest thing you could possibly do! Now, a Touch Assist, of course, violates this prior confusion. Those are not hard words; that's just a joke. But I should think that somebody by this time would have gone up to BBC and found out where they could find Charlie Drake and gone over and done a Touch Assist on him.

We did one here just a few days ago – boy was seeing triple, wasn't – couldn't remember very much and was mostly blathering. Did a Touch Assist on him for an hour and a half, I think, or a couple of hours – for two . . .

Male voice: Two and a half, but it had cleared up on two.

Two hours or . . . ? Yeah.

Male voice: Two hours.

Yeah, just did a Touch Assist on him. His triple vision turned off and that sort of thing. You can do miracles like this.

Well, that actually is addressing the time. See? That violates this prior confusion thing. But, of course, it's the best thing you can do. And if there's anything left after the Touch Assist, there must have been a prior confusion that is still holding it up, but it's marvelous that a Touch Assist can get rid of as much as it does.

But you at any time – that exact thing, that we – on this workman here – done on this Charlie Drake and his memory would be back, you know, right now. It's not even a hard job, you know, I mean, what the heck. The hardest job would be going to find the taxicab to go over to his house. That would be the toughest job.

But finding any kind of a rudiment out or any kind of a somatic that the pc is desperately worried about or that sort of thing – you can take a slap at it, you know, on a prior confusion basis. You know, you find it out in the rudiments and you decide you're going to do something about it. The fastest way to do something about it is just take a couple of fast sweeps on O/W on the prior confusion and it's liable to blow right now. And it's quite quick; it's quite quick.

All right. Now, we're doing some kind of a Goals Assessment here. Start the Goals Assessment and we've still got that. And we found the pc's confront process, "What's the emotion of . . .?" And we're still doing a Goals Assessment and it's carrying on here. And this Goals Assessment is apparently prepared for very well. she started the session and did goals and then came back to and ran: "Who left a Sec Check question unflat?"

"We found out it wasn't a Sec Check question; it was just a nosy question, just before the pc left home and withheld the answer. Somatics lightened up. 'What's the emotion of that object?'"

I don't read this – I don't dig this at all. why have we got: "What's the emotion of that object?" That's a Havingness process – and then the Alternate Confront? I see; I get it. And this is Alternate Confront. And those two, and checking goals, and they're all null. And then it got Alternate Confront and "What's the emotion?" and so forth. Ah! Well, we've got a rather standard auditor problem staring us in the teeth here: The goals all nulled and the needle is rising and the tone arm is 3.75 and so forth.

I wonder how many auditors between now and the turn of the century will be at this exact desperate point of the track. The goals list has been handed over and the goals are all null.

All right. Well, let's get magical, shall we? Let's get magical about the whole thing. This is very tough.

And, by the way, you shouldn't use these report sheets to write goals lists on. Goals lists go on white pieces of paper and they get clipped together and they don't get separated and left on little bits.

Sheets. Get some long, white sheets; don't use these things. And whenever you have a goals list, clip it together because a goals list is valuable – particularly, the first goals list of the pc is very valuable. Clip it and file it and guard it with your life. He doesn't care about it but you do.

What are you going to do for the second Goals Assessment? Dig in here and find little bits of paper all through the pieces of report? Oh, no, you're not. you clip them together, okay? And make them look good.

Now, you've got a Goals Assessment and they all went null. How many goals have we got? This is also a poor job from the standpoint of – the goals are not numbered. The goals are not all numbered! Ooo! And the goals are numbered in two different number sequences. Ohhh, Ellen! This is the kind of thing I say at two o'clock in the morning: "If I could just get ahold of Ellen now . . ."

Now – now, you take your goals list, and you better recopy this whole goals list in your own script on a long white sheet. And you better put a date at the top of the thing and you better number every goal consecutively so I could look on here, or anybody else, and say, "We are down to this many goals. And the total summation of goals amounts to 199 goals," or whatever the thing is. Because we just look at the last number on the sheet and we see 199. We know that many goals. We already have enough numbers here scattered around – some numbered goal 60, some numbered goal 33, others numbered also goals 20. There's – I think you have several goal 17s here. I don't know whether you do or not. But auditor bookkeeping these days is – yes, you do have. There are two goal 17s. We don't know what this pc is up to, but I would say offhand that this pc is up to about – you know, anybody's guess.

"Oh, well, Ron can do this kind of thing; so go ahead and do it to him." One – I can – I'm very good at cryptography. This is well written by the way. But some of your auditor reports – I have a little microscope and I get it out and I read – you think I'm kidding!

Well, I don't think this is enough goals.

Female voice: I don't think that it is.

No, you haven't got enough goals here. And now, that's a main point. You have to get up to – if goals are giving you any trouble at all, get up to at least a 150, 200. Get up into that range before you start worrying too much about it. But probably this has not been shaken down. I can tell you everything that's wrong with this case. I'll just rattle it off: (1) The rudiments are out. (2) An insufficient number of goals has been taken from the pc. (3) The pc at some earlier time has done a goals list. That's a guess. Is that right?

Female voice: Yeah.

Where is that list?

Female voice: I don't know. I did it one time on a train and I . . .

Where is it?

Female voice: . . . threw it away.

Who threw it away?

Female voice: Me. It was never used. It was one I did on a train one time. One you did on a train.   Female voice: Yeah, I didn't have anything. . .

You sure it is thrown away?

Female voice: I'm not positive. It could be home somewhere. I didn't look. Yeah. There you are. was my guess right? Her goals list was done on a train and has probably been thrown away. Her goal is probably on *that* list and has never been repeated and will never again be repeated anyplace so we just might as well throw . . .

I'm not joking. I'm not joking, really. When they do an original goals list and they write the whole thing out, they're talking turkey. After that, they're worrying. And the primary goal that you're after has the best chance of all goals of submerging and never being repeated on a subsequent list. Isn't that interesting?

There's nothing you can do about it, so we just might as well scratch the pc.

"(1) Ruds out. (2) Get more goals off meter. And (3). . ." Now, you got any suggestion, Ellen, as to how we could do that?

Female voice: Get more goals?

No, no, no, no. How we can get over this point (3) of the original list having been destroyed. Is there any way we could get over that?

Female voice: Can see if she can locate it.

Hm?

Female voice: I can find out if she can locate it.

Yeah, but supposing it's been destroyed; let's just assume it's been destroyed: Is there anything else we can do about it?

Female voice: Yes, using the meter to see if I can get her to recall them.

Yeah, that's right. Let's get her to duplicate the list by meter which will be a nice piece of metering for you. "Is there any other goal on that list that you have not put on subsequent lists?" Until you finally get all fall out of it. But to do that you'll have to get your rudiments severely in and keep them in and you will have to get everything that appeared on the original list, okay?

"Get original list off meter." Okay?

Now, I'll put down here: "Sorry to call you to account in front of class. Best, Ron."

All right. In that event I'll just put "Best, Ron."

Okay. Now, here we are and we have Constantine being audited by John Sears. And here we have Routine 3A. Right.

I wonder – I wonder if this goal still falls. Does this goal still fall, "To be myself?"

Male voice: Yeah.

Does it check out and fall?

Male voice: Yeah.

What do you know. How long did it take you to get that? Forty-five minutes?

Male voice: Yes, about that much.

Interesting.

Male voice: we had a very short list, too.

Yeah. A very short list.

All right. Now, we've got to get a modifier for this and let's see how far we have progressed in the direction here. And he – he was still running a ten-way bracket and still running a ten-way bracket, and he ended rudiments and so forth. What date was this? This was clear back here. This – here's the 8th. What is this all about? Yes, here's the 8th. Yup, the goal was to find a modifier and so forth and so on. Modifier. There we are.

Now, he did a list of modifiers here. Where is the list of modifiers?

Male voice: Foolscap.

There – here we are! Here's a nice long list of modifiers. That's actually about three times as many modifiers as one would ordinarily have. Let me see what number this modifier might have been here.

Male voice: Five or six.

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. was it still shaking down by meter after number five? Were you taking – from number five on, were you still reading the meter, "Is there anything else will modify this?" and see if the meter knocked?

Male voice: oh, it was from about eighteen on that I was doing that.

Oh, yeah. And you were still getting a meter knock?

Male voice: oh, yeah, definitely.

Is that right?

Male voice: Very definitely.

All right. And you stripped it down and it got down to thirty-four?

Male voice: Yeah.

Of course, this is brand-new, this type – particular operation. All right. Well, we've got some idea. The meter went null at about thirty-four, huh?

Male voice: No, it went null before that, and the pc originated the others that are written at the tops of the pages.

Oh, I see.

Male voice: From about . . .

Oh, it's thirty-eight, thirty-nine.

Male voice: Yeah. That's right. From about eighteen to about thirty on the meter.

Yeah.

Male voice: The others originated.

I see. And the pc originated after the meter went null?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right. Okay. Very good. Well, we find it was modifier number five – which falls within my guess that they give it to you in the first five or ten. And it's, "In spite of other people trying to influence me," which is a perfectly valid modifier. That checked out, did it? Have you checked it out thoroughly?

Male voice: I checked it out, thoroughly. Yeah. It was . . .

Doesn't say so here.

Male voice: But the checker who checked it said that it was going in and out.

Female voice: It did not check out; others came alive. Didn't check out.

Didn't check! Didn't think it was. It seemed too reasonable. There's no denyer. One would look at it. I would – don't you dare add this as a modifier, now!

"To be myself in spite of not being here" or "to be myself although I am elsewhere." You get the modifier type of the thing. You have to kind of dig for those things. Sometimes they are hard to blow out. That would be a denyer type of modifier, don't you see?

I don't care, even if one of the two I have just said *is* his, he can't have it.

Okay. "Reassess, more modifiers." Yeah, well that was checked out and it was found to be going in and out and some of the others came live. So I would say, offhand, that there is a denyer on this thing that puts it out of view. And this "in spite of" is a kind of a denyer. It is a kind of a denyer, but there might be something else there that has something to do with it.

Now, you realize in checking these things out, something interesting is liable to occur. You're liable to blow the whole goal! Particularly on the second or third goal that you check out with the pc, you repeat the modifier and you repeat the goal. And then you repeat the modifier and you can't find it. And then you repeat the goal and you can't find it. And then you look for the terminal; then you try to get the rudiments in and they're all in. And you try to find the goal and the terminals. It's about time to listen to the pc: He's been saying it's been gone for some time.

So, that is not what occurred here. I'd, tomorrow, check the goal, huh?

Male voice: Yeah.

Check the goal. It's perfectly accurate but check it anyhow. Get how much it's falling and see if you can't get a modifier that falls like the goal is falling. You know, the goal falls like the modifier, falls like the terminal, falls like the level – or pardon me, I should have said "reacts" throughout.

The needle reaction of the goal is the same as the needle reaction for the modifier, and the needle reaction for the terminal is the same as the needle reaction for the goal. The needle reaction for the level will be the same. They all will, more or less, be the same. Sometimes *more!* You'll find you will sometimes get a *greater* reaction, but if you have a *less* reaction be suspicious.

If your reaction decreases and if it's sporadic and goes in and out, we haven't got it. There's something wrong here. Either the rudiments are out or the wording is not quite correct, and so forth.

I appreciate your difficulty in this particular case because you are dealing . . . Constantine speaks very excellent English, but his basic tongue is not English. And so when I'm doing one like that I almost always do it in the native tongue of the pc. Even though I couldn't write Greek these days to save my life. Get the idea?

Have him say it in Greek "to be myself," and then try this thing in Greek. Try the same goal, see if it stays in. See, we might be running the English off the top of it. you know something weird might be happening.

All of you, by the way, are language cases. You realize that? You've only been talking English for a very short period of time. Do you realize that? English is sort of a polyglot tongue. There is a civilization – there are two or three civilizations on the track, though, that do speak the same English that we speak, right now. They're backtrack, way, way backtrack and they talked English. Funny, isn't it?

It's very funny. You get back into that area with sonic, you know, and somebody is saying, "Hey boy, look out," you know? Usually it's in lingua spacia or something like that, you know. *"Polyga muga!" "Rrrr."*

I like those tongues, though, that are all gutturals. *"Ghlk." You* know, where that is a consonant – *"Glnk."*

All right. We got that taped? Yeah, all right.

Never be ashamed to be clever as an auditor. Just remember that, never be ashamed to be clever. Because you're being clever as an auditor, you're not being a squirrel.

A squirrel is doing something entirely different. He doesn't understand any of the principles so he makes up a bunch of them to fulfill his ignorance, foists them off on a pc and gets no place. And you know your fundamentals and you know what you're doing, and so forth, and you don't ever get clever about anything – what a knucklehead of an auditor you will be because you will run into impasses every now and then that – you'll say, "What's the textbook solution?" There was no textbook solution. There are textbook fundamentals but no textbook solution.

They tell an old gag – there's an old song in the Marines about this Marine private who went into the battle with a vim. And his name was McBin, I think, and he went into a battle with a grin because although he got killed, why, he had used the textbook solution. He died with a grin, that was it, because he'd used the textbook solution. Yeah. Well, don't go around dying with a grin just because you used the textbook solution, because that's just an effort to make me wrong.

No, you've got to be clever now and then. You've got to be very clever in checking some goals, some terminals, that sort of thing. You've got to be clever. And this modifier thing requires a certain degree of cleverness. After the pc has said to you, fifteen or twenty times, "Well, you keep asking me but I just can't reach it, you know?"

After the pc has said to you for fifteen or twenty times, ask him – just, you know, go get a big, blue spark and suddenly say, "Well, is the modifier 'that you can't reach it.' Is that it?"

"Well, yes, yes. I want to be a plumber but I can't reach it."

There are all these denyer bits, see. There's another gag you can get the modifier with, is you can run the goal. Run the goal both ways for a moment or two, and the modifier will show up if it's hard to get. you can take the goal and you can say well . . . Well, we'll say the goal was "to give myself up," or something like that. All right, the goal is "to give myself up." you run an auditing command something on the basis to "How would you give yourself up?" "How would somebody else give himself up?" Anything like that. Run it two ways just for a little while, and so forth, and then ask for the modifier and you'll come out at the other end with a good – well, a better look at the thing. Remember all – nearly all modifiers are denyers.

There's something else to know about this particular battle front, is – a pc goes into a sort of a numb games condition when he's ARC broke and he won't give up anything but he doesn't have any flexibility or fluidity of mind. In other words, his zones of attention are very short; they're very small. And if you get a pc into a sort of a knuckleheaded, wooden, "Well, I'll go along with it somehow" frame of mind, the amount of success you are going to have in getting that pc to reach anything is going to be very poor.

In other words, the livelier, the happier, the more cheerful, the more fluid or fluent a pc feels, why, the more likely you are to get a goal, get a terminal, get a modifier, you know, and so forth.

Pc is sitting there, glumly, "Well, I'll go ahead and be audited just because you say so." you know? Don't expect him to reach very much because he's sort of not extending himself. And sometimes it's a little bit worth your while to get a pc to extend himself slightly. Instead of just sitting there, a wound-up doll yourself and so forth, why, just have a discussion about all of this, you know.

Of course, in the process of the discussion you can invalidate him, break the Auditor's Code fifteen times and make him worse. If you find you're doing that, it's a better thing not to do anything. A wooden frame of mind is better than a completely gone one.

All right. Here we have Maxine Kozak auditing Jenny Edmunds and I am sure the pc will absolutely die in her tracks at my taking up this particular report because the goal is "not to be found out"; isn't it, Jenny?

Female voice: Yes.

Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. And we don't find anything here. We find the modifier is assessed and we've got several – the modifier: "not to be found out." Well, I don't know how this goes together. What have we got, another goal here? I have been wondering about this. I spent some – I was worried about this, as a matter of fact. How do we take this goal, "not to be found out,"

because "not to be found out" sounds more like a modifier than it does a goal. Now, did we ask this pc if there was any goal on the *front* end of it?

Female voice: Today.

Yeah.

Female voice: Yeah.

We did?

Female voice: Yeah.

Was there anything on the front end of this "not to be found out"? You know, "to be a plumber but not to be found out." Any goal on the front end of this? Is there? What is it?

Female voice: "To tell lies."

Yeah. "To tell lies and not be found out."

Female voice: Yes.

So, oh! What you've got written down here is the front end?

Female voice: Yeah!

That's how it makes sense.

Female voice: oh, yes. The whole list is. Yes.

Yeah. All right. You don't say so anyplace, see?

Female voice: "Not to be found out!"

No. "Not to be found out" is the modifier. You've got the goal. you did a Goals Assessment on top of the modifier.

Female voice: Yes, I realize that.

You see?

Female voice: Yes.

So these actually are goals and we've got the modifier up here: "Not to be found out."

Female voice: Yes.

All right. That's the modifier, and we already had that as a goal.

Female voice: Yes.

See? It wasn't a goal. And now we've got this other goal here. Do you mind if I – .

Female voice: Hm.

All right. She does mind – .

Female voice: I tell you, I don't.

Ha?

Female voice: I don't really.

You don't really?

Female voice: No.

All right. It's "To tell lies and not to be found out." And that's your goal-modifier sequence. Fascinating. I was concerned with that because I saw that, and I said, "Good heavens! We've got the modifier end of the line." Now, I held my breath because I didn't know whether or not we could easily get the goal end of the line. And I'm very, very glad you did. Hm?

Female voice: As soon as you said it last night I knew it was the modifier.

Oh, yeah? All right. Well, I'm very, very glad that we got that pair sorted out. That was a very good job. A very good job.

Yeah, this'll – there's only two or three here in this particular unit that I was concerned with and this was one of them. Very much so. And I thought, "What on earth is that one going to turn out to be?" Well, that was an excellent job.

Now, has it been checked out?

Female voice: No, it hasn't.

All right. We'll just say, "Get it checked." Very nice. Very nice. Well, apparently here, that was – went rather smoothly. Pc tended to have an ARC break here toward the end of session because of the rudiments. Pc was traveling along here all during this assessment at 2.5, 2.25, 2.75, and then all of a sudden on the rudiments went to 3.25, and then went to 3.0 and then stayed at 3.0. What was that all about?

Female voice: It was after the break. When she came back after the break, the tone arm went up.

She'd been figuring.

Female voice: Hm. Yes.

Something on that order. Been figuring or something like that. Do you think that was it?

Female voice: I asked her what it was.

Did you get it?

Female voice: No, I didn't get the tone arm down.

Yeah, well, I would show that up, wouldn't I, in front of God and everybody.

Female voice: It's okay.

When a pc's TA goes up during a break or between sessions, it's a very good thing to investigate it rather thoroughly.

All right. Well, you get it down for the next session. I think that's very nice. Okay. Stop worrying about that one.

Okay. Hm. Yeah. You're having a ball. All right. Now, I'm glad you put this one in my hands because this was the first one that was done and I gave this to Bob to sort out Jenny's goal and modifier.

All right. We had a goal running on this particular case and it was "to be a racetrack driver." And that goal was not – it was doing all right. The case kept hanging fire on the terminal "racetrack driver," and so forth. So I caused an assessment here and this caused an upset to the pc. The pc was quite upset to have another Goals Assessment or something like that done. And while we were scrambling around on it we got in here with this goal-modifier arrangement and the auditor promptly shook it out as a goal-modifier arrangement. May I say what it is?

Female voice: of course.

All right?

Female voice: Sure.

All right. "To be a racetrack driver, but a racetrack driver couldn't rule." That was what was missing off the end of it. And of course this makes a highly specialized terminal. Now, what does that terminal turn out to be? The terminal turns out to be – may I say it? – turns out to be Lucifer. Now, just why it does is up to the pc and so on, and we're not interested in whether terminals are logical or illogical or something like that; it's whether or not they run. But the pc couldn't run this – couldn't run a five-way bracket on the assessed Prehav Scale. Couldn't do it, because the pc says, "I'm too much the terminal."

Now, you're going to find that. Now, that you're finding a very finite . . . Remember what I told you, I said, "We're heading in for a way of finding *the* terminal. Well, of course, if you get a very fundamental terminal you get a total association between the pc and the terminal as being almost the order of the day. They don't differentiate between one another at all.

Now, you find terminals on children and you find exactly this condition. You find out they can't differentiate between one thing and the other. So your first auditing commands – this five-way bracket wouldn't run on this pc – and our first auditing commands of a five-way bracket, couldn't be checked out. The auditor very cleverly *did not* run them. The auditor

actually cleared the auditing commands – and possibly the pc's digging in her heels had something to do with it – and found out they couldn't be run and asked me on the report what to do about all this.

Well, what to do about this became very simple. You just treat this as a total closure, that is, the pc thinks of self as the terminal so you limit the bracket.

And I must call to your attention the tremendous importance in the Prelogics of gradient scales. You solve all cases by gradient scales. All things are solved by gradient scales. All auditing is done by gradient scale. And so auditing commands, when they are difficult to do, are done by gradient scale. And you get the simplest auditing command that you can think of and then you go from there on out.

Now, of course, perimeters of attention are so limited when you've got a terminal totally closed with the pc, the perimeter of attention is too tight. They can't get the idea, actually, of another person. You've got the terminal and then you haven't got anything else. you see? You've got the terminal and here's the terminal. Crunch! You see? And you say, "Well, how would you shoot another? How would you communicate to another?" You see? "How would another communicate to you?" This is too steep! This is too much.

But you can ask them something on the order – or should be able to – whether or not the person can communicate with himself or whether the terminal can communicate with itself. Naturally, you could get that. And if you ran those two you'd eventually get a differentiation.

So the auditing commands I recommended were something on the order of (suggested) "What might you have" – "disagreed" was the level – "What might you have disagreed with?" and "What might Lucifer have disagreed with?" See?

Not "What have you disagreed with about Lucifer?" or "What has Lucifer disagreed with about you?" You see? This is just total concentric, singleness. "What have you disagreed with?" "What might you have disagreed with?" and "What might Lucifer have disagreed with?"

We put *might* in there and the person doesn't have to answer very specifically. You see? We aren't asking for the *exact recall.* You ask a person to recall – all right: "Recall a time when you built your first pyramid. Thank you." They can't answer that kind of question. But you can say, "When might you have built a pyramid?" See?

"Oh, well," they think, "Well, then . . ." Anytime within that million-year line, see, they might have done it, you see. And they don't even have to say they have done it. And yet it will run very easily and it is quite beneficial. So we put *might* in there; that eases it up. We've got already – it on a gradient.

Now, let's see what we did here. We ran this apparently. Hm. Looks awfully good here. It looks like the tone arm was flying around a bit. Cognition and so forth. Heavy rock slams. Running between 2.6, 2.5. Oh, it took a little while to get going apparently. Yeah, and then it started flying up here to 3.50. This is nice action. Then you got a blowdown, and a blowdown, and the pc made her goals and feels good about the tone arm action, and so do I. A break. Rudiments well in. And then we got – went flying back up to 3.50, down to 2.25. That is very fine action, by the way. That is very good action. 2.25 to 3.5, you would realize, is three-quarters of a division but it's in the Clear range. And that much action in the Clear range is pretty fantastic.

Don't think too much . . . You can have a whole tone arm action between 5.0 and 6.0, way over here and it doesn't mean anywhere near as much as a half a tone arm action down around the Clear range. It's interesting.

You get a person up at 5.0, all he's got to do is withhold the fact that his – the end of his nose twitches and he goes up to 6.0. You see?

So, anyhow, that was fine. And he got various blowdowns and then some apathy began to come off. I'm glad to see that, actually, because she's been sitting around in it. I've been looking at her now and then saying, "Well, she's swimming through some bit of it." That's right, isn't it? And it was sticking around a little too long, so I was glad we found that.

All right. And she's – auditor's comment is: "Tone arm action fairly active. Pc felt this area was difficult to run because there wasn't much MEST to grapple with. Felt kind of queasy in the stomach since the beginning.

"Says, 'Oh, what's the use,' and sighs frequently. However, she's answered each command without any dispersal. I questioned pc by expanding – about expanding the bracket."

Male voice: Right.

"And the pc has certain resistance to running these agreed-upon flows because she claims they don't get at one area and clean it up and she has to hop around too much to do the command in a full bracket." Well, that's perfect. I agree with that a hundred percent. I'll give you the answer to this in a minute. "Which I will have to ferret out and clean up. I suspect it's probably ARC breaks in doing the bracket commands."

No. No, no, no, no, no. No, you're just asking the pcs to fall in over their head a little bit, you know, and they just *zzzttt.*   And "How do I expand this bracket? Is it Lucifer to others? Pc to others?"

No. The next way you expand the bracket – you can go to a straight five-way bracket. You can, but the theoretical way you expand the bracket is to make an interchange between the pc and Lucifer now.

Male voice: That's what I had across from it.

Yeah. Well, that is the – that would be the next change. It would be the inter "What have you disagreed with?" "What has Lucifer disagreed with?" You could say something on the order of – you could put the word *might* in there – "What might you have disagreed with about Lucifer?" or "What might Lucifer have disagreed with about you?" You get the interchange going now. You see, you've got it center-center. All right. Now, let's get an interchange going and don't swing around into "Lucifer to other" or "Other to Lucifer," because that requires a loosening attention. But that's added later. See?

All right. And I think that is going very, very well. But here's – here's some data you're in need of here. The pc's goal. Let's go back and look at this goal, see? "To be a racetrack driver, but a racetrack driver couldn't rule."

Now, this integrates in some fashion with the behavior of the pc. And you'll find out in running a goal-plus-modifier terminal that the pc – this is quite important – may heavily dramatize the goal when they first run the terminal. See? They – that's – well, let's say part of the modifier is "but it is unreachable." And as you run this, they don't tell you directly that it's unreachable; they just feel very dissatisfied about the thing, you see and "There's nothing there," and so on. And they keep feeling like this as you're running it and they're uncomfortable. And don't think anybody is very comfortable running a goal-plus-modifier terminal because this is – we're getting into heavier raw meat with this stuff. And the goal has a tendency to be dramatized slightly by the pc. The goal is not in view and so forth.

Now, I wouldn't expand the auditing command – yet. I would dream up a method of running a two-way flow on the goal-plus-modifier.

Male voice: Hm.

"What racetrack driver couldn't rule?"

Male voice: Hm.

See? Now, how do you get the reversed flow? Well, you just say, "What couldn't you rule?" "What haven't you been able to rule?" "What mightn't you have been able to rule?" Don't you see? "What mightn't a racetrack driver be able to rule?" You know, anything of that character, but slide that in as your three and four. See? You plus self on "rule." Racetrack driver, see, plus self – plus racetrack driver, see, on "rule." Just – that's it. See?

"You, not rule – you couldn't rule." "Racetrack driver couldn't rule." "Disagreed with self." "Lucifer disagreed with." And this thing will suddenly start integrating. You'll see a different scene suddenly. Then you can start expanding it. But I wouldn't necessarily drop the goal out of the line. It all depends on how it runs. you have to kind of run it by ear. We don't have very much experience right here at this moment or much backlog on it. We know we're

dead right and that it is running along fine. But it's just – exactly how you tune up the heterodyne so it will super-receive – we're not quite cognizant of. Okay?

Male voice: Right.

Sounds sensible to you?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. "Add goal commands to two-way and run." An awfully good job, Bob. Thank you.

All right. This is Marianne Christie auditing Smokey. Smokey? All right if I mention any of this?

Male voice: I don't give a damn.

It's all right? All right.

Now, I suspected that this was going to be a dog's breakfast. Do you know why? Because I think that this was another one of the things where we had the modifier and didn't have the goal, or there was something wrong and I couldn't imagine, myself, easily or readily, what you could add to "Hidden source of action." "To be a hidden source of action." All right, a goal "To be a hidden source of action." How do we modify this? It seems self-modified, doesn't it?

So, I've been kind of – I've been very interested in seeing what came out of this and so forth, and he got a list of modifiers here apparently about – oh, I don't know, maybe thirty, something like that. And all we're getting is restatements of goals.

The goal is "To be a hidden source of action." All right. And all we're getting is "Not unknown," "Could be found," "Somebody could find it." Now, how do we add that in, Marianne? How do these make a goal-plus-modifier – "Not unknown"?

Female voice: It seemed real to Smokey that these would be stopping or make it difficult to get that goal. These were liabilities.

Yeah, but how would we make a statement out of it?

Female voice: Once it got known, it wouldn't be possible to have a goal in it. There'd be no game on it.

No. We want a full goal-plus-modifier. We've got a misapprehension here on what's required. That's what this is all about. I see some sign of it here, ". . . but to be apathetic," or "To be a hidden source of action would be degraded about not being known. "Well, now, that would make a complete statement – "To be a hidden source of action but to be degraded about not being known." All right. That would make a complete thing. I see here that we have a double check on that. It was still staying in. Did that stay in?

Female voice: Everything has gone . . . No, not just now. There are only about four at the bottom there that are in.

These four at the bottom are still in.

Female voice: Yes, but these are relatively new ones added on at the last – at the end of the list – it tended to null the lot, just in the last quarter of an hour.

"To be a hidden source of action with an intention to be found?" That was a more recent one, huh?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Well, you'll just have to carry on with this. You'll have to also make very, very sure that your pc does not feel that his goal is being invalidated, which it isn't. We don't think it's wrong, we only think it's incomplete. See? So, go along and get that. Pc's riding pretty high here on the tone arm which is not extraordinary for this particular pc. Seems to have done all right, though, and seems to be pulling with you very well. And that's very fine. Now, this pc has already run some of his goal.

Female voice: Yes.

And if I had any more trouble with this at all, I would simply go into it on the basis of running this command: "How would you be a hidden source of action?" Something on that order. And "How would another be a hidden source of action?" And I'd just run this back and forth a few times. See? I'd run this for maybe fifteen, twenty minutes, something like that, and then check out the modifier that came with it, or anything that came up as following it.

As a matter of sober fact, you have a very tough one here because I think it is highly probable that it is the goal and modifier all in one package statement, *bong,* see? You get the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

It just sounds like it. "To be a hidden source of action." It's almost impossible, you know. See? That forms itself enough problems to make a game from here till Halifax. Doesn't it Smoke? Huh? All right.

But don't go torturing the pc about it in some way. If he can't get a modification to it he can't. And if he can, he can. But these sound very, very promising. "Intend to reveal some source later," "intention to be found," "wanting to reveal source later."

Female voice: There were one or two straight in the middle, too, that sounded very promising, but then they went null.

Mm-hm. Well, all right. But he's getting the classification, clarification of it and I am sure that you will get it. Okay? I've told you ways and means of doing so. Okay.

Female voice: Thank you.

Okay. I've just taken up some sample cases, to show you what we look at, how we go through it. Maybe you've learned something, maybe you haven't. I haven't shown you the one-two-three of how to do it. And I should add the one-two-three.

First, let us find out if the pc was audited that day. Now, you think that is funny, but by George, if you don't check the time audited you may find that the session has been abbreviated or had to be cancelled out or something like that. You're immediately short-circuited, then, into some other interest. In other words, what is wrong here does not become any technical question, it becomes some personal relationship of some kind or another. Or present time problems of the pc or something of this sort. So you look over the amount of time the pc was audited that day.

Then, the next thing you look at is to look at the pc's goals that were set for the session and find out whether or not – if the auditor has noted it – that the pc felt he made any of his goals for the session. Pc felt he made his goals for the session, in whole or in part, well, that's fine. That's fine.

And then you check tone arm action. You look down the line for tone arm action. If you're not getting any tone arm action of any kind whatsoever, you know doggone well one of two things is true: The rudiments are out a mile – regardless of what's being done, whether it's Sec Check or assessment or anything else – the rudiments are out a mile or the pc is Clear. And that depends in large measure on what the tone arm is reading.

Then you look on the list. If a process is being run, you quickly check twenty minute periods, down the column for the tone arm reads to find out if at any time this process was flat for twenty minutes and the auditor has missed it.

That's to make sure that you're not getting an overrun on a level. It's very easy to do, you don't have to do it with very great care. Thing says, "3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0," or there's a whole bunch of 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0s all together, you say, "Gee, what do you know, dzz-zz-zz. Is there a quarter of tone arm difference here on this 3.0, 3.0, 3.0 column?" And if there isn't, why, then you might find that you've got some trouble towards the end of the session. And this is easily explained to you. Now, anybody can understand how there's trouble at the end – toward the end of the session. All we've done is flatten the process and then we've overrun the process and then the needle was getting sticky, and the pc is getting very restive, and pc can't find any more answers, and it all seems very stupid and masses are being dragged in on the pc and he's being crushed inexorably under the wheels of Juggernaut, and a few minor things like this might account for the fact that there were some ARC breaks at the end of the session.

And they come out of this area: "Was the process flat for any given twenty minutes in the session?" If it was, why, you yelp.

Now, actually auditors going on noting tone arm reads, noting tone arm reads, noting tone arm reads, just going on down the line, down the line, down the line, down the line, sometimes, are so interested in auditing they don't realize that they've written down 3.10, 3.20, 3.10, 3.05, 3.10, 3.20, 3. – . It won't go reading like this long. I mean, it'll now start to do something else. It'll start to climb. You can say that if that goes on for a half an hour – you know, the vast difference of read between 3.1 and 3.15 and it went on for an hour – now you can expect the tone arm to go to 3.5, 3.75, 4.2, 4. – we're getting lots of tone arm motion here, you see? – 4.2, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25. They never mention what the needle characteristic is but of course it is rigid as a girder in the Eiffel Tower. *Thuuuurh!* Chance of reassessing gone! That is exactly what happens along these lines.

You check for that, and then you check the auditor's comments. The next thing you check is the auditor's comments. What's the auditor think about this and find out if the auditor wants any advice. It's whether or not you're going to give him advice gratuitously, whether he asks for it or not, or you found something that you should comment on, or whether or not he wants advice on the thing, or what progress he's making, and you put down whatever the adjudication you have of it.

Now, you can do an awful lot with an auditor's report. It depends to some degree upon the legibility of the report. Cryptography shouldn't be part of an auditor's report study line. I'm not good at cryptography. It is much easier for me to come around and read your mind than to bother with your writing sometimes. But I know that auditor's reports are written hurriedly and I would rather have an auditor's report which is the original report written at the time of the session, written during the session. And I don't like copied reports. I don't like a report to be copied after the session or written after the session. I actually like all the gimmicks and stuff written during the session. I don't care how many sheets of paper it took, how much scribble there is to it. Somehow or other it can be made out, because that is a better report than what you remember after the session. And when it comes to tone arm numbers – copying tone arm numbers – when you transcribe from a scribbled sheet of note paper over here to a column, you're liable to make some kind of a mistake.

I like to see the report, as it was written during the auditing session. If it's legible, fine. But certainly the report that was written during the session, not a copy of the report afterwards. You'll find out it's much more beneficial.

That is about all you look for.

Now, knowing Scientology as a background of all of this and the various things that you see that are taking place during that particular session, it doesn't take much of a crystal ball to find out that this or that or the other thing *is* taking place during the session. It isn't very hard to adjudicate that the rudiments are out. Why, I just gave you an example of what I mean. Karl set no goals at the beginning of the session. Well, he must have felt kind of mug,

you know. I can sympathize with him because I felt that way myself occasionally at the beginning of a session. But usually I didn't think the auditor could audit. I didn't think he was going to do anything. Why set any goal? You know?

So that's an easy one to adjudicate. You get the idea? You just say, "Well, he's – didn't set a goal? *Poom."*   A tone arm – tone arm no action – well, there's something flat.

Tone arm extraordinarily high and stays there and never fluctuates – well, we don't know. He might be running through a phase of the process; he might be in an awful ARC break; he might have withholds; he might have a lot of things. But now you get to a point of adjudication; we don't know what that high tone arm means. There's nothing wrong with having a high tone arm. Nothing wrong at all with having a high tone arm. But it can stem from several things. If a person's tone arm doesn't ever go high, they'd never make any progress.

Remember, that a case that is reading constantly at 3.0 with a sticky needle, forever at 3.0 with a sticky needle, will go through 7.0 before they come down to 3.0 again, and will spend the greater part of their auditing career after they get launched in the vicinity of 4.0 or 5.0.

You realize that? It's not a matter of trying to keep the pc's tone arm at 2.0 or 3.0. Because you take someone who's below death and work like mad to keep his tone arm between 2.0 or 3.0, you're going to be spooked all the time, because every time you make a gain he reads 6.5. You make a gain, he reads 1.2.

The other thing is, as you see tone arm reads drop below 2.0, you realize that sooner or later they're going to go all the way around. And as you're following the reports down the line and you see the tone arm has – registers 1.2, it's sort of – somebody has dropped a shoe and you're waiting for them to drop the other shoe. Because that is going to follow sooner or later. If it *doesn't* follow, the case is not progressing.

I gave Mary Sue one, one night. She was auditing me and she got me to recall something or other, and I recalled something or other, and turned the tone arm all the way from something on the order of 3.0 through 7.0, through 6.5 and down to 3.0 again on the other side. It went on a complete revolution. It just sat there – it went about that fast, see?

Staggered her. she was no good for the remainder of the session. I hardly . . . The end of the session she told me about this. See, she was stonied. Recall one thing and you get a revolution of the tone arm. All right. This was as fast as she had seen it. But you shouldn't operate on a huge – this is no criticism of what she was doing – but you shouldn't operate on a big withhold from your pc on what the meter is doing. If the pc wants to know what the meter is doing, you let the pc know what the meter is doing.

He asks you what the meter is doing, why, you say, "That's all right," and show him what the meter is doing.

He says, "Well, is that goal still in?" or "Is that modifier still in?" Well, tip the meter over and repeat the modifier and let him see it knock, just once. Don't let him sit there and make a life study of it. But don't deny him information through the session. You see? And sometimes you have to read between the lines because you haven't got all the steps of the auditing session, you don't quite know what's happening in the auditing session, but you sometimes have to look it over from the basis, well, maybe Code breaks and that sort of thing are occurring, or maybe the pc is just being denied lots of information, and so on.

And you only get curious about these things when a pc is doing poorly. Go by this rule: Don't go charging around on a case and throwing smoke into the air and so on . . . Well, I can do this once in a while; I think the case could be moved a little faster or something like that. But don't go throwing your weight around on a case that is moving.

If the case is moving it's moving. What means moving? Tone arm action, pcs making their goals, everything seems to be going along and they are making progress.

All right. It's a relatively uneventful picture. It merely means you're getting tone arm action, pcs apparently making their goals, auditor doesn't have any vast questions about it, apparently doing all right. Leave it alone. Leave it alone. Just say, "Fine. Okay. Good. Continue." That's it. you know? Leave it alone.

Tone arm – no action; pc sets ninety-five goals, makes none; we see that the end rudiments took three-quarters of the session, something, you know. Well, actually the thing to do is to get ahold of the auditor or pass him a word or write the report out in such a way that you want information. That's basically what you want. you shouldn't be telling him things to do without some information about it. you want some personal information. The best kind of information is personal information. You're directing a lot of auditors and you see a report like that and – what the hell, you know? Three-quarters of the session was devoted to the end rudiments. Three-quarters of the session devoted to the end rudiments.

Well, the thing to do is get ahold of the auditor and the pc. It's better to get ahold of the auditor *and* the pc than just the auditor. Always better, because you can always cross-check the pc. That is to say, you can always put the pc on the meter and you can find out how the pc is going, find out what the pc is reacting to, and so forth.

But this all comes under the heading of checking cases and keeping them running, and I've tried to give you an example here of this – of some of the things I do and look for and think about. I do this every night with your cases, and sometimes I actually miss your presence on deck and I have to sometimes make a wild guess about it. And there you're lying there in bed innocently asleep and so forth. And it's very hard to pick your brains. Very, very hard to do so. And the aura that comes off the auditor's report is usually a bit mucky.

So, the essence of the thing is that cases making smooth progress are the cases that you pay the least attention to. Except to make sure that they go on making smooth progress. What you pay attention to are the hang-ups. And if a case is running well leave it alone. Case is running well, don't change it. If an auditor is auditing a case very well, don't rouse him around. Don't rack him up one side and down the other. See? Lay off.

But if this thing is going by fits and starts, and falling on its face and that sort of thing, well, give them a note on the report but always try to follow it through with some personal information along any communication line which you have about that particular case.

In this particular case, why, most of you whose cases are going badly – auditing somebody whose case is going badly, that is to say – you generally will stop somebody on staff and you will generally tell them all about it. you didn't know that you put a communication line almost directly, straight, dead to Ron whenever you did this. Because that's, of course, what we pay attention to. Want to keep them rolling.

Well, cases can be an awful worry to you. They can be an awful worry. And you get this many cases running all together, it's a case of sometimes holding your breath just a little bit, you know. "Well, is that one coming back on the line or not, you know?" It's like keeping twenty-six plates spinning simultaneously on the end of sticks. Something like this. And they're all different and they all have their peculiarities of operation, but they all follow the same rules.

So I hope what I have given you here might have helped you out at some time. Okay?

All right.