

AUXILIARY PRE-HAVE 3D SCALE

A lecture given on
23 November 1961

Okay, well now here we go, and this is the 23rd of November, 1961. And you are well on the way; you have been once more rescued by the Marines.

You have a new scale: the Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale.

First and foremost let me make it very, very adequately plain to all those present and accounted for, that: A scale like this does you absolutely no good if you can't read an E-Meter, or if you can't detect a pc selling on the E-Meter, or if you keep asking somebody during an assessment which implant he is now in or – or, or, or! You understand?

Now, given a perfect, exact, completely checked-out 3D – in items one to five – everything's perfect now you see. Given that, this applies. But not given that, this is of no use to you whatsoever. This is of no use to you and it's no use to Scientology. It begins where a 3D Form finishes at Step Five.

I received a nasty letter from – the other day from a fellow in California. This is not unusual. North Pole, South Pole – it doesn't matter where – South America, Australia, even in the middle of the Boola-boola-boola-boola-boola tribes of South Africa – I get nice letters, saying, “Thank you Ron, everything is going along fine. The data is working.” But California, no. No, they have trouble in California. Everybody here from California is arriving at this moment. And what error did I finally find out – much to my chagrin, after I'd shot this fellow off the target rack and he's lying in bits of pipe clay right now all over the floor – I find out that one of the better known California auditors has been auditing him on Routine 3. This fellow is not trained to run Routine 3.

I don't care how long he's been auditing I've never seen any results. He couldn't, he couldn't do a Routine 3. And frankly what he probably did was run some – he's by the way one of the Central Organization's wildest and greatest opponents out there. He is – he is the burning torch for doing things wrong. And what he's doing running Routine 3, I just wouldn't know.

But of course, this letter from this other fellow, I found out belatedly, was in the middle of some kind of a (quote) intensive (unquote), on Routine 3 by an auditor that wouldn't

know what he was doing Of course, the fellow blew up. Naturally he's mad at everybody. Naturally he's very upset. Naturally he doesn't know whether he is coming or going or on a trip to Mars, or in one of these fictitious Russian space shots. He doesn't know where he is at or why. Because he's being audited by somebody who doesn't know what he is doing, and has not been trained to do that.

And therefore, you can here and there and everywhere expect trouble in large quantities – expect trouble, and more trouble, and more trouble – where auditors are sec checking who do not know how to run a meter; auditors are doing Routine 3 where they don't know how to run a meter and you think that's trouble. Well, now there's plenty of randomness connected with that fact. There's plenty of randomness.

I don't have to burn the midnight oil by the way – even the late English sunrise is furnishing me enough light to keep ahead of you. I'm knocking off these days at seven o'clock in the morning, and so forth. Pretty wild! I can stand it if you can.

Anyhow, the point I'm making here is that with Routines 1, 2 and 3 – Routines 1A less so... Almost anybody apparently can run a Routine 1A. I don't know how they do it, but they do it. They just sit down and they just run that one command and it's fine. Actually Routine 1A probably still ought to have a place in our activities, because apparently nobody's gotten into very much trouble with it, except they've failed to flatten it maybe here or there. That's the only trouble you could get into it.

But besides the point, they've gotten into trouble with Routines 1, 2 and 3, and they've managed to make engram running and other things not work at various times. What do you think is going to happen with Routine 3D? Now, just let me ask you that burning question, ladies and gentlemen: What is going to happen when they collide with Routine 3D? What is happen – going to happen with this character out on the coast – who is the Central Organization's most inveterate foe, who is the pc's most inveterate poison and so forth, anyhow – when he finally gets a copy of it and to make a couple of quick kabutniks, he runs somebody on Routine 3D and never gets any part of it checked out and didn't know how to read the E-Meter in the first place, and . . . ?

His favorite idea, by the way, is, “Well, let's see, all right. Now, we're going to do an assessment on you. What is your goal? All right, that's fine. What is your goal? Okay, that's fine. Now, let's list some of these goals. Hey, you know, that's a good one. That's an interesting goal. I've been wanting to do that myself for years. All right, well that's your goal. Okay.”

Now I'm not joking; I'm not joking. Right here I've probably laid in an ARC break today, by just cutting one person off who was doing a 3D items on up the line, just cutting them off, until I can get time to check this personally. Because it is that vital – it is just that vital – that you don't run anything wrong on a 3D. It is absolutely vital.

Now, I tell you from the depths of my dark, deep bin of little known facts, that this one should be pretty well known. You won't get anyplace on some cases and a case will be upset, and well, it'll just go on and on forever. And it isn't too violent, nothing drastic will happen, except maybe nothing will happen and somebody will be rather upset. That is all you can say about it.

But look at what is at stake. Do you realize that with a completed 3D – and you will realize this shortly, and I of course am, after being committed to the action and there is no withdrawing from it, of course, you can imagine that my fingernails have gotten terribly short here in the last few days, watching you and what you were doing with this. They've practically gone down to Chinese fingernails.

The point I'm making is: that with that care, with a careful assessment, knowing how to do your meter, handling your pc straight, getting him right up to the point with each item absolutely accurate; and then launching into the Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale for assessment; that person with high probability, is within just sauntering distance toward Clear, see? There's only one route. It is one tightrope walk. And you get up to this – the running of it, the actual running of it – and he's practically there.

Because the running of this is nothing compared to the assessing of it. You don't even have to do tricky command forms. I mean the command forms are all laid down almost verbatim in advance. You can change from a “Why” to a “What” to a “How,” occasionally, to vary the monotony, but it's the same bracket, the same bracket, the same bracket, the same bracket.

And these things assessed properly and those levels run properly, and he's going to come out the other end. But your eyes are going to be a bit round while he's doing so.

I can now tell you, after experimentation on the line, that there is nothing will fish him out of it if it is wrong I have been testing it all. I have been going back over everything I could go back over. And there's only one thing that brings him through and that is: Pre-Have assessment runs on the exact terminal. Nothing else disturbs the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, this is utterly fantastic. I mean, how come I suddenly dreamed up this particular type of weapon? It is the only weapon that works. Nothing else works. You can go back over the years and – and as I have been doing – and taking this item and that item and the other item and trying to combine it up against terminals and trying to get a terminal to run, and trying to do something else with the terminal, besides this activity. Nothing else works.

And this is mostly assessment. It's minimal running and maximal assessing And now that I have added this many levels – *huh-huh-huh-huh!* Shudder! Look at all that assessment. Look at that much assessment for a level. Just look it over.

Now true, I've put it into a form where it's relatively easy to assess and will put it into an easier assessed form than this, even this. It'll have the same items on it but they may be slightly rearranged so as to make easy assessment. That however, is experimental and you now have the levels.

So it's more assessment than it is running. You – I say that advisedly, you – because on some brackets you may not be able to get one bracket. You may stick the arm with one bracket with a new level. And then you go back and the new level is flat. That's all there is to it. It's flat. That's it. It's fantastic.

Because, of course, you're right into the middle of the problem. You're not running an engram; you're running a mass. And we're running something new, and I think you could find it on the books of about 1954, that you shouldn't tackle these black masses. We had Admiration Processing way back. I guess that was 53 wasn't it, early 53. And we ran Admiration Processing and I said, "Well, you just better leave those black lines closed."

You can open them with admiration and you can't do anything about them, and nothing works on them. But this chug-chug-chugs right through them. This eats them up, which is quite interesting. All of this is on the basis – just telling you – that given a perfect assessment and then given proper assessment on this auxiliary scale, and then assessment – and then the running of the level assessed and flattening it and running it properly, and then finding the next level, and running that properly, and so on – if you were very, very rapid, on some cases you're going to discover that you could get in as many as five levels run per session, on some cases. That's quite amazing. Now, not all of them will go like that. You'll be doing probably more like two levels a session or something of that sort. Maybe one level will run a session or two. That is the expectancy of auditing. But there isn't anything else that's going to get them out of it. This is the only thing that pushes them through it. And that is hair-raising, you know? That's like walking across the top of the Empire State Building on a tightrope strung above it, you know, with no umbrella and no parachute, in a high wind. It's kind of hair-raising.

And you think I'm going to sit by quietly while somebody out in the lower marshlands – you know, where that – all that oil is down there, is in San Pedro, where it's all mucky, you know, around San Pedro there – I think that's probably where this person comes from. Anyway, they were spawned there, spawned there, and -I'm not going to sit by quietly while these guys muck this up.

Because an inexpert auditor is actually slamming the gates shut with a crash on the entire next hundred trillion years of a being. Misrunning it, that's what he does. *Crash!* And therefore you'll find me coming around here saying, "Yow-yow-yow-yow-yow-yow-yow-yow-yow, learn those E-Meters, learn those E-Meters." Saying to you politely and quietly, but meaning, in back of it all, "What the hell do you mean getting a wrong level? What are you

doing sitting there cross-eyed? You know? I mean, *can't be*. It's got to be right. You get the idea?

So all of a sudden we'll just upgrade this whole – this whole thing. You can read a meter or you can't, see? You can read a meter standing on your head groggy and slogged up with engrams and you've got to be that good on a meter – or you've got to be that good on assessment. Or we just upgrade the whole thing

You've got to be that good. That's all. So, because, listen: *That's what it takes!* You get the idea? I mean, that's what it takes! All right. If that's what it takes, you can do it! Let me – let me say to you, calmly, that back a few years ago – a third of a century ago – well, it was a matter to me, well if that's what it takes to break this barrier and to push this thing through for a big win for all of us, well, that's what it takes. Do you understand?

It isn't a question of me being bright or me being extraordinary or me stepping off. I do know where I came from, you see. I used to tell my grandfather where I came from. I used to explain my red hair to him. I fell off of Mars and got into a bucket of red paint. I was two when I was telling him that. And he thought I was joking!

But anyway, it wasn't a question of what I could do or what my ability was: that was not the question. The question is: is what does it take to get it done? Is that a different look? It's what do you have to be able to do to get it done. All right. Well, you look at it that way, well you just skip your limitations, and you say, “Well, if that's what it takes to get it done, well, we'll just, you know, somehow or another we will get it done.”

And, of course, being apathetic, being restimulated, being upset, having a headache, not wanting to, thinking it's really best to dramatize the opposition terminal today – all of these things all add up to, of course, not getting it done – so you just wash those out and skip them. You see the forthright look that it takes.

Because I can tell you, what I have done in the development of this material is impossible. It could never have been done. It's impossible. The last fifty thousand years it's never been done, so why should it ever be done? All right, that's impossible. All I'm asking you to do, is do the impossibility of “do it.” That's simple, isn't it?

That's a good bargain, isn't it? I couldn't possibly have done it, you can't possibly audit it: I did it, you do it! That a good bargain? It's rather adventurously stratospheric in its viewpoint, but actually that's what it takes.

And you see in a little needle here wandering around... I'm satisfied that we can't build a better meter. I'd be happy to build you a better meter. Years ago I used to tell Mathison. . . The reason Mathison and I came to a parting of the ways is: every time I'd tell Mathison to take something off of his ruddy meter, he'd put something on it. And it finally got so doodle-daddled up, you know, that I couldn't find where to plug it into the mains. And after I'd

practically executed a pc or two – there were some people around I happily would have handed a pair of electrodes to; actually contemplated a time or two; ran it out in auditing one day – overts on the meter! Why, he was just getting so complicated.

What I really wanted was something that would flash a light when you had a read. It would just flash a light when you had a read, and you had to interpret no more than a light. Or: two lights, which was a red-green light, something like this, and you got a red-green or you got a green-green or you got a count system of some kind or another. Possibly something like that could be made. The point is, it never has been made and every time I've tried to improve this particular existing meter, I have run into the thing that the mind, after all, doesn't register very much on the meter. It doesn't register very much. And when you start to amplify its registration, you run into the registration of body motion. And you amplify the registration of body motion and the mental motion becomes unreadable.

That's what I've continually run into in this. Now, I could of course, have – could taken some time off and built a much better meter, instead of doing a lot of other things, maybe, but I've been at this – making sure this meter stayed in good shape now – for about ten years, and it's the best we can do. Every time I branch off into some other field to give you a better meter, why, some limiting factor of some kind or another defeats it, and I come back and say, “What a wonderful meter we've got. It's just fantastic that this meter will do these things.” Well, all right. This is the meter we're doing it with and I have good confidence in the meter.

Now, amongst us we have people who don't have much confidence in the meter, and quite rightly, because if you don't know how to read a meter, you of course can't have any confidence in the meter. And after a meter has been thrown for you a few times or after you've thrown a meter a few times, or after somebody's missed a withhold on you, your ability to run the meter deteriorates like mad. Did you realize that? You say, “Well, I can beat the meter from where I sit, so therefore the meter isn't very accurate and so forth.” Well actually, please realize that you were beating a lousy operator, not a meter. You can always beat an operator. When the operator isn't good enough, you can always beat the operator.

But to watch these little – this little black needle doing little odd dances – and as it swings back and forth to catch the fact that something stopped it for an instant, and to catch that sort of thing – requires, frankly, a rather high degree of skill.

It is an order of skill that Einstein respected, because Einstein has – had written – I don't know where Einstein is now. Has anybody audited Einstein lately? Anyway, he isn't very old. It'd take Mary Sue or somebody like that to audit him.

The idea he had was the idea of the observer. He had the idea of the observer, and it's a very, very good thing for you to know this particular thing in connection with the meter.

He had this concept of an observer. Now, of course, the old man, in floundering around in the field of physics and small currents and that sort of thing, he was limited by the fact that nobody ever got him any data. He also – always had to go out and read the meters himself I suppose, or something like this. And it finally drove him down to writing a paper on this. I wish I had a copy of the paper. I don't. I have never read it. I have only been told about the paper. But his viewpoint, “The Viewpoint of the Observer” is the name of the paper, “The Viewpoint of the Observer.”

And what is an observer? An observer is somebody who, without the introduction of an opinion, can look exactly and directly at a needle or registering item, and say exactly what it did, without further introduction of opinion. He doesn't say why it did it; he just says what it did. In other words, if it went up on some meter to 105 and then it fell back to 102, then his ideal on the thing would have simply noted that it went to 105 and fell to 102, and that's all the person would say.

You see, now, psychology, not knowing this, has never given us any data. We have been denied the whole pack of data that the psychologists might have been collecting for us because the whole thing is full of opinion. There was never an observer amongst the psychologists. There are no observers amongst the psychiatrists.

The psychiatrists go in and they don't limit themselves to saying, “This fellow takes three hops across the room and bounces against the ceiling” You see? “And his name is John Jones, and he has been incarcerated here and our classification for it is ceiling bounceosis,” and so on.

No, he doesn't do that. He says this fellow keeps leaping about and we have made a very deep study of his familial background, and we find out that there was three and one-tenth percent schizophrenics during the last 1800 years connected with this particular familial line. And we know this to be the case because his skull is cleaved in a peculiar way which is only found in the Cro-Magnon pits of northern Italy.

Oh, what the hell. Do you know that on some half-written psychiatric reports, they give you the whole engram the person is in. And then add something like this: We have tried and tried to disabuse her of this particular opinion and we have not yet succeeded, but we will. Or the patient's comment after treatment was, “Well, it still seems awfully real.”

The psychiatrist was just going headlong into pictures. In other words, he was so interested in doing something, he never looked at what he was doing it to or he long since would have found the mental image picture. Do you realize how far we are ahead of these people? Its hard to realize sometime for a Scientologist, I – just how far we are ahead of these people, and how far we are ahead of existing technology.

Nobody has pictures. What is a picture? A picture has no influence. If they ever mention anything about pictures, it's just vague imaginings. It's really very interesting that they have never done any observation.

Now aside from this point, aside from it and totally, this quality: the ability to observe as a single action, is what it requires to E-Meter. It's the ability to observe as a single action independent of all interpretation.

Now if you take that as a separate action of the auditor, and only when that action is done, only when we have done that action do we then do anything else, you will get the whole problem compartmented properly.

In other words, we don't sit there and worry and stew and fuss. We don't sit there and worry and stew and fuss about what we are going to do if the needle does something, you see. Now, our action is: whatever else we are doing, we are also an observer and we observe exactly what the needle does, and don't wishfully hope it had done something else. You ask somebody for a PT problem. You're all set, you want to do an assessment, you want to get another level, you want to go on and charging down the line.

Everything is going to be just fine and you get into the rudiments and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" very cheerfully, pressing on. You get a *clank* and it falls. Oh no! Now we're going to spend the next few minutes, probably, you see, having to handle this and not getting on with our affairs and that sort of thing. Well, it's a great temptation at that point to just wish there hadn't been one, and there's not much of a step from wishing there hadn't been one to not seeing it. You see? There's not much of a step between those two points. In other words, you've got "wishful observing"

Falls on the wrong level; falls on the wrong goal. We know this person – we know this perfectly sweet, young girl that we are auditing here: this kind, sweet person would never have as their basic goal in life, "to murder men." We *know* that. So we just skip that, you see? We throw the observation, because it assaults our reality.

But why should the observation of a needle assault reality? Why? Why should it assault reality? And the observation of a needle in its action on a meter is simply an observation and it is something to be noted. It's regardless of whether it's right or wrong or it's against what we're doing or for what we're doing or anything else.

As long as you keep this idea of "the observer independent of the doer," as the auditor, you're all set, see. You're sitting there watching the needle and you're running engrams. Well, therefore – a thetan can do a lot of things at once, by the way – and therefore, well a part of you is simply looking at it and you're asking this and it notes that it falls at that particular point, and so forth. Well, that is the action of an observer.

Now, what you *think* about that, and what you're going to *do* about that, are entirely different segments. They haven't anything to do with this fact. The needle acted in a certain way. All right. We observed that it acted in a certain way and that is all there is to it. So, pure observation is a subject that is very worthwhile for an auditor to look over.

Go out and take a look at the trees sometime and just try to observe a tree. It's quite interesting. Just do nothing but observe a tree. Don't *think* about the tree or have an *opinion* about the tree, one way or the other, but just look at a tree. Do you understand me? All right.

Now, let's take that up one more stage and look at a tree when there's a wind blowing. And look at what is happening there at that point of the tree. Of course, there you have the tree and the leaves are wobbling. Now, if you can hold this as an observation independent of an emotional reaction, an opinion or a doingness, or a summation, like, "Well, its going to come up and – and – and rain, in a little while, obviously, because the air is rather damp." Well, that's part of a whole new package of observation. You're predicting already, before you have noticed. Now, people get to the point where they predict without bothering to see. And this is a characteristic of the human race. They're always predicting without seeing.

You're just – this time-honored example of these fifteen people who stood around and saw the automobile accident, and you'll get fifteen different automobile accidents. And that is because they've added all sorts of connotations to it. Whose fault was it? You see? A guess at the mental attitude of the drivers; a wonder about the pain of the occupants; estimate of the amount of damages; worries concerning how fast a crash wagon can get down there, or an ambulance can get there, or how long it is going to take to get the road cleared: color the observation, actually color the observation. You had to – it doesn't seem possible until you look it over. Here are two cars and they came together and made accordions out of their respective bonnets or hoods. There they are – *daduthng*.

Well, what exactly happened there? Now, you ask somebody, "What exactly happened there? Without any other opinion, exactly what happened right there at that point?" And you know, you get all sorts of additional data.

Well, this fellow came down the road and he was in a hurry. See, we don't know that. We don't know that he was in a hurry. We know that he was traveling fast. Maybe when that particular fellow was in a hurry, he went twice as fast. But in any event, we now have hazarded some idea of the mental attitude of the person who was driving one of the cars. And then we hazard a mental attitude of somebody else driving a car and it doesn't take very long to color our own mental attitude. See, what exactly did happen?

Well, two cars came down, they went on an exact certain course. They stopped or tried to stop or didn't stop at a certain place, and thereafter accordion-pleated their bonnets. And that is exactly what happened. If a wheel came off or a hub cap went off, it actually fell off and ran so many feet.

That is a total non-emotional observation. This is *exactly* what happened. That *is* what happened. It – what happened is not how much its going to cost to repair the damage. What happened is not the respective property culpability of the participants in this favorite game of Western civilization today. That had nothing to do with what happened. The mental pressures involved could not even be estimated by the casual bystander, unless he were a Scientologist and had the person in session for many, many hours. And now you can get an idea with a 3D, of exactly why he had an accident. But short of that, it's all hazard. So we ask somebody to observe an automobile accident and, “Well, *suh* and *suh* and *suhm*.” They never tell you that. They say, “Well, one fellow was coming down the road and there were a couple of girls on the sidewalk, and they were horrified, and uh . . .” See, here we go. And we've got mental attitudes, mental attitudes, mental attitudes, mental attitudes and after a while you say to this fellow, “Wait a minute. Did you see what kind of cars they were?”

“Well, their nameplates were in clear sight, but I didn't read them, see.” They were plastered all over on one Ford, you see – it was all over one – and Austin was all over the other one, but he didn't notice that. That's part of the observation.

A Scientologist has to become – we have talked about this for years. We've called it “obnosis” and so forth – but a Scientologist has to become, as far as an E-Meter is concerned – at least some small section of his attention and his beingness, while he is operating as an auditor, must be of a pure observational character, uncolored by *any other* consideration. In other words he has to be able to look at a meter and say exactly what the needle is doing.

See, that's maybe only a tenth of his attention, but it still has to be a pure attention. It has to be very pure. Now, he says, “The needle is doing this because... The needle is doing this because...” You see? Now, that's the auditor in him talking. That isn't the observer. The observer has no “because,” see. The needle just *did* that, that's all.

And that is first things first, and that is the first step in learning an E-Meter: is actually able to observe a single, simple action and say what happened. In a HPA/HCA class, it would be very amusing to go up to the board and take an eraser or something on the blackboard, and reverse it, and then step back and ask the class of new auditing students, “What did I do?” And get, if there were 20 students, get 20 different replies. You went over to see if the board was dirty. Or you decided to give us an example and . . . The fact of the matter is, he went across and picked up an eraser and turned it over. Now, what actually happened is that a person took several steps across the room, extended hand, picked up the eraser, and turned it over, put it down and then took several steps back across the room. And that is *all* that happened as far as the observer is concerned. Nothing else happened at all.

Now, why did he do it? Ah, well now, we've got the – now, we've got the Scientologist. Why did he do it? What was the purpose behind this? What was he trying to demonstrate? What effect did he have on us? Do you see? Now, we've got the cause and

effect, the purpose and the this-a and that-a. And that had nothing to do with the observation of simply walking across the room and turning over an eraser.

I imagine you could actually train a class by having a pointer on the wall that could be turned somewhat like a – with a magnetic base that you could put on a piece of metal, and let it hang there. And somebody picks it up and turns it around and then step back and says, “Now, what exactly did the pointer do?” And you'll have one small sensible voice out of a bedlam of contradictory “because,” «predictions,” “past track” and so forth, will say, “Well, you turned the pointer around.” It won't occur to anybody else to say that. Or “the pointer turned around.” That is what happened. That is the observer.

Now, if we take it from that simplicity and move it on forward, it all becomes very easily. And how many people are having difficulty reading a meter because they're trying to read the meter – read the mind before the meter acts, or trying to read the mind and the meter at the same action, and so forth. Frankly, it's perfectly all right to know what went on in the fellow's mind, and you should be able to know what went on in the fellow's mind, when you saw the reaction on a meter. But that's after the fact of an observer. That is an analysis of the observation based on your professional skill. That is another action. The fact of the thing is, is it went up here under the words – where the words “fall” are, and it did a little dance that was something like an eighth-of-an-inch wide, and it did it several times, immediately after certain words were uttered.

The words were uttered, “Are you – are you tired of a willow buck?” And the word “willow buck,” after it's uttered, and we get this little dance occurring there and the fellow then says, “Well, that's still live.” But note that his desire to know if “willow buck” was still alive was independent of this other action.

First, he desired to know if the willow buck was still alive, and then he said, “Are you tired of a willow buck?” See? At the moment there, his voice is the cause, the pc's bank is the effect and the meter is the reaction. All right, he's still a practitioner up to the moment he says, “willow buck,” and then this other chain reaction takes place. Notice that this is another action. He's causing an action to occur there. All right. Having done that in something like a millionth of a second, he changes from the practitioner to simply the observer. He is just nothing now but a pure observer. What did the needle do? And for something on the order of eight-tenths of a second or something like that, he is an observer. And at that moment he is nothing else but an observer.

But for a split instant there, maybe something on the order of an – of a – well, let's say, .8 seconds is what I should have said, 8 seconds, he is an observer – or 1 second, he is an observer. He's purely an observer and he's nothing else in that 1 second but an observer. In other words he is a practitioner, he's a Scientologist, everything is fine and he's doing his job

and then for a second he is an observer. And then right after that, he's a Scientologist and he's cause and effect on the mind and all that sort of thing.

But you carry over cause and effect on the mind at the moment you're observing, and you're inevitably going to carry some hopefulness or some disappointment or some wishful thinkingness or something across that moment of observation.

You know, I have had to swallow an awful lot of bitter pills. I know what I'm talking about when I'm running a meter. I've had to swallow some mighty bitter pills.

Way back when, particularly, I would be absolutely sure, you see, that I knew exactly what was wrong and everything that was happening with regard to the preclear's mind. You see, I absolutely had it taped. I knew the exact thing that the pc was going to come up with next, and it all indicated to that, and all I had to do – I knew it was there, the only question mark was the pc going to have any reality on it, and was there going to be any release or action because of this enormous discovery?

You see, I figured it all out, see, up to this point and then I asked the pc – I asked the pc, and I say, “Well now, how do you feel about a family?” No action. “Family, smamily.” *Phew!* It wasn't right. You see, all this skillful figure-figure all added up all of a sudden to nothing. No reaction of any kind.

“Oh, I feel fine about a family.” *Nyeh.*

All right, but for a moment I never forgot how to be a pure observer. See. I did observe it, even though it was against my most fond hopes. And in the next moment be back again figuring it out, see. Thinking it over. All right. And then all of a sudden, “Oh, have you ever beaten a dog” Oh well, I got a reaction that time, so it's all right – come on.

But on some pcs, in trying to figure it out, when you didn't know all you had to know on the subject and which way they were going, *phew!* You know, you'd get it pretty well taped and you know exactly where you're going and then – oh, you just know exactly now what will just blow the whole thing up and you say it, you know, and you put it to the test, and your hopefulness doesn't cause you to misread the meter.

And maybe that is where I excel where other fellows have fallen down. I am not so fond of my own ideas and theories that I must have them right. I can always get another theory.

Now, one of the things that's defeated research work is some people get so fond of some theory that they've had, one way or the other or they're trying to prove out. It looks so logical and looks so wonderful, and we know now fitted so well with their goal, modifier and opposition goal, this is all so handsome that they never let go of it. The weight of evidence can be delivered to them with large iron bars. It could be delivered to them in trucks; the

evidence against this theory, you see. The whole countryside gets stacked up by built-up models to show them completely and conclusively that the thing never works and they haven't got a single model anyplace to show that any shadow of the theory has any truth in it of any kind whatsoever.

And they still hold on to the theory. In other words, all evidence has disproved it and they have no evidence that proves it in any way, shape or form. Long and arduous study on the subject has not borne out any part of it and they still hold on to it. Theories are so marvelous. After all, they're theirs. They're theirs, you see. The evidence there, well, it would be pretty unsafe, you see, to let go of one. Because we might never get another one.

Well, you know very well, in looking at a pc when he gives you a list of terminals, or something like that, which is eighty, ninety – oh, all right, one of them looks pretty good. But you'd be amazed. I usually find out that the one it actually is- is better than I hoped for. The right one – the right one is usually much better than I'd ever hoped it would be.

You know, I've got this guy totally taped and I get ideas as to what this thing ought to be as I look down the list and it help and sharpens my perception, but I never permit that to overthrow me as an observer. At the instant I observe a meter, I observe the meter. I don't observe it hopefully, I don't observe it pessimistically, I don't observe it any other way than I just open my wide blue eyes and let happen what happens at that moment.

More than anything else, and the fact that I very seldom go to sleep as an auditor, and-very seldom fall out of my chair and drop ashtrays and that sort of thing – the capability of actually keeping my mind on what I am doing and being interested in actually auditing the pc and being able to observe purely as an observer at a split moment – I know now is what gets me my results as an auditor. And they're worth – they're worth reaching for, because they are very rapid results. But there is an instant there when there is nothing but absolutely pure observation.

And if that observation disproved to me completely that every theory I had stacked up was absolutely wrong, it was still an observation and I would – still would observe it. Oh, I might check it and observe it again, and I might check it and observe it again, but if it wasn't there it wasn't there, and that's it.

Now, that I recognize as – is a skill of sorts. It is – is a skill all by itself. It's to be able to suddenly become an observer for one second, and then cease to be an observer and become an auditor. That's what it takes, but that's what E-Metering takes: uncolored observation. What happened is what happened. No matter if it shatters our fondest hopes, what happens to the meter is what happens to the meter and that's what happens to the meter. And that's all we're observing and there's no alter-is connected with the observation, no alter-is of any kind whatsoever.

And you'll find consistently and continually, that where you have a bad assessment – where you have a bad assessment, it's hopefulness has entered in or pessimism has entered in. And neither hopefulness nor pessimism should ever enter into the moment of observation. You read right down the line, clank, that's what it is, that's what it is; that's what it isn't, that's what it isn't.

Oh, I have actually often suddenly grabbed a pc practically by the collar and steered him into the chair during a break, all of a sudden, you know, or something like this. Or out of session – well somebody I was auditing regularly. All of a sudden get ahold of them practically in the hall and say, “Come here a minute,” you know. “Sit down,” you know. And put them on the cans, you know.

And I've got – I've got what it exactly was, you know. I've got it perfectly, you know. And I know exactly what it was. It was elephants. That was what was missing in that engram. There must have been elephants in that damned engram. Got it all figured out, you know. Put him on: “All right. Good. You're all set now? All right. Now, just shut up and be quiet now. Good. All right. Elephants. Thank you. Go ahead, get your coat now.”

It is simply, not actually the willingness to be overwhelmed by an E-Meter, but it's actually the willingness to put something to a pure, reliable test, and then abide by the decisions. The reason we have law courts – man can't do this very easily – the reason we have law courts is nobody ever abides by the evidence. That's what makes law profitable.

You have fifteen people see the accident. I remember practicing law here a century ago, up around Reigate and so forth. It was absolutely fantastic. But I was always taking cases on the absolute outside impossibility. Everybody would come along, but they'd say, “But – but – uh, the ship down in Portsmouth steamed right into the harbor, cut the other ship absolutely in half. It sank and the captain was at fault. The insurance company, everybody agreed! What do you mean, you're going to take this case? With your reputation, you're going to take a case like that? Ooh-ho, you're silly!”

“Oh no, no, no, no, no. I'll take the case. Yes, I'll defend that ship that came in, and cut the other ship in half. Yes. Happy to do so.” The whole Royal Navy could have been lining the beaches and to find one reliable witness for the other party would have been nearly impossible.

I could shake any witness anybody else ever had for anything They could stand right there in the wide-open corridor of a public building, seen the fellow, recognized him, and pulled out a knife, killed the other man dead. Take the case? Hell, yes. What's evidence got to do with cases?

We're dealing with human beings and they can't look. They never see. And furthermore, in court, they have opinions. The Lord Chief Justice sitting up there, impartial,

wigged, and so forth. All the other fellows around there, of course, I'd been in that category myself a time or two. This is not a major line of mine. It's something I do when I'm broke.

They were all of the opinion that justice was totally impartial and that he was impartial. Oh, no. He was a family man; he had kids, and so forth. And they've got this burglar – maybe I was the Crown Attorney or something – and they've got this burglar and he burgled into the home and he's took this and that, and they're going to let him go free to burgle into more homes, and so on. And impartiality finds absolutely no evidence of the fact – no absolute witnesses to the fact that he broke into the home. Of course he did, we all know he did, but we haven't got the exact legal formula that adds up to evidence.

No Crown Attorney in the world could have sent the guy up. Everybody is rather despairing. It's about the fifth time he's been arrested. I'd stand up in court and say, “Well, now when you climbed in this window, Blackfoot Joe, now when you climbed in this window here, did you stumble into the baby's crib in any way? Mmmm? Well, did the child wake up?”

He'd say, “No-no-no, never near the home, never near the home, never near it.”

“Well, did the child wake up? Is that why the child had bruises on its face the next morning?”

The Lord Chief Justice says, “What is this? You mean the fellow broke into the home and beat up the children?” You see. “And tried to strangle the children?” And so forth.

“Well, I was never there, governor – never was, never was, honest, I was just never near the place. I was, as a matter of fact, was up at a pub in Piccalilli and we were just having a pint of beer, me and a couple of pals, and we were up there and I can bring them both. You've just heard them both in court. They said I was never near the place.”

“Well, now, we're getting back to these things, now the toys. Now, the toys. Did you break any of the toys when you were climbing out of the window? Now, how would you go about silencing a child's screams that was terrified in the middle of the night by somebody coming in the window?”

About that time, why, Lord Chief Justice or the magistrate or something or other turns around to the jury and says, “Bring in a verdict of guilty or I'll have you all booked.”

The guy had a button, that's all! The great impartiality of justice on the magistrate's bench had buttons. He just couldn't stand the idea of children being terrified in the middle of the night, or being abused by burglars and you never tried the case. You tried the emotions of the justice. You never tried the case really on any line except you were fairly sure that nobody ever saw anything happen.

All of these factors entered into what they laughingly call “law.” I very often take time out for a lifetime and just do a total relaxation – just like other people read comic books. So

it's not at all surprising to find even the more intelligent people amongst the ranks of auditors – and auditors are a more intelligent people, that's for sure – falling from grace and failing to observe. Because it's the one thing the human race does worst.

Honest, you turn the – you turn the weathercock around three times on the top of the steeple, while you've got half the town marshalled up to make sure that they saw it, and ask them what happened on the top of the steeple. And some will tell you that the angel Gabriel flew in and out of the belfry, and they'll go on and on. But there'll be some honest carpenter out on the outskirts and he'll say, rather grumpily, “Well, he turned the weathercock around three times. That's what you did. And I'm not quite sure what you mean to accomplish by that, but we can tell you, it won't do any good.” He might have been able to observe, but he had to go and write script after the fact, see.

Now there's your point, not to belabor it, but there's the power of observation. The power of observation actually does not couple with knowledge of the subject of Scientology. These things are entirely different. Why it is happening has nothing to do with the fact that it is happening.

Why it is happening and what it indicates is the business of a Scientologist, but observing it is simply the business of an observer, who need know nothing about the mind or anything else. He merely need know that a needle wiggled. He merely need know that the tone arm was located there and the needle wiggled. He's got to be able to observe that fact. And if he can't observe that fact in that split instant, independent of all other actions, he will very often color his observation. So it's a learned skill and it's something you should learn how to do.

Just for an instant, just note what is happening That's easy – it's very easy. It's just – it's so easy you just keep missing it, see. It's just, “What happened in that instant?”

“Well, the thing theta bopped.”

“All right. See, but what happened in that instant?”

“Well, the thing theta bopped and that meant so-and-so, he's got charge on the subject. See, that thing . . .”

What happened in that instant is succeeded immediately by the observer, and he is the unseen silent person. He simply looks at the thing and he sees the needle go . . . And then he becomes the auditor again and he says, “Well it theta bopped.”

But for a moment there, he had to observe the thing acting, totally independent of all other action, totally independent of all other thinking, totally independent of all judgment. That's just it; he simply observed it.

It's actually a very easy trick, if you know that it is a sort of a trick. You should try it some time. Try to observe something purely without an opinion. And you're liable to set half the circuits in your bank going whiz, you know.

Now, all of your 3D comes up to – each part of it comes up to the final role. The final role in the thing, as far as the test of it is concerned, requires an observer to be present. The reason you have these things checked is you hope the checker will be – serve as an observer, that somebody will observe this thing from another quarter. But actually a pure observation could be done by anybody, couldn't it? Did the needle wiggle or didn't it? Did it fall or didn't it? Did it rise or didn't it? You see? That's all. That's all you have to know, at that particular point.

Now, in assessing this particular scale, you could foul up like fire drill, because it is almost totally an observational reading action – the running of this scale. You read the level and then see whether or not that level – not the attached associated words to the terminal or something – whether or not that level produced a reaction at that moment.

Now, you have to do this observational stuff rather fast. You're a reader and then you're an observer, and then you're a stenographer. You note down what happened. You're a recorder. A reader, an observer and a recorder; that's one, two, three. That is actually the exact actions which are undertaken at that moment.

You say to this person, “Would you have faith in a waterbuck?” And you have to know that the reaction didn't occur on “waterbuck” because of course the needle will always react on “waterbuck,” as a charged subject. So you merely want “faith in,” and you observe at the second “faith in,” the observer comes in, observes what the needle does and then you say what it did as a recorder. And that is the action. And it's a very rapid action. It's a very rapid action.

Now, here and there you may have trouble with a pc who insists on talking while you're assessing I'm going to talk to you about how to actually brightly, smartly do an assessment. And you may have a pc who is going, “*Gab-gab-gab, walla-walla-walla-walla-walla-walla.*”

Well, I always handle that. I always handle that. I handle it diplomatically and I never get any ARC breaks either. I say, “Hold the cans quiet in your lap and shut up; I'm about to read the list.” That's just about the way it is, too. Do you realize why that isn't an ARC break? He's getting all of your attention, man. You're doing it all for him. He doesn't expect you to be polite while you're ministering to him.

Oh well, the way to produce an ARC break is give all your attention to the meter and say, “You know I had a meter last year that read much better than this meter.” Well, that

shows there's no attention on this fellow's case and you're not giving him his attention. You're violating what his goals terminal should have, which of course is attention.

But you can tell him almost anything within the perimeter of getting the job done and he'll take it. Well, if that's what it takes to get it done, well that's what it takes, and so on. You, by the way, are learning that rather well. I've heard a few cracks coming through doors, something on this effect, and so forth. "You want to find your terminal, don't you? All right, well stop wiggling around. Sit still."

This, this of course doesn't produce much of an ARC break. It doesn't produce any, as a matter of fact.

All right. Now, you want the pc silent. Now, he might not be as silent as he might – as a tomb, while you are assessing other lists. Oh, as he assesses his goal, every once in a while it makes him think of something and he asks you to put down another goal or something of the sort. Or he didn't understand or his attention is hung up; he's still thinking about something; he says something about it. You say, "Well all right, yeah?" He says something about it. And you say, "Did you want to add another goal on that, you want to modify that goal? You want to change it in some way?"

"Well, I think I ought to change it," and so on.

You say, "Well all right," and you just put it down at the bottom of the list. By the way, the best thing to do is to add it to the bottom of the list. Because it's kind of a Q-and-A to put it in afterwards and he gets the idea he's running the session, I've found out. So, you just add it in to the bottom of the list of goals, go over here, seven pages, wherever it is and put it down, write it down. That's the way it is. And you say, "All right; thank you," and carry right on.

However, you do tell the person, even in those assessments, "You do not have to speak while I am assessing this. As a matter of fact, we will get it done faster if you do not." That's it. But in assessing this Pre-Have 3D Scale, particularly, you haven't got time. Look-a-here, man! Look at the number of words that are in this scale!

You think you've got time, for heaven's sakes, to sit around and gab about how wonderful it would be if you were having absolutely no effect on waterbucks. Wouldn't that be interesting And we could have just an old ladies' tea party going here, you know. "Well, would you have no effect on a waterbuck?"

"Well, now, I don't know whether I would have an effect on a waterbuck or not, because a waterbuck might have effect on us and it might not have effect on U8. But waterbucks are what waterbucks are and actually my attention is sort of stuck on 'faith in.' "

“Well – oh, it is, huh? Still stuck on 'faith in waterbucks.' Oh well, maybe I'd better repeat that, uh, the . . .” What a dog's breakfast! And you're going to do this – it'll be two sessions for the assessment, five minutes for a run, two sessions for an assessment, five minutes for a run. You get the idea? Nonsense!

So you have to really start getting slick the moment you get down there to your – to your final runs and assessment on the Pre-Have in your 3D. You've got to be slippery. And at this time you can admit of no conversation. Now we get down to *no* conversation. Just let the person sit there in a total state of giddy irresponsibility. We don't care whether he's thinking about it or thinking about something else.

Of course, we want our rudiment's in. If our rudiment's in, he will be thinking about it. But just let him sit there in a giddy state of irresponsibility. We don't care whether he thinks about the levels or not thinks about the levels, or adds them up. We don't care if he hangs up on some level while we're going down to later levels. We do not care what he is doing at all, as long as he will sit there like a good boy and hold those E-Meter cans, amen.

That's all we want him to do. That's all that's expected of the pc. Once you start the assessment line, that is all he's supposed to do. And you make sure we do that.

Now, the pc says, “You know, I'm still rather hung up on – I'm still thinking hard about . . .” You'll hear them say this; this is about what they say, “I'm still thinking hard about Disperse. I can't quite get my mind off Disperse.”

You just say, “Well good. All right. Thank you.” And go right on with your list. If they do say something, don't hit them; but don't engage in any conversation with them either on the subject.

Now, the mechanics of it are these: It doesn't matter a bit, a bit, a bit, a bit, a bit whether they are thinking about it or not thinking about it. You are not reading this to the pc anyway; you're reading it to his reactive bank. And it doesn't matter whether his mind is hung up on the title or the date of the HCOB – you don't read that when you read the list, by the way – but we don't care whether his mind hung up on that or nothing.

Do you know, you are saved by this fact: No power on Earth could keep the E-Meter, practically, from registering on the exact level he's stuck in for that terminal. We don't care if his attention is analytically somewhere else or not. We're going to get a reaction, as long as he's sitting in the same room and the rudiments are reasonably in. We're going to get a reaction; that's all there is to it.

Now, pcs will try to fool it, you know and they try to hang up somehow or another, see. And they try to say, “Oh gee, you know, I know what should be run on this thing. Actually Faith is way overdue because I keep saying to myself, I caught myself last night at supper, and I was saying faith in this and faith in that. Obviously it's Faith that should be run.”

So they sit there and they say, “Well, if I think hard on Faith,” you see.

And you say, “Do you have faith in a waterbuck?” And you get a little action. Well, your final – your only action on it actually is just to make a mark. So you make a mark and it doesn't take you any time at all till you're off on the next level. That's just split seconds later that you're saying the next level. So they're still sitting there, Faith, Faith, Faith. So what?

You're down here. Probably their level at this particular thing is Withhold, or something. When you get to Withhold, they will no longer be thinking about Faith, I guarantee. “Withhold! *Ooh, oooh, huh!*” They shut up.

Now, there may be many, many assessment systems brought out but – I mean on a list assessment of this character – there may be many systems that could be followed; maybe some will work better than others. But they will all be based on this: is get the maximum number of levels for the minimum amount of time with the minimum restimulation of the pc. Maximum number of levels, minimum period of time, minimum restimulation for the pc. Now, that's what you're trying to accomplish in any assessment and you want to go off on a machine-gun basis *b-r-r-r-r svit* speed yet. It's got to be fast.

Now, let us take the type of assessment we were doing. It goes something like this: (And they tell the person we're going to assess and this – meter's set up and all that.) We say, “Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck cause things for you? Would you prevent a waterbuck from knowing?” Something like this. And you would catch those marks as you went by, actually, just about that fast. That is the type of assessments done. The reaction, if the level is going to be live, is going to hit as you say the level. You say the level, you get the reaction and you're out of there, don't you see. You don't wait until you've said it and then wait for it to react. Because it's going to react when you say it anyhow and if it didn't react when you say it, well the hell with it. And of course if it does react, why, there you are. You mark it, that's all. That's your total action. You just mark it if it is – acted. And of course if you don't know whether it acted or not, you mark it. That's – you don't sit there and study it and read it three times and so forth.

Now, under the heading of “minimum restimulation of the pc,” you don't keep repeating, repeating, repeating a level. You never run repeater technique on a level on a – on an assessment of the Pre-Have-type scale. Never run repeater technique. You just go down, one read – *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-wang* – one read each – *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang* It read or it didn't read and that's all you'd want to know.

Now, as far as acknowledging the pc is concerned, oh yeah, fine. Say, now this is a good slow way to assess, probably a very thorough way and probably a way that would give you lots of certainty as to whether or not you had the list, was: “Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Thank you. Would you cause a waterbuck anything? Mm. Thank you. *Ahhh,*

hmm. Thank you. How would you prevent knowing a waterbuck? I don't know. You know it seems to read on every level. You know every time I say 'waterbuck' it reads.”

And now, perhaps, if you'd sort it out at that rate of speed – and maybe you'd have to go at that rate of speed if you didn't know quite what you were doing – you probably would wind up with something like an assessment at the end, perhaps. Take a session to assess, five minutes to run, session to assess, five minutes to run. You get the idea? All right.

Nobody's going to say speed up faster than you have certainty on what you are reading. See, nobody's ever going to tell you that. People are going to say, speed up, speed up, speed up, but included in that remark is, of course, have certainty on what you're doing

Now, after you have read the whole list from bottom to top, you have marked each one that reacted. You have only read the level once and after that you marked it or you didn't mark it, and of course it's just not marked at all if it was null. You leave it alone. And if it did react in any way, shape or form, you put a mark after the level.

Now, that leaves you, when you finish up down to the end of it – you finish up down to the end, you have a number of levels which have marks on them. Now, you don't start in at the beginning again. You start in at the end, right where you finished up. And you go back only over those items which are now marked with the symbol of the assessment. You've put a mark there, so you only read the ones that you marked. On the first run down ten were marked, so on the back up one, you only read ten, and that is each one that is marked. All right. That's the second one.

Now, each one of those that fell on *that* particular reading, you take your pencil and you mark that it did or it – or if it didn't, you don't mark. If it fell or reacted in any way as you went back over these ten, you of course gave it an additional symbol, and it is the same symbol that you use coming down, but it's just a second symbol.

Now, you've got four left and you're now back up at the other end of the list, so you start through and only that four do you read, and each one of those that is still alive you add another symbol to it.

And now you've got two and these two now have three marks after each one. You read one of them and it says, “to own,” and you've got a mark after that, and the other one is “to make amends”; so you read “own,” and you and that it is null, and you read 'kake amends” and it is still alive. And that is all you do.

You now have “make amends,” and that is it. And that is your level. You do not check it any further than that. You do not do anything more about it than that. That is it, period. You have done your assessment.

In other words, it's a sweep down, mark anything, one read each, mark anything that is productive of a needle action. When you get to the bottom of the list, all the way through to the end of the list, where you see my name, you stop and turn around and go back up and only read those that were live coming down. Only mark those that are now live on the second read. And then you come back the other way and you only mark those that are now alive and you'll wind up with the other.

Now, sometimes you'll get into a situation like this: This is perfectly acceptable. Approach. Get out of. All right, you've got four marks after Approach, you've got four marks after Get out of. Which is it? So you say, "Get out of. Would a waterbuck get out of things?" Mark it. "Would you approach a waterbuck?" Ha-ha. That's live too. Now you got two of them.

So it's perfectly all right for you to say, because you are right on the pc level and it is very close to one or the other of these anyway, it is all right for you to say right after that, "What would a waterbuck get out of? What would you approach?" They're still both live so you go back over it again, and all of a sudden there is nothing on Approach. "Get out of" is live, you take it. That's it. And that's all the checking that you do on it.

Now, how about reading this. You get a variation. You read these things two ways in order to get a two-way flow. "Would a waterbuck have faith in you? Would you cause a waterbuck something?" Now, remember you are saying "you" and "waterbuck." Now, waterbuck is certainly charged as you go through the whole thing It's charge, charge, charge; paragraph, *paragraph* after *paragraph*, level after level after level you're saying waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, water – water – water – *waaa-waaa-waaa-waaa-waaa . . .*

That's an awful lot of talking, isn't it, for all this level. And what if you acknowledged the pc for every level. The pc doesn't talk, you see, you acknowledge his not-talkingness. There might be a better way to do it. You might say, "Would a waterbuck have faith in you, cause you, prevent you, have no effect on you, affect you? Thank you. Would you obsessively can't-have a waterbuck, make something of a waterbuck, create, think about, peculiar interest in, disperse a waterbuck? Thank you. Thank you. Would you intend not to communicate to a waterbuck? Badly control, betray, collect for, substitute for, withdraw from, duplicate, enter a waterbuck? Thank you." You get how you could eat up levels if you did something like that?

Well, it depends to a large degree how your pc can be in-session. How consecutive their wits are. That's – is their attention on you? Because actually you're not *blanging* their attention every time in to the terminal, don't you see? They're only getting a terminal about every ten levels. They still know what you're doing So it depends on your presence as the auditor and your ability to keep somebody in-session, whether you use one level every time and acknowledge it and say the level and read just that level and then reverse the flow for the

next level like, “Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck *cause you* things?” See? “Thank you.” And then go, “Would you prevent knowing a waterbuck? Would you have no effect on a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck have an effect on you?” See? It would depend on how you wandered back and forth. As long as you're keeping that flow going both ways. All right. You could take it one time.

You see, you got several variations here. You could read it twice and acknowledge once, so you get two levels with one acknowledgment. You could have one level, one acknowledgment. You could reverse the flow every other level. Or you could reverse the flow every two levels, but using a waterbuck each time, see.

“Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you cause a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck prevent knowing you? Would a waterbuck have no effect on you?” See? “Thank you.” Now you've read four levels and one acknowledgment. See, you could do it that way.

Or, if you really had presence and you thought the pc was in there and that you weren't going to miss anything, you could sail down five levels. “All right now. (Yeah, that was really depending on him.) All right now. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Cause a waterbuck, prevent knowing, no effect on, effect, obsessively can't-have, make something up, create, think about, peculiar interest in, disperse a waterbuck?” He found a level, so we mark it.

All right, well, we had the flow going that way, didn't we, so we now – we're going to come back the other way. That isn't necessarily down to a mark, it's just so many.

All right. Now, “Would a waterbuck intend not to communicate with you, badly control you, betray you, collect for, substitute for, withdraw from, duplicate, enter, inhibit, disagree with you? Thank you.” You get that?

It just depends on how good you are. It just depends on how much altitude you are as an auditor. Don't miss any levels, because it will fall on it. Person's attention is on a waterbuck. The person will be – his attention will be on a waterbuck. All you do is have to say somebody's terminal to them hard; all you do is have to say “willow wand” to somebody whose terminal is “willow wand,” “willow wand,” his attention will be on willow wand for some little time now, you see.

You know these wind-up toys, you know, that have these traction wheels, you know, and you get the wheel running real fast and you set it down and it runs. His attention will be on it for several levels before it's jarred in any way. Well, you take advantage of that fact.

Now, you could cover it that way. Now, I haven't and actually don't lay down a standardization because frankly some auditors would have an awful lot of trouble trying to keep somebody's attention in that long The pc's attention, sort of nervous and upset and his attention usually isn't on anything. You're liable to start just reading random levels.

Now, if you were covering the gross level in that particular character, if you were covering the gross chart in that particular character, you would still come back to the one read for the second run. You've only got ten left so what are you winning You're winning nothing See? The second – you got – you've covered the whole thing in that fashion, many – five levels let us say, three levels without saying the terminal or getting a flow. And then you got three more going the other way and then three more going back again, you see, with the flows. Or five, as far as that's concerned, levels before you flip-flopped the flow or said the terminal again, or something. That's perfectly all right.

But on the one back, you've only got ten levels live, you would take every one of them on the basis of: “Have you failed to interest a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck fail to help you? Would you destroy a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck propitiate you? Would you survive a waterbuck?” See. You'd take every one on a cross-flow.

I'm just advancing these ideas to you for just this good reason, is this is an awful mouthful to assess on this Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale and you've got to have some way of getting over it more rapidly, so study it over and see how you'll get over it. Actually you want maximal – you want accuracy, you want maximal speed and minimal restimulation to the pc.

The way to get maximal restimulation and minimal speed is to assess this way: “All right. Now, we're going to assess a waterbuck here. All right, you all ready? All right. Thinking about a waterbuck? Are you thinking about a waterbuck? All right. All right. Okay. Think, think about a waterbuck now. Uh, let's see. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? It's live. All right. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you have faith in a waterbuck? It's still alive, you know. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Oh, it went null that time. All right, that's good.

“All right. Would a waterbuck cause you things? Oh, you know, that's null. Would a waterbuck cause you things? That's null, you know. Would a waterbuck cause, cause, cause, cause, cause, cause; would a waterbuck cause you things? Cause things to happen? Would a waterbuck cause, cause everything? Now I'm getting a fall. That's better.”

Do you know actually there was an – were some assessments done that way here back in July, before we caught it. They were erasing every level. Now, I don't think that would be possible with this kind of list. But sailing down the line on this, you should be able to get your assessment in and get it in fairly rapidly, and with you satisfied with the accuracy of the assessment.

Now, this Auxiliary 3D Scale, given the fact that you're reading a meter, getting in the fact that you're trying to get the level well and expertly and that you've got the thing right on the front burner anyway. It's got a lot of new beef in it. There's a lot of stuff in this that is raw meat.

The earlier Primary Scale was delivered up on an idea that wasn't too successful. It was supposed to move over into a Secondary Scale. Now, you have a scale which is an Auxiliary Scale which is all one in itself, and you have murder, kill, maim, tear to pieces, exhibit, bury, pain, wound, antagonize, bore; you've got all kinds of words in it which are your major action words.

The formula of any such thing, by the way, is reach and withdraw. They are the words which reach and enter, and withdraw and leave. And that is your formula for putting together one of these scales. And there it must be all action words; they must all be doingness words and there must be no stop words because you cannot run a stop. You can try to stop. "What would you do to stop a..." Yes, you can run that. But you couldn't run "Now, get the idea of stopping a waterbuck. Thank you. Get the idea of stopping a waterbuck." Well, that's just dandy. After a while at the end of the session, the pc has nothing but waterbucks from his face to the wall. He did what you said.

But you'll find this scale is very useful. Now, this scale, of course, comes to us in the nitch of time because we are already starting these runs and we have one pc who doesn't look quite so good today, and I think it's because she didn't have the scale earlier for her session. You might have found something much hotter on the scale. But you'll find it tomorrow and it will be something like, "How would you sexually satisfy a waterbuck?" I say it's a raw-meat scale.

Well, anyway, this scale, this scale could go on forever, and it might even get a few words longer, however, you'll notice there are quite a few words missing on the Pre-Have. That's because nobody ever fell on them. And by deletion we've lost a few words but we've added a tremendous more.

I will ask you that if you have somebody flat on this entire scale and it becomes necessary to you – either here or anyplace else – and it becomes necessary for you to look up in Hartrampff's Vocabularies or look up in a sheaf of the old Secondary Scales and find a new level or two that you don't have – if it becomes necessary for you to dream up a level for the pc because all these levels are run – would you please, please remember to send me the level you had to dream up. Okay?

And in that way, we will eventually, down the years, exactly crowd them all in, one way or the other; anything that any case would fall on. And if you will carefully, carefully, carefully preserve these Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scales, one for a pc. Put it in the pc's folder and use it for the pc, and use different symbols for each time you assess – different symbols, I don't care what they are there. You use a little half-circle, a half-circle open at the top, a half-circle open at the bottom, a half an X, a full X and there are several alphabets you haven't used for words; there's cuneiform – and if you'll preserve those and when it's all washed up, I will be able to lay my hands on some of these, we'll find out if there are any null levels in this

thing Are there any levels nobody has ever gotten run on? And then of course we can delete those and it will shorten the list.

It's in your interest to have the list as short as it can possibly be kept. Okay?

All right. Well, we got this out at the break of dawn; use it from here on. Don't use your old 3 – your old Routine 3 and earlier Pre-Have Scales. Just abandon those things because they're – they're not dangerous, they're just not complete. And you'd do much better with these.

I may be able to compartment this at tone levels. I may be able to get it into various tone levels so that you only have to – after you've gotten rid of a section of it, you don't have to reassess across that section again. You know, segment it somehow or another. Get rid of parts of it. I don't know quite how I'm going to do that. That's all in the future.

Right now you've got this and it does work, and you've got 3D and it does work. You've got E-Meters and they work. And your Instructors and me are going to make doggone sure that you work them. And as we used to say in innumerable wars down the last 200 trillion years: We'll be out of the trenches before Christmas.

Thank you.