QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
GPMs, RELEASE

A lecture given on
19 June 1962

All right, this is second lecture, June what?

Audience: 19.

Nineteen, AD 12 and it's a – this is a Q and A. Gag Questions? Yes?

Male voice: In the lecture last week on listing, you mentioned that the second goals list would be shorter than the first one.

In the lecture last week on listing, I mentioned that the second goals list would be shorter than the first one that was done.

Male voice: or words – words to that effect. Uh – I sort of thought that you took the original goals list and added to it for the – to get the second goals list.

That is not a settled fact we are talking about.

Male voice: I see.

We aren't far enough advanced on second goals to make very sweeping statements concerning whether it's longer or shorter, whether there's any virtue in using the first list, or otherwise. I personally would simply take off into the blue, run the TA action out of the listing – on doing the second goals list. That way we'd be sure would be fairly right.

And if we didn't find the goal on it, then we'd take the first one and the second one, see. But the easiest way to do it would just simply be to list some more goals and take the TA action out of it. If you find after a person has had the first one done – the first goals list – and it's come down to a goal and then that goal has been adequately listed and it's now not acting and everything is fine, you've got a sporadic or free needle on the case, you'll find now that the person does have tremendous numbers of new goals. And you'd have to take advantage of those things anyway.

So the simple way to do it is why make the thing more complicated than it is until we find some reason why we should make it more complicated. Which is you just take the TA

action out of the goals list – make them list goals so you don't get any TA action anymore. They think that goals list is complete, null it, put any additional ones that they want on it, come down, find a goal, check it out. If you find a goal and it checks out and that's fine, and if you've got it, why, fine. If you haven't, you've still got the first list. Maybe work that one over.

But this is – this is to some degree a guesstimate. Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Yes, Tom?

Male voice: I'd like to know if you get tone arm action if the rudiments were out, on listing.

If you get tone arm action if the rudiments are out, on listing I'd say that was fantas – very, very doubtful.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay.

Male voice: Ron, what might be the liabilities of running Havingness while shifting lists – lists of items?

What would be the liabilities of running Havingness while shifting lists. If Havingness is run in a Prepcheck with the What question null, it has no liability. And in a Routine 3, Havingness run as you shift lists would only have a liability and it could have a liability, if you hadn't even vaguely exhausted the list you had just left. And if you had the pc way back down the track someplace and you all of a sudden uncork a lot of havingness, wow! See. It might be very poor indeed. Might throw him.

I'd say, that this would depend on how much TA action you were leaving. As a matter of fact, I see no real reason to run much Havingness between lists unless your pc is just – seems to be going out of havingness every time you turn around. If a pc's havingness runs down ordinarily their rudiments are a bit awry. That's another little side rule that belongs there as an addendum – pc's havingness going down.

Of course, you mustn't go around worrying all the time about the fact that the pc's rudiments go out. So they go out. So you can put them in. The thing you worry about is that the pc go on listing smoothly. See, you start getting worried when the pc's listing smoothly . . .

There's something I'd like to comment on. Some people are doing a fish and fumble halfway through a session of listing or a session of goals or something In other words, they take a – they see that the needle gets dirty so they start doing a fish and fumble and it's halfway through the session, something like that.

If you're going to do a fish and fumble to clean up a needle on a Routine 3, you do it at the beginning of the body of session. And if that needle occurs – the dirty needle – and it gets

rather unreadable and that sort of thing, try to get it in with your middle rudiments. And if you can't get that needle cleaned up with the middle rudiments – right away, you know, nothing laborious, nothing superweighted – your best bet is to go on listing

But if you're nulling a goals list at the time this happens and the needle gets so confoundedly dirty that you can't do anything about it and you can't read through it and so on, don't fish and fumble. Don't fish and fumble; shortsession it. put your middle ruds in. Needle's still dirty, still messed up, you still can't read it – go right on through your end ruds; end the session; give your pc a little break; start right in at the beginning of your next session; put in your beginning rudiments; and you'll find somewhere along the line that you're going to catch the reason why.

But I really wouldn't be too quick to take extraordinary action in nulling Because I have seen too often a goal persist in its read.

Let's say a goal rock slammed. Goal rock slammed. Now, do you know that your next five goals are going to read for that goal? Yeah, I mean there – you shouldn't worry about this. You'll find this in doing a Prehav Assessment. You'll be coming down the line with the Prehav Assessment and you unfortunately read "killed" or something. And my golly, the next five levels are all going to rock slam just like "kill" did. In other words the pc's stuck on a rock slam read. It was a heavily charged area. So that that dirty needle coasts right on over the next few items.

So you hit a goal, "To kiss girls," and it rock slammed like mad and now you've got a dirty needle, see? And you can't do anything – you apparently . . . You get your middle rudiments in and so forth. Now, what's wrong with this? It was actually a rock slamming goal. Well, a rock slam persists. And a rock slam will go over your next four or five, if you just kept on going. In other words, you never got off of the goal that you were on.

Now, the best thing to do is call their attention to a room object. If you want to turn it off, if it's going to turn off, this would be your first thing to *do.* And this is a common thing to do in nulling. This is not unusual. This – we've been doing this for a long time except nobody's just called it to mind recently. You hit "To kiss girls," rock slam, you're going to see a little tiny rock slam. Looks like a dirty needle, you know, there it is, *jiggle jiggle-jiggle-jiggle-jiggle.* "To catch catfish" *jiggle-jiggle-jiggle-jiggle,* no change of the needle. "To run horses." No change of the needle. Can't read it, see you don't know whether it's in or out or something like that.

Well, if you're real good, you remember where that turned on. It was, "To kiss girls." And to assist the auditor in catching up this bug, we used to put "R/S" whenever we got a goal or an item that was rock slamming, we wrote "R/S" after the thing. That was in case – well, it was to help us track goals originally. But it also served this: That was in case you got a persistent R/S. So that the one after that and the one after that and the one after that and the

one af – they all R/S. Well, what's R/S? Well, you know where to start in again to pick the thing up; go to the next one after the R/S. Don't read the R/S again because that's just going to give you R/S. Take the one after the one you've marked "R/S."

But what do you do? What is – what was the old solution for this? And that was to say something like this: "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." Use a null word. Preferably a room object. "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." The rock slam turns off and you go to the next one after the one you marked "R/S." It was quite a little drill and I see now that you're having to fish and fumble in the middle of a session. I'm sure all you are running into the persistency of a tiny rock slam. And it's not really a dirty needle. It's the fact that you've got a goal that read with a rock slam – tiny rock slam. And of course it's persisting right on through.

If you went on ten or twenty levels, it would also turn off. It would also turn off .It's a symptom, by the way, of an insufficient number of goals. If you're getting this thing stuck up like this and you're getting this rock slam that goes like this and it turns on and won't turn off, you haven't got enough goals on the list. It would be the first thing you would think of.

But when you see one of these little tiny dirty needle rock slams, you know, this is *g-b-z-z-z*, something like that and it turned on with something and you saw it turn on, write "R/S" after the thing And if the next one that you read, see, it was, "To kiss girls" *b-z-z-z-z*, see, mark it "R/S." And then, "To catch catfish," and man, that R/S is still on, don't be so imperceptive as to realize that this isn't just a persistency of read on something you have just read.

Now start saying, you know – it's just, "To kiss girls" b-z-z-z-z. You write "R/S." "To catch catfish," and it's still going all the way through and at the end – *b-z-z-z-z.* See, it's just consistent and continual. It'll just go right on going b-z-z-z-z. You say to yourself, "To hell with it" and you say, "Floor. Floor.

Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." And all of a sudden the pc says, "Floor? What floor?" You know, "Floor? Oh, floor! Heh-heh! Yeah, well, thank you." you know. "Floor, yes." And your rock slam will turn off.

Now, don't read that R/S goal again, go, "To catch catfish" and you'll get your proper read on, "To catch catfish" which is one of the easiest ways to put this little phenomenon back on the rails that you know of. That's the proper way to handle that sort of thing

What was your question originally, Jim?

Male voice: The liabilities of running Havingness when shifting lists.

Yes. Well, your liabilities of running Havingness on shifting lists comes under the heading of having the pc back on the track, well in-session and calling his attention out into the room environment and getting him kind of madly out of it all and so forth.

However, if your needle is persistently dirty and that sort of thing, you've probably got down havingness going and so forth and it wouldn't be any liability to it anyway because the pc probably isn't in-session anyway.

Now, that's a form of Havingness. This is how I got off onto it. "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." Thought I'd call it to your attention, because on marking folders this has been called to mind in the last day or so.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay, you bet.

Okay, what other question is there that I can diverge on like that? Yes, Quentin?

Male voice: You mentioned in the previous lecture, a possible new rudiment, "In this session have you made any decisions?" How would uh – that cover any decisions made prior to the session?

Well, "Since the last time I audited you" is a characteristic, of course, of the beginning rudiments.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And, if decision went into the end rudiments, it'd probably go into your Prepcheck of the mid rudiments list.

Male voice: I get it.

And, you'd catch that every few days anyway. And I wouldn't try to strain at it too hard. But there still, as you say, there might be some virtue. But you couldn't use it in the end rudiments. You want to know if he made any decision in the session. They do. They make decisions. Not to go into that goal channel again. Not to hold the cans this way. All little oddball things.

Actually, they all constitute a type of withhold. But if it went into the end ruds, it'd probably go into the Prepcheck list, so that every fifth session you'd be picking up those interims anyhow. Okay?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Right. Any other question? Oh, I don't think you're that well informed. Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Uh – this fifth session, is that based on the fact of a two hour . . .

This, this . . . ?

Male voice: This uh – Prepchecking every fifth session. Is that based on the fast of a two-hour session?

That is based on a two-hour session. Prepchecking every fifth session is based on a two-hour session – based on what you were doing Then this would be considerably different in an HGC.

Male voice: Yeah.

But it still – it would mean a Prepcheck about every second day. Yes. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right. Yes, Tom?

Male voice: Uh – as far as uh – completing the goals list, can we expect any uh – help as far as the tone arm's concerned ?

In completing the goals list can we expect any help as far as the tone arm is concerned. Anything more?

Male voice: Well, I was looking at also, the other thing that stuck me – would there be any good between that and the rudiments being out? Because any time, as I mention, the rudiments go out, how would one determine which was which, if we did get help from the tone arm motion of slowing down like flattening out?

Go over that last again, now. If we did get . . . ?

Male voice: The first thing I was interested in, what help could we get from tone arm motion as to telling us when the list was complete? Would it help us any?

What help could you get from tone arm motion telling you the list is complete? Well, in the first place by the time you get up to R3, you should have a good security as to whether your rudiments are in or out.

Male voice: Yes.

You should be able to know that rather easily.

Male voice: Yes.

If your rudiments are in and you're getting tone arm motion, then of course the list of goals is not complete.

Male voice: Yeah.

If the rudiments are out and you're getting no tone arm motion, of course you would just expect to get the rudiments in. But in any event, a checkout of a goal is a little bit late to find out whether or not you've got the goals list complete, so you probably should be very careful in prepchecking at the end of your goals listing And that'll make sure that your stuff was in and all was well and so on.

Ask if there are any more goals and the fellow ponders for a while and gets a quarter of a TA division change. You know your rudiments are in. So you know there's more goals. You ask him for more goals and the needle flies around – that's the best way to read it. And you say, "Well, is this list complete?" and the needle flies around. You say, "Is this list..." and the needle flies around. You say, "goals" and the needle flies around. You say most anything because, frankly, it's not very critical – it's an open and shut proposition if you're going to get any help from a TA action.

An incomplete goals list is terribly incomplete. And with just one more goal on it, it's complete. See, it's not necessarily quantity of goals that makes it incomplete, but it's whether the goal is on it and therefore that channel is sufficiently discharged.

All of the rules of Routine 3GA are based, now, on making it very easy to find a goal. And all activities of earlier Routine 3s, unless restated for 3GA, should just be forgotten. Just forget those earlier activities – just skip them because 3GA goals listing is not in an effort to get the goal on the list, but to permit the auditor to find it, you see. And there are other little changes of this particular type.

You'll get TA action if the goal isn't on the list and your rudiments are in. You'll get TA action. And with one more goal on the list you will cease to get TA action. It's not a quantitative additive, see. Yes?

Male voice: If you have run one goal, once all lines have gone null on – on the thing, the goal is gone, the lines are gone, the needle's sitting on Clear read and free, uh, you – would you expect it to stay free for any length of time . . .   Uh-uh.

Male voice:. . . or does pieces of the GPM fly back in or . . . ?

Well, I wouldn't expect it to stay free at all.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

You're saying now, if you've listed a goal and TA's come down to the clear read and the needle has gone free, would you expect it to remain free? *No.* The answer, definitely not by the mere fact of breaking the Auditor's Code and overlisting You may – got a free needle, so you list the next list, see. you read the question of the next list, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and you don't get any interruption of free needle and if you ask for one more item on it, it's a – it's a break of the Auditor's Code.

Now, by asking for one more item on it – this is what I'm getting around to here – for asking for one more item on it or two more or a half an hour's worth, you all of a sudden are going to get yourself a pretty wild needle. It is going to get wilder than scat. It's probably going to have more read on it than you've seen for many a day.

What exactly is happening The pc is being obliging and is hauling chunks of the GPM on. And you could overlist a free needle and overlist it and overlist it, until you had the whole

thing stuck up like a circus poster after a wind storm, see. It'd just be a mess because you pulled in the GPM.

So because you can pull in the GPM early on, so easily, you shouldn't have any difficulty whatsoever in cancelling out that free read with a new goals list. Now, that means of course that the pc, just living in their environment, going to be able to key that in like crazy, because they got a bunch of new goals. But actually they aren't new goals, they're earlier goals.

Now if you see the GPM as a series of cycles – you ever read *History of Man?* All right. Now, *History of Man* talks about cycles on the whole track. This would be a pc in a new environment dedicated to a new activity, going through a whole bunch of new nonsense and experience and so forth, would be a complete cycle. Then he changes. He changes his activity. And he goes over here and he becomes something else in another area and dedicated to other things. Well, that stays relatively keyed out. But that first area could have grouped and become – that first cycle could have grouped and become a piece – a piece of the track GPM. It's actually a cycle GPM, see.

All right and then he's got this next GPM up here. Now, what you've actually found when you found the first goal, is something that is relatively new. you have found the basic postulate on usually some track – piece of a cycle. Just a cycle, see. you found the earliest basic purpose of the cycle. Now you, of course, have got all the cycles earlier than that yet to clean up. So if you overlist, just in an effort to be cooperative and so on, the pc will start coasting backtrack. You see, he starts to make something out of it. And the second he does that he starts pulling in earlier track, see? All right.

Male voice: I didn't communicate one thing, Ron. I wasn't talking about overlisting, I was talking of blowing the one package. The first package is gone.

Well, I'm talking to you about how you can get the second package in.

Male voice: oh, I got it, I see. I get it. Oh, I'm sorry.

See? Now, you can get your second package in, in livingness, by overlisting and so you sure get it back in that. And there's probably nothing more delicate or easier to cancel out than the first package's free needle. That's the only point I'm trying to make with you. And I was just trying to show you how it is cancelled out. you can cancel it out numerous ways. Fellow has a perfectly free needle, he's had a free needle for days, he feels wonderful, he's up on Cloud Nine, he sails around without even a rudder, he gets up in the – he gets up one morning, he gets up one morning and sees a glass of water alongside of the bed. you put him on the meter and he reads six. What was it? Well, God knows. It just happened to be an earlier piece of track. It might have been the time she poisoned all the boys or something like this. But it's – it'll just go out, just like that.

That's what happened on your first Clears. See? And some of them stayed quite remarkably stable. Went along for quite a while. And some of them folded up by the next day, see. And that was just all because there was earlier track. You'll eventually get back to some rock goal, some goal around the rock someplace, the first time he decided to be or something like that and it'll be something way early, native state transition sort of goal. And after that you could hit him over the head with a club, shoot him with a shotgun – free needle. Free needle. You couldn't get anything but a free needle. And it's just going to take them ages to get into a state where they could gum it up now.

You see, the reason you get a – you know, you all get a very weird view of what livingness can do to a human being in Prepchecking Well, you find out this little girl, this little girl actually made an improper remark at a dinner party. And it's ruined her whole life! And life begins to look to you from a Prepcheck viewpoint, you know, like man, you've just got to walk through with your breath held, you know? And that's life, you know? And if you just hold your breath just right, then you're not going to get aberrated much, you see. And it looks from a Prepcheck viewpoint as though aberration is much easier to acquire than dandruff, you know?

So you – and then when you start blowing off pieces of the GPM, you recognize that all of this stuff – which you were getting in Prepchecking – depended, of course, for all of its force and power on the GPM. And with the GPM gone, of course it doesn't have any force and power. And a person's viewpoint becomes just as exaggerated in the opposite direction. And you could measure how long somebody's free needle would stay free by their somewhat exaggerated ideas of what wasn't aberrative. See, you could make a little test. This is all on the same line.

You could say to a person that you're prepchecking, "What would aberrate somebody?"

"Well, making an improper remark to a hostess at a dinner party. You could become very, very aberrated through having been acquainted with an aunt who took sleeping tablets. Having a mother who loved you too much, yeah, these'd all be sources of aberration. You see, this'd drive a person crazy."

And if their free needle's going to stay stable, their answers are much more likely to be in this classification: "All right, what makes a person aberrated?"

"Well, that's hard to say. It's his own Goddamn foolishness, that's – that's – that's – that's one of them."

"Well, all right, thank you. Thank you. What would make them aberrated?" You say to him – foolishness?

"Oh, I don't know. Let's see, you could find somebody who was trying to get out of this universe and then you could torture them for a long time while saying to yourself all the

time that you were not responsible for doing so – no, that wouldn't make somebody aberrated."

You get the idea? Well, similarly, the key-in is as delicate as this. See? The glass of water keys them in on that first goal, you know. Oh, that brings in the whole GPM, everything is gone to hell. And later on they're in an automobile accident and they were standing in the middle of the street – if this would happen, which it probably wouldn't, you see. But they're standing in the middle of the street and got hit by an automobile or something like that and you put them on the meter and they've still got a free needle.

Relative stability would be length of duration by which they could retain a free needle. You want to know relative state of Clear would be relative time that the needle stayed free. That's just answering and over-answering your question, but there it is. Okay? All right.

Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: Yes. I have something about this – the length of these cycles. Could one – like a sort of a Prepcheck to find out how long ago it goes back?

All right. You want to know about the lengths of cycles . . .

Female voice: Yes.

. . . and how about a Prepcheck to find out how long ago one goes back?

Female voice: Yeah. If that overlaps with other track.

Well, you can read all this off on a meter. You could actually ask people how long they've been here and how long ago it goes and you can use old electropsychometric auditing techniques that are given in that first earliest, earliest, earliest book on the E-Meter and check out pieces of track and find out how many years it responds to, although what's known as "year" we haven't a clue. But the reactive mind seems to know all about it.

And the – you could check all this up and get your responses off the meter. You could do this. And you could plot out the length of each cycle. And the funny part of it is, is you will get most of them. you would probably get it very well plotted.

What you want to do is take *History of Man* and about five yards of adding machine paper and write figures on it one way or the other. You'll finally come up with a track map. you get a track plot and then you would – you would have it fairly straight.

The oddity is, is you could do this without the GPM being gone. That's what is odd. I mean, you could do this over the head of the GPM, which is quite remarkable. Don't expect your pc to have much reality on it and don't expect a lot of other things, but you actually could do that and find out how long the cycles were and everything else.

Now on the other hand, there's another way to go about it, is you clear them with 3GA, you see. And you get them so Clear that you tick them on the shoulder and they ring for hours, see, and then you just ask them. See? The information is very available.

Female voice: That would collide with the free needle then? On that particular goal ?

Yeah. Well, if that – if that section of track has no further bunchings, groupings or masses which have been accumulated by alter-is, it'll read free needle.

Female voice: All right. Thank you.

All right. But if you're going to investigate track with an E-Meter, then you do it before you fully clear somebody. Because you're not going to do it afterwards. You have to have very aberrated banks before you can really get data. Unless you ask somebody.

Okay, any other – any other questions? Yes.

Male voice: How many packages would one have to run or would there be a fixed number of packages to be run, before the person really goes Clear?

How many packages will the person have to run to get Clear? All right, term "package" is Routine 3D. Hope you realize that. And it has no existence in 3GA, so let's – not scolding you – but let's – let's omit that. A package, we mean by a package, we mean the opposition goal and the terminal and all that sort of thing. We're not finding them today.

Now, how many cycle GPMs would you have to run out? I don't know. It's a very finite number. But I wouldn't know. you couldn't even, I don't think, guess from pc to pc. It's going to vary. Look at the life you've been leading, see. All right, now compare the life you've been leading to the life that somebody else has been leading. Now, have you ever run into a case which was basically just all free track? You know, you tell them to go back down the time track, you ask them to look at the picture and they tell you all about it? You ever run into such a case? All right, did you ever run into a case of, ask them to – what they're looking at and they tell you it's all black as night and it's never been any other way, except for this little rocket that's going from left to right. See – you get the idea?

All right, there are two factors. One is *severity* of immersion into the GPM and the other is lightness of experience. These are each two different factors. You could have somebody with light experience who's thoroughly immersed into it and totally jet-black. Now, they'd clear up awful easy. It's a fact; you could have.

Then you've got somebody else with tremendous amounts of experience, lots of – lots of cycle GPMs and so forth, only for the last cycle, he's rather new on the cycle and he doesn't int – he doesn't tend to be smeared up in anything. It's all just free track and three dimensional color pictures and so forth and you say . . .

All right. Now, this is a fooler. Because this bird is cruising along and you say, "Oh, what an easy case. There's nothing to this case, see." *Crash!* See, and we're back into the lineup and *crash!* Here we go again and there's horrible somatics and everything goes black and the person is totally *appalled* because everything has gone black. Now they know they're getting *worse* and everything . . .

And then we find out that it takes three times as long to clear the free track person than did this black five that could never move an inch on the time track, see. These are the oddities you run into. I wouldn't know of any way of estimating it, for this reason: Nobody shows the total aberration of which they are track-capable, see. Nobody shows this much aberration. They never show as much aberration as can be keyed in, man. Impossible! And it's going to vary from person to person, case to case, so on one person you do twenty packages – I use your phrase – another person, why, you do fifty.

Also, this factor enters into it: The thoroughness with which the auditor is working Some auditor is being a little bit sloppy and he goes three cycles. And he just gets three GPMs of a cycle-type out of the road and off the main GPM very easily, see. Beautiful job of it. Beautiful job. And then he says it's so easy, now, that the fourth goal he finds, he finds very sloppily while the pc is being very insouciant and he's being cross-eyed. And he didn't check it out. He didn't add it up. And it's the wrong goal. It's a really wrong goal. So he lists it. So the case goes *zzuupp!* Thud! Crash! Black mass, where is it? You know, what wall?

The remedy for that sort of thing is to find the right goal. But you see, auditing would also tend to produce a variable picture. When we have four or five thousand cases in the racks, why, we can add up a statistical average. But I think the statistical average will be filled with so many variables that it'll be worthless. Some people live 'ard. And some people just haven't had a chance to.

Okay? Answer your question? All right. Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what is the definition of Release and what test can you make to ascertain whether a person is a Release?

Oh, the whole subject of Release is a very easily covered subject – is the person better by reason of auditing and does he know it? That's a Release. In the first place, unless he's been released from some chronic difficulty that he considers – then he won't consider that he has been improved, because his attention is sort of thoroughly pinned down onto the chronic difficulty that until he has gotten out of that he won't admit to having gotten any better even though you may have cured him of a dozen other things.

So, a Release, purely and simply, is a person who has obtained results in processing and has a reality on the fact that he has attained those results. That, severely, is the definition of a Release. Now, when you try to subject this thing to a test – which can be duplicated in HCO offices for some sort of an award or something like that – you run into a difficulty.

Because you don't want this sort of thing whereby you walk in – somebody walks in and says "Well, I feel much better by reason of my processing"

"All right, you're a Release, thank you."

The guy – it isn't necessarily true. They might just be hitting a manic at session end. I've never seen anybody so *deliriously well,* now, as a psychoanalyst I audited one time and she stayed *"wonderfully, wonderfully well"* for three days. Then she really fell on her coco. Coconut milk splattered in all directions, practically. She just sailed into the middle of a manic point, you see. Dramatizing like crazy. So, that doesn't give you anything

So something of the idea of a stability of gain enters into this when you talk about testing And it isn't something that an auditor would release – issue; he wouldn't issue an idea of having released the pc at the end of session, you see, or even perhaps at the end of an intensive. He'd let it cook for a little while. But he'd have to figure some way to ask just these two questions so that he wouldn't get an offhanded or unreal response, is: "Have you had a distinct gain from processing?" and "Do you have a reality that you have had that gain?" see. "Do you know Scientology has made you better and are you better?" That – that is it.

You see, it's one of these things that's overly simple. It's so simple that it's almost impossible to – well, you can't issue a perfect test for it. You'd have to put the person on the E-Meter and find out if they were telling you the truth and you'd have to do a lot of other things to have the perfect test. But that is a Release and that has been a Release just absolutely for years and years and years. But it gets fancied up. And what you see is a release form that has to be filled in to tell whether or not the person is released. Well, actually it's just trying to be secure in getting an answer to those two questions, whatever the form is.

And you'll find that a person who has not had any improvement because of auditing and who has no reality on that fact, basically, well, could be in propitiation, you know, and could be in some other state of mind. But you'll find that that person – they're never – not really very safe to have around. They've been audited for quite a while and they haven't had any gains and so forth and, "What is all this?" They – these are the people that give you trouble and so forth.

Why is that? Well that's because, of course we know now, they have withholds and missed withholds and things of this character. You know, a missed withhold can throw somebody down into propitiation.

Now the earliest statement of release is about 1952 and it's simply: The person knows he won't get worse. So you could add that as one of your requirements for Release and to get the full historic picture. He knows he won't keep on getting worse now. And you can achieve a Release rather easily on some people – just, you can break up a neurosis with ARC Straightwire. If you get somebody that's real bad off and it's what wall and what bank and you

run a little bit of ARC Straightwire on him and all of a sudden it clears up and they've got some hope and they know they're pointed in some right direction.

Well, if you were then assured that that improvement would be stable, see, through waiting a week or two, why, you'd have a Release. Do you get the idea? All right. If you've – if a person has improved, by the way, by auditing – just to lay it on – if a person has improved by auditing, you've got one other factor here. you know that their missed withholds and that sort of thing are fairly clean and that you won't wake up some morning with a poniard sticking out of your abdomen. Looking down and finding poniard hilts in your abdomen, I don't know, you've probably done it yourself, but it's uncomfortable. Not that one feels that one is going to be struck at every time by other people, I'm just giving you whether their . . .

You'll find somebody who has not been to this exact definition a Release and they go along, just fine, for three or four months and pat you on the back and that sort of thing and then give a story to the newspapers and you wonder what the hell's going on here. There's no stability.

You see the value of a state called Release, then? You see, there is a value in having a state called Release, the difficulty of testing that state, because of the simplicity of its definition. Now, I think that's the best way to answer you on the subject of Release. Okay? All right. Of course, that's quite a question, what exactly is a Release.

Male voice: Troubled me for years.

Huh?

Male voice: Troubled me for years.

All right. Well, that is exactly what it is.

Male voice: Hmm.

Here's the weirdity. There's very few Scientologists realize they are Releases. They're bird-dogged on to Clear, you know. If they could answer that question positively and affirmatively, they're a Release.

By the way, this is very appropriate. We're just now getting a – we've got a release button, it's the "S" and double triangle, with an "R." a red "R" on it in the middle of the enamel. Very pretty little button. It's exactly the same size as the old "S" and double triangle.

Male voice: Can we all have one?

If you pass the test. Oh yes, and – but many are called and few are chosen. And in your particular case, because you brought up the subject, we'll give you one when you devise the perfect test!

Male voice: Okay. That's. . .

Because – well, frankly, right at the moment, we don't have one that I consider adequate. We just have guesstimates. Okay? "Many are called, few are chosen, the lightning often strikes...." Okay, you bet.

Yes?

Female voice: I have one more question. Uh – if someone gets good 3-D pictures on goals listing, that would be free track, wouldn't it? Would that be a possible indication for a goal or not a goal?

My – the whole subject goes back to the first lecture, Louise, is you're not interested, as the auditor, in whether they got pictures, haven't got pictures, where they're getting their goals from or anything else. you can read no indications from this because they're going to hit free track or they're going to hit black areas or they're going to hit free track and the second that you start to list it they'll hit black areas. When you finish the listing of it they'll be hitting free track. You don't – you're walking with a variation here, of considerable magnitude. And you should never, never, never, on listing *goals,* inquire if the pc has any pictures.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Never. Never mention it to the pc. Because it's of no value of any kind in listing goals.

Female voice: Yeah.

Good enough.

Female voice: Thank you.

I didn't mean to scold you. That's a good point to keep in mind.

Female voice: If it – if it is mentioned, without asking?

Hm?

Female voice: If it is mentioned, during listing, without asking for it, I just wondered what. . .

So it's mentioned!

Female voice: Yeah.

TR 4. TR 4. Understand it. Acknowledge it. And return the pc to listing.

Female voice: Yes.

But God almighty, don't ever say, "You mean the last few goals you have listed you've had a stuck picture? Hm! That is very puzzling What is the stuck picture?" Now you could go on like this, you could say, "Well, what is the largest object in the picture?" Overboard would go your pc and that would be the end of goals listing

By the way, we had somebody, last year, who found a pc's goal by sticking the pc in a picture and then asking him for goals out of the picture. We didn't find a goal on the pc either. Because there weren't that many goals in that picture. I think the goal was, "Not to be beheaded" or something like that. That was a good thing to bring up, Louise. All right. Okay. Yes?

Male voice: Uh, in your E-Meter book you mentioned about an OT meter. Is that still going to be used ?

In your E-Meter book you mentioned about an OT meter, is that going to be used or not? All right. Well, I haven't had any need of it. We would be researching it madly if we had much need of it. We started into researching on it. We found out body read is so enormous on that type of reaction. We did a little other research on it. We tried to get a very sensitive needle meter that the medicos have – I guess they've tried to duplicate our E-Meter, which has been around long enough – and it wouldn't read either.

And we've gone into this, but frankly, we haven't, since the advent of the Mark IV – see, that was not – the Mark IV hadn't appeared at that time or had been proven out – we haven't found any real reason to have an OT meter, yet. If we do, we have gotten a leg up on its research and so on, but I won't say that there is no reason for one. But right now we don't need one, so there is no priority on it. Okay?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right. Okay, any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: Could you briefly summarize the data you're got now about chronic tone arm readings, at say 4.5, 3.5, 2.5, 1.5? You told us a number of things about chronic tone arm reads over the years, like 4.5 equals actually stuck in a crowd, is a chronic reading there.

Yes.

Male voice: Could you give us your – the current . . .

The significance of chronic tone arm read.

Male voice: Yeah. Especially 2.5 and 3.5.

Yeah, well they're the same as they were. The same as they were. Your person who reads below 2.0 is lower in responsibility and the same as they've always been. 2.5 is inevitably something about a machine, a robot or something like that. Your 4.5 is a crowd, it's just as it's always been. I don't know what 7 is. But it's something And in general, chronic reads on people grabbed off the street do fall into these categories. But you must realize that you no more than start to get the rudiments in and you start upsetting this. And when you prepcheck the pc you upset it farther.. You're keying out things now. Now, you've changed the pc's position on the track and numerous other things with R3GA and your tone arm sweeps, as

they move back and forth across the dial, actually denote nothing of any significance except that you have motion on whatever you are doing, because it's all relative motion. See, it ceases to be fixed motion as soon as you start disturbing the case and it then and there becomes relative motion.

You're starting to push around the reactive bank. Your modern processes do not leave this chronic state of affairs chronic. They're very briefly there. So that the meaningfulness of a tone arm, once it has started to move on a pc by reason of Prepchecking and R3GA is practically zero. It has no meaning as such except the fellow isn't Clear. Masses are passing through, don't you see. It doesn't even mean if he has a high TA that he has a withhold now. See? There's no significance actually attaches to the exact meaning of a tone arm read, once you have started the fellow in the modern processing But all of those reads, which have been announced previously, are all factual and apply very definitely to the man in the street. If he's sitting at 4.5, you can adjudicate some oddball facts about him with regard to crowds. If he's sitting at 2.5, you can make some kind of an odd estimate on what the fellow might be doing in life.

You could tell fortunes with it that would upset people god-awfully. The – this guy walks in, sits down, PE Course, you know. I'm not saying you should do this, but he comes in, sits down, you put the cans in his hands and you find out he's reading at 1.5. Well, you could start off with a long song and dance, "Now let's see, now you've often, often had difficulty with your family, isn't that correct? *Hm-hm,* yes, *hm-hm,* as a matter of fact you've left home quite a few times. Yes, *hm, you* ever been married? Yes, well, you've left your wife a few times and you haven't been doing too well in business. And, you haven't been this and you haven't been that . . ."

He'd agree, "Oh my God," he'd say, "Yes."

"You very often are very careless of yourself, you stand out in the rain very often without coming inside."

And he'd say, "Oh, yes, yes. How – how did you know that? How did you know that?"

See, you could go on and on. Some bird is sitting at 2.5, see, and he comes in there and you say, "Well, you constantly tinker with machines. You are very interested in computers. You probably have wondered about giving people orders at a distance through some communication equipment and having those orders exactly, promptly, immediately and never defied – obeyed, you see. Never defied under any circumstance."

"Yes. Yes. How did you know that?"

You see, of course you've got a robot read. And you just read the character . . .

"You run your home on a highly systematic basis and are very, very impatient of your wife's irregularities. Isn't that true?"

You could go on, you know, you could make an astrologist look like a punk with this thing. And, you've got other reads and so forth. This boy comes in, he's reading at 2.0.

"Well, you've had a great deal of trouble with women, haven't you? You've had a lot of trouble with your mother, isn't that correct? Yes, and the last time you were in love, it didn't go well, isn't that right? You have a tendency to be rather didactic with regard to women and give them orders and – to do this and to do that, with women, but secretly, down underneath it all, you are really afraid of them, aren't you? Isn't that the case?"

"Oh, yes, yes, yes, how did you ever know that?" you see.

Some girl walks in, she's reading at 3.0. "Now, you've been death on men, haven't you? You've always had trouble with men, isn't that correct?"

Oh, my, you could go on and on. Or, "You've often thought of getting married and/or of staying married – which are you, married or unmarried? Now, you've often thought of – of staying married, but have changed your mind."

Oh, man, you could really read it out well. "You actually don't prefer housework. You think the woman's place is not in the home. Is that correct?" Yeah, you could really do that.

Have – he reads at 4.5, "You haven't – you often thought of yourself as a priest or heading a large congregation or a large organization of some kind or another? Have, you had – often had thoughts of doing revolutionary type work. you have envisioned yourself as out there talking to the multitude, isn't that correct? You don't like armies or navies and you don't like crowds. You hate to go downtown at the rush hour. Isn't that right?" And so on.

"Oh, yes, yes, how did you know?" you see. 4.5.

You'll get the positive-negative aspect. You'll get the plus and minus aspect the way one of these reads. And if anybody wanted to do a complete job of this, he would actually have a fortunetelling scheme that would make anything since Chaldea look pale. But its validity, for an auditor, once it has been disturbed, becomes zero. you audit a guy for a while and – well, it's true, if he settled down on a new read and stayed there several weeks, yes, he'll have the characteristics of the new read. But you see auditing doesn't really do that with somebody. It moves it all over the place.

Answer your question?

Male voice: It does, thank you.

All right, didn't mean to answer it at such length, but it's an amusing subject to me. Some of the things you can do – the longer we look into this, why the more swami the swamis look.

Someday – I used to be very good at telling fortunes and that sort of thing. Simple expedient, reading other people's pictures. It was very embarrassing to people. They come in

and you tell them all about what – where they've been that day. I never realized at the time that you could also shift their bank. And I've never worked it out since, so that you moved the somatic strip and looked at the pictures. You see, you get the idea? You can – you could look at the pictures where they've been that day, you'd say, "Well, where have you been today? Let me see, I can tell you where you have been today." You see, you're reading their pictures. And you give them just a description of the picture you see, you see. And, "Oh, yes, yes" and it sounds very wonderful. "You must be very prescient" and so forth. Of course they're carrying it right in front of their face.

Well, as the years have gone on – I hadn't thought, actually, until just this moment, the fact that all you have to do is move the somatic strip through various portions of the person's past, you see, in order to read all of their past life, you know. And then really all you'd have to do is move in future track. Well, we don't know anything about the validity of future track, but you could at least move in the track on them that they would like to have or were afraid of having as a future and either one of them would be other – equally satisfactory in a fortunetelling, wouldn't it?

You know, it's funny how tricky man has been about all of these tricks without ever being able to do anything for man, isn't it? You realize all fortunetelling is basically based on making the person agree to a postulate. You create the future for them by creating a postulate. So the next time the ancient witch gazes into her boiling cauldron and says, "I see you meeting with a dark-haired young man." you say, "I don't like dark-haired young men. Make it a blond." Something like that, you see. Or she says a blond, say, "I don't like blonds. I like dark-haired young men." you see. Get her to change it around, till you get an acceptable future!

Okay, well, we're overtime and overdue. That's it.

Thank you very much.

Good night.